

January 17, 2011

2012 JAN 18 AM 10:47

To: Board of Supervisors, El Dorado County
330 Fair Lane
Placerville, California 95667

Re: Sundance;Z07-0040;TM07-1454;S09-0012;Hearing January 24, 2012

This project is asking for your approval in the rezoning of Rural Land which can currently be split into 20 acre parcels. The re-zone is asking for 28 - 10 acre parcels. The Community has no problem with the original designation of AE and the 20 plus acre parcels it has been designated. We feel that the land can probably support 14 additional wells. It's not as if nothing can be done with this land if it is denied by the Board of Supervisors. Mr. Beauchamp knew what it was zoned when he purchased the land in 2002.

The Hydrologic report Bill Bennett prepared disputes the amount of water this project would draw from the surrounding properties as well as the re-charge rate for the area. We may not be designated as a low well area but there are many multiple well properties and many storage tanks already in place due to depletion of the water over the last 30 years of development. Our natural resources have to be protected and carefully designated. Mr. Beauchamp may have provided a hydro geologic report that makes an assumption that "Sundance site has substantial water to preclude any significant impact on adjacent properties" but that firm did use statewide water averages not site specific rainfall averages that Bill Bennett's report did that disputes Mr. Beauchamp's hydrologists report by using actual local statistics not assumptions. Please review these two reports carefully and make your assumptions which one is right. Do not let this area become a low water area. We are all aware that December was the third driest December on record. The snow pack at 6700 feet is 1% of normal. January has had many record warm days.

Mr. Sanford, Environmental Services, may have testified that the project satisfied criteria but the only criteria required by the County at this time is that 3 wells had to be drilled, one on each parcel, and show they produce water. They may produce water now but it is not being pumped and has to carry a warning to potential buyers that they need filters to filter out the high magnesium and iron content of the water found on this property. Maybe this isn't the best criteria for

development but that is all we have at this time. No one is suggesting that this subject area should be precluded from the utilization of wells. If it is developed under its land designation of 20 acres hopefully there will be enough water to go around.

When Mr. Beauchamp originally started coming to community meetings he acknowledged that the community wanted him to put in GDPUD water. He found out that Pilot Hill Estates had been trying to get water to their area and formed a memorandum of understanding with them to share the cost of bring water to Sundance. Mr. Laurie, in his 1-3-12 letter, makes it sound like their was opposition by the neighborhood. The opposition was to the cost and the residents could not afford it not to bringing in water. There are parcels in Pilot View Estates to the N of Sundance that are currently trucking in water in the summer. They desperately wanted city water and to join in with Mr. Beauchamp until the cost became prohibitive. I am enclosing the Historical Account of Pilot Hill Estates attempt to obtain a domestic water supply for you to decide if their running commentary sounds like opposition to bringing in in water from GDPUD and sharing the cost with Mr. Beauchamp. This paperwork was forwarded to me by the President of the HOA of Pilot Hill Estates. Pilot Hill Estates is directly N from the beginning of the proposed Sundance's entrance. I have also spoken with Steve Gau of GDPUD and he said he knows of no threat of litigation if water was to be brought in for this project.

Mr. Beauchamp originally planned for trails, open space, a staging area, fire hydrants. Now he argues against trails, deleted staging area and open space. What, if anything is he doing to enhance the community. I thought Developers were to provide enhancement to the area.

By approval of this project with wells the Board of Supervisors will be setting a precedent which could further impact the area. At the South East corner touching Sundance there is a 120 acre parcel that wraps around to Salmon Falls. The Garland Ranch which is directly N of "Sundance" is hundreds of acres could want to sub-divide and develop and could cite precedence. The Whitaker property at 49 and Rattlesnake Bar is 600 plus acres that could cite precedence. The El-Tee Ranch is hundreds of acres down Salmon Falls Road. All of these properties have access to GDPUD water but may want to put in wells as it is expensive to bring in the water. The large land splits should be required to bring in domestic water when available. They probably won't want to because it's all about money. Pilot View Drive has 30 vacant properties that have not been built on yet or drilled wells and

are not in GDPUD area. Is it fair to them? What about the rest of us who are in GDPUD area but would be required to form an Assessment District to bring in the water at costs way above what any of us can afford? This project is an example why a developer, who has access to domestic water, should be required to provide water if it is available. Developer's should be made aware that this is part of their responsibility for doing their project if they want to subdivide land.

The Cool - Pilot Hill Advisory Committee has discussed this for over 5 years and does not support this for the area. There are large parcels in Cool that could also cite "Sundance" as precedence and want to put in wells because it is cheaper than bringing in domestic water. This is just not good for our area.

Please read all the letters from the surrounding area that have taken the time to write to you to voice their opposition.

Declining this re-zone does not preclude Mr. Beauchamp from developing his land. It just cuts into his profit margin if he is required to bring in domestic water.

Please don't approve this re-zone and potentially cause Pilot Hill to become one of the Dry Well Areas.

