

SOUTH TAHOE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

P.O. Box 7695
South Lake Tahoe, California 96158

July 13, 2015

The Honorable Brian K. Veerkamp
District Three Supervisor
County of El Dorado
330 Fair Lane
Placerville, California 95667

Re: Meyers Area Plan – Issues and Concerns

Dear Supervisor Veerkamp:

I am writing to you at the direction of the Board of Directors of the South Tahoe Chamber of Commerce. I understand that the Board appointed you as the Liaison between the Board and Meyers community in the absence of Supervisor Novasel. Thank you for taking on this task and assignment.

The Chamber of Commerce has heard from its members and residents and business owners in Meyers. They continue to voice grave concerns with planning process now underway. There is an opinion that the current process that you have inherited has not been open, transparent, and inclusive. Our Chamber Board and other residents have sent to the County these concerns in writing and voiced them in meetings in the past to the previous Board members and staff and current Board members and staff, and the issues remain outstanding and unresolved.

The South Tahoe Chamber of Commerce wants the planning process for Meyers to be successful, and it can be successful if outstanding issues are addressed, and the entire Meyers community is solicited for their opinion on their future. In the end, we recognize that the Meyers Area Plan belongs to the people who live, work, and own property there.

We are asking for your support and that of the Board of Supervisors to ensure that the planning process is an open and fair one. We share your values “to do the right thing.” We continue to believe, as we have suggested in the past, that a random sample survey of impartially designed questions to Meyers residents about planning matters would be one good way to ensure inclusiveness and transparency.

Thank you for your attention to these matters. Please feel free to contact us if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

GEORGE ALM
President

C: Board of Supervisors
Interested parties

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

From: **Mike Filce** <filcewriting@gmail.com>

Date: Sat, May 9, 2015 at 11:20 PM

Subject: Re: Follow-up on Wednesday's Meyers Workshop

To: Meyers Resident

<meyersresident@live.com>, Bosone@edcgov.us, bostwo@edcgov.us, bosthree@edcgov.us, bosfour@edcgov.us, bosfive@edcgov.us

El Dorado County Board of Supervisors:

I am writing to urge you to undertake a shift in perspective in order to perform the jobs you have been elected to.

A while back, I called the county to find out about Mr. Veerkamp's role in the Meyers plan process, and was told that he is in fact an elected rather than appointed official, and as such, the next in line to take over the Meyers plan in the wake of Novasel's recusal. Fine: I accept that.

The problem is that, elected or not, and despite the adherence to the letter of the law, it is patently inappropriate for Mr. Veerkamp to serve on behalf of Meyers, just as it would be for a south shore resident to make decisions on behalf of Placerville. To do so puts expediency over ethics. A process that adheres to the proscribed rules yet so clearly violates the spirit and intent of our democratic offices and processes is no process at all -- at least not one of which to be proud.

Mr. Veerkamp has expressed that "a small vocal minority" stands against the Meyers Area Plan, and in this assessment he is mistaken. Many more of us are concerned about the plan, and the fact that we can't make it to this or that meeting is not an indication of our lack of passion or interest. It is a reflection, if anything, of the increasing demands on working people in Tahoe these days. Further, the plan itself has not exactly been presented in a user friendly format; it takes time, effort and a fairly advanced critical reading ability to sift through the obfuscation to get a glimpse at what the plan actually says.

Like others, I am baffled by the clearly pre-planned physical set up of the meeting room at the Environmental Magnet School this past week -- an arrangement of "workstations" without chairs, clearly designed not to facilitate a community meeting, and to discourage a community forum. These efforts at railroading and manipulating the Meyers community are in fact the only transparent aspect of this entire process, it seems.

Why Mr. Veerkamp feels that a community discussion is "not necessary" is incomprehensible, and shows just how disconnected he is from the Meyers community. I, and many other residents, am looking for an equitable process, one that allows the participation of all residents, including those who are unable to attend the meetings, and yes, at least an unbiased survey. The County's resistance to these repeated requests is disconcerting and frankly, puzzling; and in itself raises additional questions about why the County is so invested in pushing through a plan that ignores the wishes of the community. Such behavior suggests that certain individuals and entities will benefit if the plan gets pushed through, and that only makes me more curious and suspicious.

Maybe my fears are unfounded, but they are only natural given the way the County and its representatives have handled the Meyers Area Plan.

