

From: **Lori Parlin** <loriparlin@sbcglobal.net>
Date: Thu, Jan 15, 2015 at 7:38 AM
Subject: CEDAC and draft Economic Framework
To: Supervisor Mikulaco <bosone@edcgov.us>, Supervisor Frentzen <bostwo@edcgov.us>, Supervisor Veerkamp <bosthree@edcgov.us>, Supervisor Ranalli <bosfour@edcgov.us>, Supervisor Novasel <bosfive@edcgov.us>, edc.cob@edcgov.us
Cc: Carol Louis <cjrl4664@gmail.com>

Dear Supervisors,

Please see attached comment letter regarding CEDAC's current draft of an Economic Framework. I have been working closely with Carol Louis on making suggestions to CEDAC regarding the draft. We have many concerns about the Framework and the process CEDAC used to create the draft. Also attached is our one-page alternative to CEDAC's verbose and suggestive draft.

Carol and I would like to arrange a meeting with each of you to further discuss this matter. Please contact me to arrange a meeting as soon as possible. The last update we received is that CEDAC plans to present their Framework to the Board at the January 27, 2015 meeting, and we would like to meet with you beforehand.

Thank you,

Lori Parlin
530-672-6425

FRAMEWORK FOR A COMPREHENSIVE AND PROACTIVE
IMPLEMENTATION PLAN FOR SUSTAINABLE ECONOMIC
DEVELOPMENT FOR IN EL DORADO COUNTY

or

JOBS: JUMP-START OPPORTUNITIES FOR BUSINESS STRATEGY 1/3/15

The introductory paragraph of the El Dorado County General Plan states that ...”It provides for growth in an environmentally balanced manner, maintains the rural character and quality of the living environment, providing adequate infrastructure while conserving agricultural lands, forest and woodlands, and other natural resources.”

Objectives

To expand existing and develop new businesses in El Dorado County.

Phase One – Assessment

- Inventory of existing commercial and industrial facilities, and all lands presently zoned for industrial and commercial use.
- Ongoing inventory of vacancy of commercial and industrial properties.
- Success and failure of past efforts.
- Investigate programs of other jurisdictions with similar characteristics and demographics
- Identify shortfalls of existing infrastructure, including but not limited to parking, roads, and high-speed internet.
- Identify realities and obstacles to economic development in El Dorado County

Phase Two - Program Development

- Create an Ombudsman position to assist future and existing businesses navigate the many policies, regulations, and legalities that are required to do business in El Dorado County
- Reform and improve regulatory process relating to business development
- Quarterly analysis of the intent and objectives of the economic development program

Phase Three – Implementation

- Analyze and monitor the benefit of membership in regional marketing organizations
- Seek out retired professionals to provide a business-to-business mentoring program
- All phases of the plan will be performed in a transparent and open manner that invites public participation
- Project management and reporting will be directed by an Oversight Committee comprised of 10 or less members, including 2 public employees, a CEDAC member, a representative from a large corporation, a representative from a medium-sized business, 2 representatives from local small businesses, and a chairperson from the private sector.
- Work with local education systems to promote workforce development and institute programs with grant funding for extended and technical education to provide employees for small business to large corporations.

CEDAC will be asking for funding to implement and create policy from their proposed Economic Development Framework. What is the ROI on other CEDAC funded projects? The Web Portal, Community Grants, and Grant Consultant are all projects that CEDAC has persuaded the Board to fund, yet is there going to be a positive return on those funds, our taxpayer dollars? CEDAC/Reg Reform has also taken credit for pushing the Board to create the new Long Range Planning Department, which caused the County to hire more staff. Has customer service to the public increased? Was this a wise investment of County funds?

Why did CEDAC decide to push this through during the holidays when most people are busy with family and don't have time for county business? When asked if we could take time to get more input, we were told that they had a goal of getting this to the Board by the end of January to try and get it in on time for upcoming budget talks. So the goal is to get it to the Board, not to spend time and effort getting input from qualified individuals and the general public.