Thank you



Marlane and Mario Gregoire
4800 Pilot Creek Lane
Pilot Hill, California, 95664
530 823 1640

Attachment: Historical Account of Pilot Hill Estates to Obtain Domestic Water

**HISTORICAL ACCOUNT
OF PILOT HILL ESTATES' ATTEMPT TO OBTAIN A DOMESTIC WATER SUPPLY FROM
THE GEORGETOWN PUBLIC UTILITIES DISTRICT**

The original petition submitted by the Pilot Hill Estates Homeowners Association (PHEHA) was based on the Georgetown Public Utilities District's (GPUD) amount of approximately \$30,000 per house. This petition was written with the assistance of GPUD staff and then signed by 80% of the homeowners. Upon submission, the GPUD Board of Directors officially approved the PHEHA petition for a domestic water supply.

Although PHEHA was told that they were first in line for a domestic water supply, GPUD continued to delay implementation.

When the Sundance project was proposed, PHEHA went into a working arrangement with Chris Beauchamp, the project's developer. This would have divided the cost for PHEHA homeowners to a more affordable \$15,000 rather than \$30,000 per home.

A right of way over Catecroft was obtained from Clear Channel Radio. The water supply could then go from Catecroft down Oakview to the other side of Rattlesnake Bar Road. Because of the elevation, water pressure would suffice for an adequate delivery system.

El Dorado County did not grant permission for Mr. Buchamp to proceed with the Sundance subdivision. However, if Pilot Hill Estates could have shared this cost with Sundance, the cost to PHEHA would have been approximately ½ of \$30,000, or \$15,000/parcel.

At that time, PHEHA asked the homeowners on the other side of Rattlesnake Bar Road if they would like to also join PHEHA to obtain GPUD water and further reduce the cost for each house. This was rejected.

PHEHA then tried to go on its own without Sundance or the homeowners on the other side of Rattlesnake Bar Road. GPUD refused to meet with the PHEHA Board of Directors. The PHEHA board successfully appealed to a GPUD board member who arranges the following meeting with GPUD staff.

GPUD staff presented PHEHA with a new cost of approximately \$60,000 per house. GPUD staff stated that the original \$30,000 was a guess because they did not think that PHEHA was serious about bringing in GPUD water into Pilot Hill Estates. (Please refer to items 1-13, dated 5/3/04-3/5/08, as documented in the attached record of PHEHA's attempts to secure a domestic water supply from GPUD.)

This is not a wealthy community. The PHEHA board had no choice but to inform GPUD staff their homeowners could not afford \$60,000/per house to bring in GPUD water.

Be advised that these events are officially documented in the board minutes of Pilot Hill Estates.

- 11) 10-06 to 12-07 PHEHA was in coordination with Sundance Development to obtain GPUD water supply on a cost sharing basis. This involved the exploration of two alternative routes: one is from Catecroft to Acorn Court; the other is a longer route through the Whittier property. The route via the Whittier property is not an option. The Whittier property is on the real-estate market and will not grant an easement. This means PHEHA's only option to obtain a GPUD domestic water supply is from Catecroft to Acorn Court.

To date, Sundance development has not been able to obtain El Dorado County permits to proceed with its development. As of 12-07, it is the PHEHA Board of Directors' understanding that Sundance has taken the position of not developing its 40 parcels using GPUD's domestic water supply. (These 40 units were based on a cost analysis for this project based on a GPUD water supply.) Rather, Sundance can, at some point in time, use its current 29 residential zoning parcels to create 29 wells for this project.

- 12) 3-2-07 The PHEHA Board of Directors contacted Clear Channel Radio which responded to our earlier request to grant GPUD an easement for the benefit of an underground water pipeline. The pipeline would allow residents in PHEHA to access a domestic water supply, including fire suppression. Clear Channel Radio approved PHEHA's request for an easement as of this date.

- 13) 3-5-08 PHEHA contacted GPUD staff to initiate the timeline required to obtain a domestic waterline into this community. PHEHA initiated this request separate from the Sundance Development because Sundance has not received El Dorado County permits to proceed.

At that time, our PHEHA's Water Committee Chairman was informed by GPUD of the following. PHEHA must have its own holding tank. GPUD cannot provide for the necessary electrical power to lift the waterline over Catecroft to PHEHA's easement via Clear Channel Radio to Acorn Court. Rather, GPUD staff informed PHEHA that we would have to locate on an unknown property and pay for a holding tank costing over \$600,000 as an alternative.

P. O. Box 416
Pilot Hill, CA 95823
23 June 2009

Bonnie Neely, Board Member
Georgetown Divide Public Utility District
6425 Main Street
Georgetown, CA 95634

Re: Domestic Water Supply, Pilot Hill Estates Homeowners Association

Dear Ms. Neely:

Enclosed are documents dated from 2001 until 2008 which represent continued attempts by the Pilot Hill Homeowners Association (PHEHA) to obtain a domestic water supply from the Georgetown Divide Public Utility District (GPUD).

Please note, the original cost was \$641,000 in 2001. At a meeting with GPUD staff and board members in September of 2008, the cost was \$2,422,000, not counting an \$8,000 hook-up fee.

My conclusion is that GPUD never had any intention of providing a domestic water supply to this community.

Thank you for your concern and review of the enclosed documents. Rosemary will be in touch with you as soon as we return from Colorado at the end of July.

Respectfully,

David Ragsdale
President, Pilot Hill Homeowners Association

Enc.