Mike Filce
Meyers, CA

From: **Charmaine Pape** <charmaineape@sbcglobal.net>

Date: Wed, May 20, 2015 at 12:08 PM

Subject: Meyers Plan

To: Charmaine Pape <charmaineape@sbcglobal.net>, "meversresident@live.com" <meversresident@live.com>, "Bosone@edcgov.us" <Bosone@edcgov.us>, "bostwo@edcgov.us" <bostwo@edcgov.us>, "bostthree@edcgov.us" <bostthree@edcgov.us>, "bosfour@edcgov.us" <bosfour@edcgov.us>, "bosfive@edcgov.us" <bosfive@edcgov.us>

My husband and I have been living in Meyers for more than 40 years. The reason that we choose to live in the county and not in the city limits is because we enjoy the rural country lifestyle. We have a lot of open space in Meyers and many trails for hiking and biking. The people who live in Meyers chose this area to live in because it is rural and away from the hustle of the city of South Lake Tahoe.

I used to attend the Meyers Round Table Meetings that we had in the 80's and 90' and those were the type of grassroots meetings that we need today. The local voices were listened to and we were making decisions based on what our community wanted. Now we are just getting bulldozed by agencies who don't seem to care about what the people who live in the community want.

We live in such a beautiful part of the South Shore with views of the Sierra all around us, so you can understand why we have such strong feelings about height and density increases.

The way we have been treated for the last year has made us become very suspicious about what is really happening. Does the county have big developers in their back pockets ???? Why else would they not want to listen to us? I just pray that someone in your office will stand up and do the right thing. We have a wonderful community and we deserve to have a voice in what happens to us. Please listen to our voices!!!!!! Charmaine Pape

Bill

May 12

Abiko billajunk@sbcglobal.net via edcgov.us
to MeyersAreaPlan

Sorry I missed the meeting. Haven't gone through the entire document. Particularly interested in these statements:

7. Goal: Reduce the number of vehicular access points and other points of conflict along US 50. Encourage the use of shared driveways along US 50. Coordinate the access locations with the planned US 50 center median.

... layouts will accommodate the combined access without major modification.

8. Goal: Recognize the status of US 50 and SR 89 as state and regionally-designated scenic highway corridors. Maintain and improve the scenic quality of the corridors and their viewsheds.

9. Goal: Reduce the visual dominance of the US 50 highway corridor through Meyers.

Policy 9.1: Request Caltrans to make available for sale or other means of transfer, excess right-of-way along US 50 to adjacent property owners or El Dorado County.

Policy 9.2: Develop an enhanced center lane along US 50 through the Area Plan which provides access and visibility to adjoining land uses, and permits turn movements at cross street intersections.

I know this is would require major modification but I'll throw it out there again. As long as hwy 50 remains a mass of asphalt plowing through Meyers it will never be scenic, even if you replace the center asphalt median with a raised concrete one. It is much wider than it needs to be and impossible to cross safely. Instead of bringing the businesses closer to the road, why not separate the road to bring each direction closer to the businesses. There could be a substantially wider median that could replace the asphalt with a number of features: vegetation, pedestrian/bike paths, plazas, public art, visitor center, etc.

I would rather county take ownership of the excess right of way. Is this (9.1) encouraging more development closer to the road?

anonymous (sort of)

John

May 7

Drum tahoedrums@icloud.com via edcgov.us
to Brendan

Hi - we had quite a few more comments to make, but had to leave the Open House early last night.

1) We have to ensure that the height restriction is no less than 45 feet. Our town centers do not need to have the same height restriction as our neighborhoods. We have to encourage higher density development in our town centers and it is critical to ensure that we can create mixed use redevelopment. It is the only way to provide workforce housing and middle-income housing options (on the second level) with retail and restaurant space on the first level. Nicely designed two story buildings will not harm our community.

2) The community should not be afraid of growth and change. Do not listen to the loud minority. Most of the residents who live here (including those like us who have been here 20 years!) want to see progress and change that is positive for our community. Many locals are priced out of buying a home, so offering opportunities for new or expanded small businesses in Meyers, with more affordable housing options through mixed-use development in our Meyers town center is the only way to have that.