Ad Hoc Committee 2014

Last year when the ad hoc subcommittee started working on this framework, I asked at least twice for the meeting times, agendas, and meeting minutes to be published so that the public could attend. I was told that that was not possible, despite the fact that there is a Park & Recreation ad hoc committee that openly publishes their meeting details. If Park & Recreation can do it, why can't CEDAC? Additionally, one of my friends was personally invited to attend the ad hoc meetings and declined. Do we know who was invited to attend and who was excluded?

Framework Introduced to CEDAC at November 20, 2014 meeting

When the Draft Framework was introduced to the CEDAC committee at their monthly meeting on November 20, 2014, the intent was for the committee to receive the Framework to present it to the Board. There was no intention to discuss it before getting it to the Board. The reasoning was that it was fundamentally the same framework that had been presented to CEDAC in January 2014.

Questions raised and comments made: Is the CAO the correct person to head the proposed Steering Committee, especially since CAOs come and go and may not have expertise or availability? How do we identify an expeditor for businesses, much like the film industry has Kathleen Dodge to expedite film projects? How will a policy be crafted to create the new Steering Committee? Plans are great, many plans have come and gone before, but having representatives at regional business meetings is just as important if not more. Use retired CEOs, we have many in El Dorado Hills alone, to attend the networking meetings. The Food cluster is a good match for El Dorado County. Be careful that the Framework isn't aimed at primarily corporate business, when we also want to promote smaller and home-based businesses. The presentation and the Framework document didn't match up well as far as the intent; the

presentation was succinct and did not have subjective language, whereas the Framework had language that was subjective and would lead to specific conclusions.

CEDAC tried to push the Framework through to the BOS with little or no changes. Fortunately, enough concerns and questions were raised that a workshop was scheduled to discuss the Framework and get input.

December 15, 2014 Workshop

At the Workshop a lot of suggestions were made to improving the Framework. It was brought up by several attendees that the Framework was very wordy and not easily readable. Since CEDAC was firm that the Framework was not the actual plan, it was suggested that it be whittled down to no more than a page so that it did not include suggestive language that would lead to predetermined outcomes. Suggestions were also made to include data that defined what certain terms meant, such as 'high-paying' jobs. Notes were taken and then a second workshop was scheduled.

December 18, 2014 CEDAC meeting

There is no recording available on Legistar for this meeting. A new draft was presented with some of the requested data added and edited text. The document was fundamentally the same with mostly clean up editing in terminology.

January 5, 2015 Workshop

Prior to this second workshop, I met with Carol Louis and we worked for a half-day to shorten the Framework to a one-page outline, as was suggested at the November CEDAC meeting and subsequent workshop. The one-page document was acknowledged at the workshop, but merely to note that it had been received and that it would likely be packaged with the draft Framework going to the Board as an attachment. The Workshop started with the 6 attendees being told that we really shouldn't use up a lot of time and go line by line through the draft. Well, then why were we there? It was not an open and inviting environment, so Carol and I left after it became clear that the Workshop leaders were not going to welcome our suggestions to make the draft Framework more succinct and less suggestive.

Concerns about this Framework process and CEDAC

This Framework is intended to be used as a document to create policy and use Taxpayer money. As such, it should be fully vetted by the public, not just a few dozen people in the county who are appointed and may not have adequate expertise.

At the January 6, 2015 Board meeting, it was said several times that our county is striving for 'open government.' The process in which this Framework has been created was selective and exclusive. Putting it on the county's website and sending email notifications is not good enough.

Were local, successful business owners sought out for input? Why were meetings held on weekdays during work hours?

Conclusion

Your CEDAC has failed you. Please send them back with their Draft Economic Framework Plan to rework with true community input. Back in 2013 I asked that the 'C' not be added to EDAC because it would give the impression that the committee is community oriented and actively engages the public for input. They do not. So far they have not changed their mode of operation to better include community input.

