

#38

**LATE DISTRIBUTION**

DATE

10/25/16

EDC COB <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

10-25-16 BOS Agenda, File #16--0477, Item #38

BOS 10/25/16

1 message

Jeannette Maynard <jeannette.maynard@yahoo.com>

Mon, Oct 24, 2016 at 4:29 PM

Reply-To: Jeannette Maynard <jeannette.maynard@yahoo.com>

To: "bosone@edcgov.us" <bosone@edcgov.us>, "bostwo@edcgov.us" <bostwo@edcgov.us>, "bosthree@edcgov.us" <bosthree@edcgov.us>, "bosfour@edcgov.us" <bosfour@edcgov.us>, "bosfive@edcgov.us" <bosfive@edcgov.us>, "edc.cob@edcgov.us" <edc.cob@edcgov.us>, "shawna.purvines@edcgov.us" <shawna.purvines@edcgov.us>

Dear Supervisors,

I was shocked and saddened to hear the Community Region Boundary issue may be kicked down the road at your meeting tomorrow to the detriment of my community.

Please do NOT accept the staff's recommendation to receive and file the Five Year Review.

Instead, please direct staff to begin the process to reduce the Community Region Boundary as part of the 2016-2020 work plan.

Thank you, in advance, for your careful consideration and favorable vote on this issue.

Respectfully,

Jeannette Maynard
Shingle Springs



EDC COB <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

FW: General Plan Dixon Ranch

1 message

John O'Connor <JOConnor@cfmequip.com>
 To: "edc.cob@edcgov.us" <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

Mon, Oct 24, 2016 at 9:28 PM

John O'Connor Territory Business Consultant cell (916) 835-4412		1644 Main Avenue Sacramento, CA 95838 (916) 447-7022 fax (916) 679-4075
 www.cfmequip.com	 www.go-greenpower.com	 www.usolarsolar.com
SOLAR • HVAC • GEOTHERMAL • WIND • CONTROLS • ENERGY MANAGEMENT		

From: John O'Connor
Sent: Monday, October 24, 2016 9:24 PM
To: 'bosone@edcgov.us'
Subject: General Plan Dixon Ranch

From,

John O'Connor, Pres. HRCSD

10/20/16

Dear Supervisors,

As President of Hickok Road Community Service District

I request that you reject staff's recommendation to receive and file the Five Year Review.

The public including the 62 property owners in our district has every expectation that you will include review of the Community Region boundaries for possible reduction in this General Plan update , based on previous Board hearings and direction. I request that you follow through on this commitment and revise both the review and the 2016-2020 work plan for the General Plan update to include consideration of the CRBs, as promised.

10/25/2016

Edcgov.us Mail - FW: General Plan Dixon Ranch

Thank You,

John O'Connor

President, Hickok Road CSD



EDC COB <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

Subject: 10-25-16 BOS Agenda, File #16--0477, Item #38

1 message

steve clark <jsclark58@gmail.com>

Mon, Oct 24, 2016 at 11:10 PM

To: bosone@edcgov.us, bostwo@edcgov.us, bosthree@edcgov.us, bosfour@edcgov.us, bosfive@edcgov.us, edc.cob@edcgov.us, shawna.purvines@edcgov.us

Dear Supervisors,

I request that you reject staff's recommendation to receive and file the Five Year Review. Based on the discussions at past meetings, the expectation was that you would initiate the reduction of the CRBs during the Five Year Review process. Please follow through and direct staff to begin the process to reduce the CRBs as part of the 2016-2020 work plan.

Sincerely, Steven Clark

Shingle Springs



EDC COB <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

10-25-16 BOS Agenda, File #16--0477, Item #38

1 message

Susan Statti <susanstatti@gmail.com>

Tue, Oct 25, 2016 at 6:37 AM

To: The BOSONE <bosone@edcgov.us>, bostwo@edcgov.us, bosthree@edcgov.us, bosfour@edcgov.us, bosfive@edcgov.us, edc.cob@edcgov.us, Shawna Purvines <shawna.purvines@edcgov.us>

Dear Supervisors,

I request that you **reject** staff's recommendation to receive and file the Five Year Review. Based on the discussions at past meetings, the expectation was that you would initiate the reduction of the CRBs during the Five Year Review process. Please follow through and direct staff to begin the process to reduce the CRBs as part of the 2016-2020 work plan.

Sincerely,

Susan Statti
Shingle Springs



EDC COB <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

Fwd:attachment to GVA Public comment BOS 10/25/16 item #38, file 16-0477

1 message

Green Valley Alliance <gvralliance@gmail.com>

Mon, Oct 24, 2016 at 6:14 PM

To: Jim Mitrisin <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

This is the file you were unable to open, Jim (see email dated 2/24/2015, below). I'm not able to convert it to pdf but email format should work - Ellen

EDC COB

Your comments have been forwarded to the Board of Supervisors. I was able to open the the second document which was a pdf, however I was not able to open the first document. Can you please resend it in pdf? Thank you.

