



EDC COB &lt;edc.cob@edcgov.us&gt;

**Fwd: Dixon Ranch**

2 messages

**The BOSONE** <bosone@edcgov.us>

To: EDC COB &lt;edc.cob@edcgov.us&gt;

**LATE DISTRIBUTION**  
 DATE 2/28/17  
 BOS 2/28/17

Mon, Feb 27, 2017 at 12:32 PM

Kind Regards,

**Cindy Munt**

Assistant to Supervisor John Hidahl, Dist 1  
 Board of Supervisors, County of El Dorado  
 Phone: (530) 621-5650

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

From: **Verner, Shaun** <Shaun.Verner@edwardjones.com>

Date: Mon, Feb 27, 2017 at 11:04 AM

Subject: Dixon Ranch

To: "undisclosed.for.privacy" &lt;undisclosed.for.privacy@edwardjones.com&gt;

BOS,

I have read the article in the Mountain Democrat as well as information from a few other sources and found it quite interesting that a board meeting can be run in such a fashion. Isn't it BOS job to follow the rules, guidelines and discuss the "facts" of a given project? It appears that this did not happen at last Tuesday's hearing on the Dixon Ranch proposed project. All applicants should be given a fair and unbiased platform in which to discuss in open forum their project especially when it directly adheres to the counties general plan as well as provide much needed upgrades to El Dorado County infrastructure. This county needs quality housing, infrastructure upgrades and tax revenue to grow and yes we need to grow.

Sincerely,

Shaun Verner

**Shaun Verner/Financial Advisor/Edward Jones****4369 Golden Center Drive., Suite A Placerville, CA 95667****530-626-6060/shaun.verner@edwardjones.com**

Shaun Verner

Financial Advisor

Edward Jones

4369 Golden Center Dr Ste A

Placerville, CA 95667

(530) 626-6060

www.edwardjones.com

If you are not the intended recipient of this message (including attachments) or if you have received this message in error, immediately notify us and delete it and any attachments.

If you do not wish to receive any email messages from Edward Jones, excluding administrative communications, please email this request to Opt-Out@edwardjones.com from the email address you wish to unsubscribe.

For important additional information related to this email, visit [www.edwardjones.com/disclosures/email.html](http://www.edwardjones.com/disclosures/email.html). Edward D. Jones & Co., L.P. d/b/a Edward Jones, 12555 Manchester Road, St. Louis, MO 63131 © Edward Jones. All rights reserved.

---

The BOSONE <bosone@edcgov.us>  
To: EDC COB <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

Mon, Feb 27, 2017 at 3:59 PM

Kind Regards,

**Cindy Munt**

Assistant to Supervisor John Hidahl, Dist 1  
Board of Supervisors, County of El Dorado  
Phone: (530) 621-5650

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

From: **Brittany Cullen** <brittany.cullen@gmail.com>

Date: Mon, Feb 27, 2017 at 2:47 PM

Subject: Dixon Ranch

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

Dear Supervisors,

I am a resident of El Dorado County and I felt it necessary to write this email given the recent news of a rejection of the proposed Dixon Ranch Project. I am a female in my twenties and am currently in graduate school. I want my voice to be heard. **I am concerned that only the voices of the no-growth movement are being heard.**

I want to stay in El Dorado County in the future, to live close to my parents who also live in El Dorado County. I am getting married and planning on having kids and will need to find a new place to live in the relatively near future. Along with many people in my generation, I do not want to buy large lots and manage acres and acres of land. I want to live in a new development. I thought that Dixon Ranch was a great, well-thought-out project that would provide much-needed housing and funding to fix traffic problems.

I know that the developments that are being built today were proposals that were being considered 20 years ago. We need to plan now for the future. Blackstone, which does provide much needed new housing, was not approved in the last five years. Please understand that I respect the fact that people do not want their rural lifestyle changed, but they are not the only ones living in El Dorado County now.