Lori Parlin
Shingle Springs



Beverly Savage <beverly.savage@edcgov.us>

Fwd: CEDAC meeting Please include my comments in the minutes of the July 15th meeting:

1 message

EDC COB <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

Mon, Jan 12, 2015 at 2:12 PM

To: Beverly Savage <beverly.savage@edcgov.us>

Hey Beverly - This should have gone to you. Thanks, Kim

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

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Tara Mccann** <mccannengineering@sbcglobal.net>

Date: Mon, Jan 12, 2015 at 1:30 PM

Subject: CEDAC meeting Please include my comments in the minutes of the July 15th meeting:

To: "edcquestions@edcgov.us" <edcquestions@edcgov.us>, "bosthree@edcgov.us" <bosthree@edcgov.us>, "bostwo@edcgov.us" <bostwo@edcgov.us>, "bosone@edcgov.us" <bosone@edcgov.us>, "bosfour@edcgov.us" <bosfour@edcgov.us>, "bosfive@edcgov.us" <bosfive@edcgov.us>

Cc: "edc.cob@edcgov.us" <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

CEDAC and CAO Office:

Do to work conflicts I won't be able to make the CEDAC meeting. Please include my comments in the CEDAC meeting Thurs Jan 15,2015 minutes and log them as pubic commit.

Sincerely ,
Tara Mccann

Comments:

Dear Board or Supervisors, Planning Commission, and esteemed CEDAC committee member volunteers:

RE: Second Workshop to Discuss Input on the Draft Framework (Architecture) for a Comprehensive and Proactive Implementation Plan for Sustainable Economic Development in El Dorado County.
Monday, January 5, 2015, 1:00 - 4:00 p.m., OES Meeting Room, Building A (lower level), 330 Fair Lane, Placerville, CA 95667

This Draft Implementation Plan is intended to provide the structure and approach to implement the Economic Development blueprint for El Dorado County. As such it will detail the approach, with specific tasks and activities, leading to the establishment of a proactive, comprehensive Economic Development Strategy for El Dorado County.

The attached Updated Draft ED Framework includes CEDAC and Public Comment contributed at the 12/18/14 CEDAC regular meeting. Additional input may be made at the second workshop to be held on January 5, 2015.

- [Updated ED Draft 12-31-14.pdf](#)

Please enter my comments below into record. I am requesting they be read aloud during public comment period

15-0404 B 6 of 10

and logged as my public comment in response to attached referenced ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT DRAFT 12-31-14.

Dear Board of Supervisors and Planning Commission,

I am writing this lengthy commentary as a response to attending CEDAC meetings but not be able to participate, comment or share views. At the meetings I intended often (OK always) I was yelled out of the room and often told it was too late to come and disagree with the direction of CEDAC. I have been very concerned about the public being told participation is welcome and then being denied participation just because the message differed from some of the CEDAC members own. I am not the only member of the public that experienced this. As most of you know I try to be involved and active in our local Area Planning Advisory Committee and land use policy community. My background is in construction and the delivery of fiscally responsible projects, land use, utilities, project permitting and project management. I feel there is some validity in what I have to say even if some CEDAC members don't want to hear it. So Thank You in advance for reading through and please feel free to contact me directly at any time with any questions, clarifications or just your own 2 cents and just so you know I welcome opinions that differ from mine. I know that is what leads to solutions.

Sound growth cannot be achieved without fiscal stability and that fiscal stability comes from sound, fiscally responsible, well managed infrastructure. Anyone can look at case studies of success and failures of economies both local and globally. What sets them all apart is one fundamental thing, their infrastructure. Is it managed, funded and maintained? Or is it ignored? It all seems to go back to where the priorities were and what infrastructure was funded or not funded. A good Economic Development Element will have a clear and supporting Economic and Infrastructure Plan. Everyone should have an Economic Plan and as Local Agencies that Economic Plan needs to be infrastructure driven to be successful. What I see happening is the other way around with the CEDAC Element emphasizing CEDAC's goals of streamlining and expediting to the detriment of processes in place for public and fiscal protections. I see growth being pushed and infrastructure at the bottom of the list, an afterthought. We see this in the County's Discretionary Approval Process. Projects are approved and conditioned later, sometimes never to be conditioned at all until a need comes up that identifies the project needed infrastructure that wasn't required of the developer in the project approval phase. So then this becomes the tax payer's burden or the odd man out developer's bill.