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

From: Ellen Van Dyke**Sent:** Friday, February 20, 2015 11:23 AM**To:** Brian Veerkamp ; Ron Mikulaco ; Shiva Frentzen ; Sue Novasel ; Michael Ranalli ; Jim Mitrisin**Subject:** Public comment re: Community Regions ROI, BOS 2/24/15, file no. 13-0510**Public Comment urging SUPPORT of the ROI for contraction of Community Region boundaries**

Dear Supervisors:

One of the items under discussion for 2/24/15 (item #47) is prioritizing the ROI to contract the Community Region boundaries (CRB's).

In the 1996 General Plan, the 'expanded' Community Region boundaries included over 150 parcels from a 1995 'hot bucket' list of site specific requests that were never specifically reviewed either then or before the 2004 General Plan was adopted. Many parcels that are the subject of this ROI were included on that list. Site specific review was again avoided in the first 5-yr update. (If this is incorrect, it should be very simple to produce evidence of the review, which has been requested many times)

The EIR for the 2004 General Plan says that the 'reduced' Community Regions would "FULLY IMPLEMENT THE INTENT OF THE GENERAL PLAN", with analysis that backs this up (see page 5.1-45 for the Environmentally Constrained Alternative). Since this is from our *current* General Plan EIR, is there some reason why it cannot be used to contract the CRB's to appropriately remove parcels that were never specifically evaluated in the first place?

Regarding Attachment 6C for the 2/24 meeting, Staff's timeline related to CRL's is incorrect in some places, and simply artful obfuscation in others:

Nov 14, 2011 This listing purposefully omits that the intent of the adopted ROI was to analyze ALL Community Region boundaries, and says that only Camino/PP was to be addressed. This is clearly not correct - from adopted ROI 182-2011:

"Policy 2.1.1.1 and 2.1.2.1

Consider analyzing the possibility of adding new, amending or deleting existing Community Regions or Rural Center planning areas"

Note the conflict of today's memo (6C) with the staff memo from the Community Region Workshop for the BOS in Sept 2013, which includes this statement on page 2:

*"CRBs were reviewed in the first 5-year General Plan review, **and are currently included in the TGPA.** A fundamental component of the TGPA's environmental review was to provide a "Range of Options" to ensure the Board has flexibility to select the best option to meet the objectives of the project."*

June 11, 2013 omits the fact that Staff had been directed in *MAY 2013* to determine the next steps. In this June meeting they did not have those steps prepared and instead recommended deferment. The Board *again* directed staff to prepare a work plan and costs for the 'next steps'.

Sept 2013 staff again recommended deferment and the work plan is still not evidenced anywhere. Staff recommended development of local community plans, which is very specifically design element oriented and NOT an avenue for community region boundary change. The Board directed staff, *AGAIN*, to return in Jan or Feb with options for amending the boundaries.

February 2014 When staff requested further direction and map info at this hearing, after being given direction and maps SO many times, residents fully launched into ballot initiative mode. During this time, members of the County's CEDAC committee, the Chamber of Commerce, and even one of our Planning Commissioners, joined the assault against these initiatives with many untrue statements and a boatload of developer money, and the initiatives failed in November. They did NOT fail because County residents made an informed decision, but because voters were misled by members of the County that they would typically think they could trust.

Aren't Community Regions an important strategic element of our General Plan? Shouldn't they be reviewed before we base our budget and transportation plans on them? It is quite clear at this point that County staff does NOT support moving forward with CRB review and that this Board of Supervisors needs to take the lead to make it happen.

I would urge County staff and Supervisors to stop this cycle of avoidance. Utilize the 2004 General Plan EIR we have in place & get the CRB's adjusted.

Ellen Van Dyke

#38

**LATE DISTRIBUTION****DATE**10/25/16
BOS 10/25/16

EDC COB <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

10-25-16 BOS Agenda, File #16--0477, Item #38

1 message

Karen Schiro <knschiro@sbcglobal.net>

Tue, Oct 25, 2016 at 9:35 AM

To: bostwo@edcgov.us, bosthree@edcgov.us, bosfour@edcgov.us, bosfive@edcgov.us, edc.cob@edcgov.us, shawna.purvines@edcgov.us, bosone@edcgov.us

Dear Supervisors,

I request that you reject staff's recommendation to receive and file the Five Year Review. The public has every expectation that you will include review of the Community Region boundaries for possible reduction in this General Plan update, based on previous Board hearings and direction. I request that you follow through on this commitment and revise both the review and the 2016-2020 work plan for the General Plan update to include consideration of the CRB's, as promised.

Sincerely,

Karen Schiro
Green Springs Ranch
Rescue