3) Connect our neighborhoods through bike paths (and budget to actually maintain them) and trails to the town center to encourage more mobility and environmentally friendly options to get to the town center. We currently have a variety of bike paths that are not integrated in a cohesive manner - many end abruptly: by Lake Valley Station 7, at the old car dealership, or into a drainage dip on Pioneer Trail. They also cross multiple driveways, are haphazardly maintained, and are not cleared in winter. Additionally, as we have witnessed with the habitual delays to completing the Sawmill path, separate Class I paths cost more, and involve more planning. Since Highway 50 and 89 are plenty wide enough, it seems as though it would be financially more effective to create better bike lanes (possibly colored) along the existing right of ways.

4) Definitely include tourist accommodation options in MAP1 and MAP3.

5) Allow for lighting (LED lights on trees) all year around - it would be great to have trees lit at night at the "Welcome to Meyers: Gateway to Lake Tahoe" sign as you enter on highway 50. The entrance to Breckenridge has beautiful lighted trees. We also need to clearly define the role of (and redevelop) the neglected Forest Service visitor's center.

6) Increase the density options for multi-family to 30, for bed and breakfast to 20 and for other tourist accommodation units to 30 in MAP1. If done right, the development can be well planned and encourage higher density without negative visual impacts. Encouraging more density in MAP 1 is the goal! Who wouldn't want to walk to dinner and then back to their hotel room? This is a big win for the environment as it encourages much less driving!

7) All future development and redevelopment should include sustainable building and design elements.

8) Some sort of park (my 13 year old envisions a small skate park) at the old abandoned car dealership/gas station/Mexican restaurant at the end of town. A bike path along the river could easily start here, bisect the golf course realignment and then intersect with the Sawmill bike path. This could also better tie in with the discussed bridge across the river which would safely allow bicyclists and pedestrian access from the North Upper Truckee community and not force people to cross Highway 50 at the bottom of Echo Summit. This could also tie with a "Safe Routes to Schools" plan for LTEMs students who could be enticed to ride to school from those neighborhoods knowing that they would not have to cross Highway 50 twice.

9) Someone needs to take a leadership role in enforcing better visual standards for our community - ie, why is a dilapidated wedding chapel with makeshift parking lot barriers one of the first things that visitors encounter?

Thanks Brendan - feel free to contact me with any questions.

John Drum - 942 Kekin Street in Meyers.
tahoedrums@icloud.com

530-577-6348 home
530-545-3008 cell

Debbie
Klee dklee213@gmail.com via edcgov.us
to MeyersAreaPlan

Apr 23

Hello

I received a postcard in the mail regarding the upcoming meeting on May 6, if I am not working that evening I will definitely come. In the event I am not able to attend the meeting I would like to share my thoughts on Meyers,

What happened to the Visitor's Kiosk/Center off Hwy 50 by Meyer's Station? It looks like at one time this was a nice place. With all the visitors we get who pass right by this it would seem the county would want to keep this maintained. Meyer's has a rich history and this would be an excellent way to share with visitors and the community in addition to just being a nice stop for visitors or locals to walk through. Meyers should have a visitor's center. I know many people, including myself, are interested in how Christmas Valley came to be and the story behind the name.

One thing I do not want to see here in Meyers is "Urbanization" - the focus should be on "preservation". Tahoe is unique in that the environment, is in most cases, is key on the priority for protecting our historical history and environment.

We need to strive to keep Lake Tahoe a "Mountain Community". Look what is happening with the proposed historical Barton Property near the Y - it is deemed for demolition which would be a sad loss. Yes, the property is run down, has mold, and other issues but this is only due to neglect. This should be "preserved" for the historical value and made useful. I realize this does not pertain to "Meyer's community but it is example of people wanting to take the easy way - eliminate, destroy and move on. History "should be" preserved"

Regards,

Debbie

**South Tahoe
CHAMBER OF COMMERCE**

P.O. Box 7695
South Lake Tahoe, California 96158

April 6, 2015

**The Honorable Members of the
Board of Supervisors
El Dorado County**
330 Fair Lane
Placerville, California 95667

Re: Ad-Hoc Meyers Area Residents Concerns, Meyers Area Planning Process

Dear Honorable Members of the Board:

I am writing to you on behalf of the Board of Directors of the South Tahoe Chamber of Commerce who voted in support of this communication at its meeting of April 6, 2015.

The South Tahoe Chamber of Commerce Board of Directors supports the request of the Meyers Group Ad-Hoc Committee (and members of our Chamber) that communicated with all of you via electronic mail on March 16, 2015.