**While I have not been political in the past, this past election has motivated me to start to take a stand for things that I believe in out of fear that outspoken individuals in the minority are being heard over the silent beliefs of the majority.** I know that California has requirements for growth that counties must follow. I don't believe that El Dorado County has met these requirements. To prevent the state from intervening, aren't projects like Dixon Ranch the right way to meet the necessary growth? I am the type of person who will help start a movement to get the state involved in development and growth in El Dorado County if the county isn't doing its job.

Sincerely,

Brittany Cullen





EDC COB &lt;edc.cob@edcgov.us&gt;

---

**Fwd: February 14th Hearing**

1 message

---

**The BOSONE** <bosone@edcgov.us>  
To: EDC COB <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

Mon, Feb 27, 2017 at 4:00 PM

Kind Regards,

**Cindy Munt**Assistant to Supervisor John Hidahl, Dist 1  
Board of Supervisors, County of El Dorado  
Phone: (530) 621-5650

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

From: **waterdog0525@gmail.com** <waterdog0525@gmail.com>  
Date: Mon, Feb 27, 2017 at 2:43 PM  
Subject: February 14th Hearing  
To: bosone@edcgov.us, bosthree@edcgov.us, bosfour@edcgov.us, bosfive@edcgov.us

I am writing to express my frustration with the Dixon Ranch hearing. I am neither a project supporter nor a no-growth project opponent. Whether or not Dixon Ranch is a project that should be approved, the political gridlock in El Dorado County has to STOP. In these past local elections, there were so many propositions about growth, limiting growth, allowing growth that it is IMPOSSIBLE to be an informed voter who is not involved intimately in county growth politics. As our supervisors, our ELECTED officials, it is your job to make sure that El Dorado County grows properly and in the best manner possible.

What happened at the public meeting was embarrassing. It was not a hearing, it was not fair and balanced. It looked like a dog and pony show put on by the Chairperson to obtain a specific outcome. The fact that none of the other Supervisors attempted to reign her in was disappointing.

It was clear that there were questions that needed to be answered. The matter was headed for a continuance, as I thought it should, until the Chairperson MADE the second motion, and then decided that it should be voted on first. Such political grandstanding has no place in a fair and balanced hearing.

I realize that the decision was made, but I think it sets a dangerous precedent as to how a single Supervisor's agenda can prevent the rest of the Board of Supervisors from making an informed decision.



EDC COB &lt;edc.cob@edcgov.us&gt;

---

**BOS agenda 2/28/17 item 41, 14-1617**

1 message

---

**vandyke.5@sbcglobal.net** <vandyke.5@sbcglobal.net>

Mon, Feb 27, 2017 at 6:07 PM

To: Brian Veerkamp <bostthree@edcgov.us>, John Hidaahl <bosone@edcgov.us>, Shiva Frentzen <bostwo@edcgov.us>, Jim Mitrison <edc.cob@edcgov.us>, Sue Novasel <bosfive@edcgov.us>, Michael Ranalli <bosfour@edcgov.us>  
Cc: GreenValleyAlliance <gvralliance@gmail.com>

Dear Supervisors,

I'm pleased to see item 41, Dixon Ranch Findings for Denial, has been added to the consent calendar.

I also see a comment was submitted complaining about the hearing on the 14th. So I need to say that I too was in attendance, and while I sat through nearly 2.5 hours of presentation by the proponent prior to the opening of public comment, I did not find the meeting to be either chaotic or disorganized, just long. The proponent had plenty of time to make his case and was not treated in a manner one would deem as unfair in any way.

I would also like to say that I, too, have followed this project closely, and know the details intimately. The Findings for Denial reasonably reflect the fact that this project was NOT compatible with adjoining land uses, does not provide low or moderate income housing, and is not providing economic benefit to the county to rationalize approval of a General Plan amendment that would allow a project that is inconsistent with both our goals and policies.

It appeared most Supervisors had read the project materials, the public was given the opportunity to speak, and that the developer was given ample presentation time both before and after public comment, all to assist the Board in making the decision to deny.

This was a controversial project that has been draining on the public. I look forward to knowing the project, having run it's full course of the planning process, has received its final 'denial' upon approval of Tuesday's consent calendar.

Sincerely,  
Ellen Van Dyke, Rescue