The underlying foundation for any Local Agency's Economy is its Infrastructure. It determines how it can grow and how it can't. The most fiscally responsible infrastructure for any County is a balance of the local agency's geographical and economic reality.

Wishing to have a Folsom like Economy to support a County that is largely Protected US Forest Land no matter how hard we'd like it to be is not a reality. I'm not saying that the County can't find its source of economic balance but it has to be realistic to its geographic limitations and find a way to make those limitations work to its benefit. The Economic Development Plan needs to consider the burden on a few localized areas that are already identified as the main source of the County's economy. These localized areas can only absorb so much. And some of these localized areas are already behind the 8 ball with the existing infrastructure not able to support the existing capacities and existing development they have.

The County's Discretionary process for approval of these projects has always been identify mitigations and pay for them later but many times later never came. This proverbial kick the can down the road mentality of trying to sustain a local economy on immediate growth and deal with the needed infrastructure later is just a powder keg of disaster waiting to happen and a true case study of how local agencies fail or go bankrupt.

This is strikingly obvious in one of the County's major funding sources the unincorporated area of El Dorado Hills, and areas such as Rescue, Cameron Park, and Shingle Springs. County staff, Elected Officials and County interests have vocalized for many years a frustration over "economic leakage" to Sacramento County from the area they target as the largest Community Region. These Community Regions targeted to be identified as the areas to receive the "highest intensity densities" of the County along the Sacramento County boarder.

What is the expectation if the County continues to put the highest intensity densities on the boarder of Sacramento County, where the jobs, infrastructure and economy exists? To keep doing the same thing when the same thing isn't working is going to push this County further down the economic hole.

Economy = Mobility. If you cannot fund or build mobility whether it be for economic reasons or for geographic

reasons or a combination of those the local economy is going to have a finite limit for growth.

The geographical and economic challenges of El Dorado County have to be met head on with a plan before throwing out any sound bites that sound like the holy grail to El Dorado County's economic problems such as this CEDAC's proposed "Element" of Manufacturing and Agriculture or agricultural supported businesses. These are good ideas, but not a sole source solution to a mounting problem and in the larger picture will not create a very big dent due to in the geographical restrictions of El Dorado County that create very costly solutions to needed infrastructure when growth is proposed.

Phase 1 of this Draft is very warm and fuzzy and sounds great, I don't think anyone would disagree with that. But get to Phase 2 & 3 and it all seems to fall apart with a small group of developer interests wanting to make case by case decisions to get around sound regulations and processes that are put in place for reasons of protecting the County and the Taxpayer. These processes are not made up for entertainment value. Some of these processes may need improving and updating I agree, but that is a lot different than deciding who gets to abide by them and who doesn't. Very Dangerous Stuff.

As an engineer and resident of the area for the past 25 years I am for growth and for development but only if it means responsibly managed growth and not passing on a mountain of debt and unfunded liabilities to the taxpayer or the existing residents. I have seen so many times this logic get painted as NIMBY's or Anti Growth. Although there are those that are no growth, most people are SPIMBY's (Smart Planning In My Back Yard ... and Your Back Yard). People want growth and infrastructure that can be compatible, fiscally manageable, not impacting to the detriment of the sole reason they live in that area, not dumping contaminants into their local rivers, creeks and woodlands, and as always safe roads and circulation that prevents congestion and allows some degree of mobility.

People are not NIMBY's if they oppose congestion and unsafe streets and roads, unsustainable increases in ratepayer fees and increased taxes to support unfunded liabilities and maintenance as well as expensive utility and public service expansions that will be necessary to support these "highest intensity densities aka Expanded Community Regions". The concerns for some of these proposed large subdivisions and commercial projects that do not have the adequate infrastructure identified or funded and possibly never will due to their geographic and economic limitations are not NIMBYism they are SPIMBYism, Smart Planning In My Backyard.

This is my open letter to the County Elected Officials, Appointed Officials, County Staff and County Residents. I hope that as County Board of Supervisors you understand the voices and interests that support you want a viable and sustainable El Dorado County but many don't see it going anywhere near that direction. Instead I've often heard people say it feels as if it's a money grab while the ship is sinking.

