



EDC COB <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

BOS Meeting, Sept 12, 2017 - Comments on Staff Report 25A

5 messages

Roger Lewis <re.lewis@comcast.net>

Mon, Sep 11, 2017 at 1:50 PM

To: bosthree@edcgov.us

Cc: bosone@edcgov.us, bostwo@edcgov.us, bosfour@edcgov.us, bosfive@edcgov.us, edc.cob@edcgov.us, anne.novotny@edcgov.us, Roger Trout <roger.trout@edcgov.us>, Shirley Parker <sparker07@comcast.net>, Ron Kooyman <ron@thekooymans.com>, Nancy Lappen <nancyinmarin@sbcglobal.net>, jim davies <j854davies@att.net>

Dear Supervisor Veerkamp,


Attached are our comments pertaining to adoption of the biological resource policies scheduled for discussion at the upcoming BOS meeting on Sept. 12, 2017. We support Staff's recommendation for removal from the project of the two Board-initiated proposed changes for the reasons stated in the Revised Staff Memo, 25A. We also support Staff's recommendation for a more streamlined appeal process for in-lieu fees. We believe that the determination of the in-lieu fee to be applied to any given project should be as straightforward and simple to implement as possible. Streamlining the appeal process is a very good start.

Moreover, we appeal to you once again attempt to expedite this process of adopting the new oak resource policies. As we repeatedly remind you, the process has gone on far too long causing continuing financial harm to our Company.

Thank you,

Roger Lewis

El Dorado Sr. Housing, LLC.

 **comments_on_BOS_mtg_20170912.pdf**
337K

EDC COB <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

Mon, Sep 11, 2017 at 2:30 PM

To: Roger Lewis <re.lewis@comcast.net>

Thank you. Appropriate public comment provided for upcoming agenda items will be added to the corresponding file.

Office of the Clerk of the Board
El Dorado County
330 Fair Lane, Placerville, CA 95667
530-621-5390

**Comments for the Board of Supervisors Meeting of September 12, 2017 Pertaining to
Adoption of the General Plan Biological Resources Policy Update, Oak Resources
Management Plan, and Oak Resources Conservation Ordinance**

By El Dorado Sr. Housing, LLC

September 11, 2017

The California Wildlife Foundation in their August 21, 2017 letter is making wild claims that the biological resource policies that the County is soon to adopt will cause enormous damage to the environment. They provide no evidence to back up their claims, but imply that adopting such policies will exact a severe toll not only on the environment but on the County's economy as well.

We beg to differ. The policies that you are being asked to adopt were developed over many, many years at great cost and effort. They are the result of numerous meetings and debates, studies by experts on dozens of topics, significant community involvement, and due diligence by all parties involved. They of course are a compromise, and yes, they may allow some unavoidable impact, but in general it has been proven without a doubt that they will result in no long term significant damage to either the environment or the economy.

If it is necessary to debate and/or study the impacts of redefining heritage trees to exclude live oaks, or revising the personal use exemption to reflect a per dwelling basis rather than a per parcel basis, then these two Board-initiated proposed changes should be removed from the project. It should be obvious to any reasonable critic that the additional impact from these considerations is insignificant; and to have to prove that point with more environmental analysis is simply a waste of time and money and can only lead to further unacceptable delays. The Planning Department's recommendation that, through actual implementation of an adopted ordinance, the County can determine whether or not such modifications are even necessary seems like a straightforward and logical compromise with the potential for meeting the objectives of the proposed changes without undue time and cost.

The biological resource policies should now be adopted in accordance with Planning and Building Department's recommendations. Failure to do so will only result in additional delays that can no longer be justified and which **ABSOLUTELY DO** exact a toll on the economy. Case in point: Our property, which in 2006 was valued at and purchased for \$2,000,000, cannot today be sold on the open market for even \$500,000. This is a 75% decrease in land value in just over 10 years caused in great part because the County does not have a workable plan for managing their biological resources.

If by law the Planning Commission must be allowed to consider any new modifications to the oak resources ordinances proposed since their last review, then by all means give the Commission the opportunity to review such proposed modifications.

We encourage you to accept the recommendations of the County Planning and Building Department and return in October prepared to approve and authorize the resolutions necessary to permit development in the county to once again proceed.

Recall that initially the overall objective of this project was simply to produce a justifiable in-lieu fee for the mitigation of oak tree impact. This objective has finally been met.