The South Tahoe Chamber of Commerce supports a clearly defined, transparent, and inclusive planning process before any action is taken by the Board of Supervisors to approve a new Meyers Area Plan. We understand that the concerns for transparency, adhering to the letter and spirit of the Brown Act, and inclusiveness are not new issues as they have been brought to the Board's and staff's attention several times over the last year. We are looking optimistically to the newly seated Board to address them.


It is unfortunate that recent County Counsel opinion has precluded our newly elected Supervisor from participating in decisions affecting her District. We urge the County to seek an independent counsel opinion in this regard, seek an opinion from the FPPC if necessary, and seek judicial relief if necessary as was done in the case of "Jerry Brown v. Fair Political Practices Commission, No. A091305, 00 C.D.O.S. 8391, 2000 Daily Journal 11157, filed October 12, 2000." The intention here is to give a voice to our elected County Supervisor on matters of importance to her District.

At a minimum the Meyers Group and the South Tahoe Chamber support an unbiased and independent survey of the entire Meyers Community to determine their preferences for a new community (or "Area") plan. We understand that organizations like the National Research Center (NRC) can conduct such scientifically valid surveys for local governmental agencies in a collaborative process with all interested parties.

Finally, the South Tahoe Chamber supports the Meyers Group Ad-Hoc Committee request to have an item placed on the agenda of the Board of Supervisors to discuss the Meyers Area Plan, process, and concerns, and how to ensure the community will have elected representation for the Meyers plan update.

Thank you for your consideration of this matter.

Sincerely,



George Alm
President

C: Board of Directors
Meyers Concerned Residents and Business Owners
Interested parties

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

From: **Bruce Brant** <bbrant.b2@gmail.com>

Date: Sat, May 9, 2015 at 3:01 PM

Subject: Myers area plan

To: Bosone@edcgov.us, bostwo@edcgov.us, bosthree@edcgov.us, bosfour@edcgov.us, bosfive@edcgov.us

Hello,

I'm one of the silent majority Meyers residents. I agree with our supervisors assessment that only a small vocal minority is against progress in our community. It has been disturbing to watch Jennifer (the Sierra Club ringleader of this group) call meetings and whip residents into a frenzy with her misinformation and rhetoric. I liked the original version of the plan before these meetings began. I read this version (the one developed by much hard work by our volunteer community representatives) from cover to cover and found it be comprehensive, thoughtful and forward-thinking. Then I watched with dismay as the plan got watered down at the sessions Jennifer and her "no change can possibly be good" cronies sponsored. I'm sorry I could not be at the last meeting - some of us have to work. But I was happy to see (from her e-mail) that the current board is not "drinking her koolaid".

I want you to at least hear from one resident that I DO support the work of our dedicated community members and would love to see the positive changes to Meyers that they worked so hard to codify in that original plan.

Thank you for listening -

Bruce Brant
946 Shakori Drive
510-936-3211

The BOSTHREE <bosthree@edcgov.us>
To: Brendan Ferry <brendan.ferry@edcgov.us>

Fri, Aug 21, 2015 at 8:48 AM

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

From: **Bruce Brant** <bbrant.b2@gmail.com>

Date: Sat, May 9, 2015 at 3:30 PM

Subject: Re: Myers area plan

To: Bosone@edcgov.us, bostwo@edcgov.us, bosthree@edcgov.us, bosfour@edcgov.us, bosfive@edcgov.us

Just to follow up. Some of the things I liked about the original plan:

- 1) The incentive program was a great way of attracting businesses while supporting the community - I understand these kinds of programs have proved very effective around the basin. I don't mind a nice facility with a 10 foot higher roof if it is an asset to the community.
- 2) Lets allow for enough density so that we could actually attract some lodging to the area. The revisions being proposed set it so low that no business will ever attempt to make a go of it here.

3) Fixing the zoning is also critical. Without fixing the current zoning, no development is reasonably possible, How can we attract any business if we make it impossible to build anywhere except where there is no available space?

I'm not an advocate for turning Meyers into a big resort town. But the well-thought out plan developed by the Meyers Community Council does not allow for that. What it does is correct the out-of-date plan that stifles all development and creates an environment where some reasonable development is allowed to move the community out of the stagnation the existing plan has forced us into for so long now.

Again, thanks for listening - Bruce Brant