CEDAC stands for Community Economic Development and Advisory Committee. Sounds good, I was on board and supportive. I looked at the makeup of who composes CEDAC it was obvious this was largely Developers, Developers Interests and large land holders wanting to direct policy that would benefit the development of their land holdings. So I attended a few meetings truly thinking that the County's Economic Health was the intention of this group. What I expected and what I found were two different things.

This was a true Developer Lobbying Committee to use public funds for private gain, its intent of modifying and even some cases eliminating regulation and processes to allow for case by case exceptions to benefit development and reduce needed infrastructure was alarming. This is the exact opposite of working towards a healthy local economy. The Economic Element should be an improving of the process not getting rid of it to benefit a few at the expense of many. This would be seen as a serious misuse of discretionary powers.

As a County we need an Economic Plan but an Economic Plan without putting infrastructure at its front and center and dealing with the hard questions of how much growth and where is a disaster in the making. The concern with the direction of the County on the TGPA and ZOU fronts is the pushing of growth into these localized areas in the name of compact densities along corridors, which would work if there was parallel (and perpendicular) circulation built off the corridors and if we had the geographical footprint to support it. Green Valley Road, Silva Valley, El Dorado Hills Blvd, and Bass Lake Road are all excellent case studies and I could site the same for Cameron Park, Rescue and Shingle Springs. The continued growth without needed infrastructure (and services) results in a lack of circulation throughout these newly expanded Community Regions that still have had no site specific analysis as was required of the Environmental Review Process when land use was changed to HDR back in the 2004 General Plan.

At the time the existing Board said we'll deal with that in the next General Plan Update and here we are with no

15-0404 B 8 of 10

mention of site specific Environmental Analysis of the "Expanded Community Regions". No environmental review to determine compatibility, or impacts to the area and especially to address local circulation issues generated by site specific projects that significantly affect circulation and congestion. The only site specific reviews are outside the GP in the projects that are requesting a separate General Plan Amendment. El Dorado Hills Community Region keeps getting dealt with on a case by case exception basis and we are now hitting the wall.

We cannot dismiss that El Dorado Hills has a real circulation issue and it's getting worse. The infrastructure isn't there in the near term or long term to support the kind of growth being proposed and the Environmental Analysis and Review has never been done for these site specific parcels that were expanded into the Community Regions back in the 2004 General Plan. The current TGPA and ZOU process wants to unilaterally change the zoning of these parcels to make them compliant with the 2004 Land Use changes for the Expanded Community Regions and for all the ones that don't get their own General Plan Amendment before the TGPA & ZOU is finalized. I usually don't use these words as an Engineer but this is ludicrous. Its equivalent to stuffing a square peg in around hole.

The TGPA & ZOU needs to include the discussion of needed infrastructure or lack of it as it's focal point in the Economic Development Element and most important needs to do site specific analysis of these expanded Community Regions before the current TGPA/ ZOA simply calls the Zoning changed to fit the 2004 expansions to High Density Residential, HDR, Land Use. Infrastructure is not limited to road improvements, but utility and services expansions, identifying Right of Way or potential Right of Way needed and the cost short term and long term. I realize the enormity of this but we've been working on it for a long time and there is a lot at stake fiscally for our County for not moving forward cautiously and calculated. There is expertise out there but they are not being allowed to participate. No matter what warm and fuzzy Cum By Ya that is being disseminated.

Trying to push major policy through that benefits the development community during the Holidays has been a long standing practice that must stop. If the County truly wants public participation, transparency and a fair level playing field. A Policy Action Moratorium should be put in place during the Holidays. I am asking the County put in place a Policy Action Moratorium on all policy actions and comment periods between Nov. 15th - Jan 15th. As most of us have seen over and over major policy and controversial projects are scheduled for action during this time period. There is plenty of general County business that can be done during this time period.

This CEDAC action plan calls for the Development Community to dictate to the County the use of the public's money on a CASE BY CASE BASIS to pay and benefit private entities. Who will determine there "rate of return" to the tax payers? Who will determine their financial viability as we saw a huge mass of bankruptcy's back in 2007- 2012? Who will be making the case to which private entities get public funds and which don't.? How is this a benefit to the tax payer? The suggestion of this Developer Lobbying Group that there should be a discretionary CASE BY CASE EXPEDITING PROCESS to circumvent the existing regulations, standards and requirements everyone else is subject to tantamount to a misuse of Discretionary Powers.

I wonder what 5 members will be the judge, jury and executer of the public's money to private entities and what will be their case by case criterion. Another concern was the Steering Committee suggestion to be small and limited to 5 people to reduce "internal disagreements". Again this gives a lot of concern to transparency and solidifies my experience of CEDAC claiming it welcomes input and participation and saying vocally, very vocally it doesn't.

This Non-Transparency of Public Funds Give Away to "Select Private Entities" designated by a Developer Lobbying Group known as CEDAC all being pushed through during the Holidays is an outrageous misuse of public money and trust. The Taxpayers and Ratepayers that live in this County will suffer greatly with this very ill conceived and one sided Economic Development ELEMENT that uses public funds to benefit a few select private interests. Again I am in agreement there needs to be an economic element but not to do away with process or needed regulation that protects the public, and it needs to be all inclusive all-encompassing to all. This is very concerning how CEDAC for years was very under the radar and secretive about what they were doing and the meetings they were having. It wasn't until some of us through the TGPA process come in 2011 at the Nov. 2011 Board Meeting Item for the NOI of the TGPA & ZOU and said "No This Does Not at All Represent the Voices of The County". So to answer some of the CEDAC members who said where were you when? I say we there at the exact right time, the NOI for the TGPA and we're still here. I only regret I cannot be there at today's CEDAC workshop and although I can't attend these CEDAC workshops during the work days my comments should count just as much as if I were there.

These are my comments for a "Draft Economic and Infrastructure Development Element" in the TGPA and ZOU Process for Our County.

- The County needs a true Economic and Infrastructure Development Plan that puts an emphasis on infrastructure and solves the infrastructure and traffic circulation problems as part of the approval process and not stamp "Overriding Consideration" on everything as a way to deal with it later. It's later and we are all going to have to solve this. The only thing that does is encourage law suits.
- The Discretionary process is flawed and needs to be overhauled. Not overhauled to allow work arounds such as create a group of 5 members to determine "Case by Case Expediting for Special Interests". Which would seriously be questioned as a misuse of discretionary powers. And not throw out or ignore standards, regulations, and processes that protect the public and are in place for a reason. The County Staff should be assisting the Developer through the process but not exempting them from all standards and regulations to the point that the resulting impacts are so egregious to the livability and fiscal future of the area being developed.
- Balance the Geographical and Economical limitations of our County and recognize if you build out maximum intensity densities on the Boarder of Sacramento County you are building in leakage. If we don't have the traffic circulation through our County it will limit the growth in the County.
- Economy = Mobility.
- Put in place a Policy Action Moratorium from Nov. 15th - Jan 15th. There is plenty of work the County can get done during the 60 day Policy Action Moratorium, like the Sign Ordinance that has been a Draft for over 20 years and many more I could list, this would be a true solution to participation and public stakeholder input that the Dec. Board of Supervisors meeting highlighted as an action item. Here is my solution try it for 2 years on an interim basis and see if it doesn't work. I truly believe it will cut down on recirculation of redoing of project documents that get pushed through during this time, and maybe even law suits. What do we have to loose, I think we have a lot to gain. Take a good look at who is objecting.
- The current TGPA and ZOU through the Economic and Infrastructure Development "Element" needs to do site specific analysis of these expanded Community Regions before the current TGPA/ ZOA simply calls the Zoning changed to fit the 2004 expansions to High Density Residential, HDR, Land Use.

Thank You All for Your Service,
Tara Mccann, Resident of El Dorado County

NOTICE: This e-mail and any files transmitted with it may contain confidential information, and are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.

Any retransmission, dissemination or other use of the information by persons other than the intended recipient or entity is prohibited.

If you receive this e-mail in error please contact the sender by return e-mail and delete the material from your system.

Thank you.