



LATE DISTRIBUTION

DATE 7-14-15

30

EDC COB <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

Re: Public comment, file no. 12-1203, BOS 7/14/15 item 30 TAKE OFF OF CONSENT

1 message

Monique Wilber <monique.w@comcast.net>

Tue, Jul 14, 2015 at 6:31 AM

To: Jim Mitrison <edc.cob@edcgov.us>, Michael Ranalli <bosfour@edcgov.us>, Sue Novasel <bosfive@edcgov.us>, Shiva Frentzen <bostwo@edcgov.us>, Ron Mikulaco <bosone@edcgov.us>, Brian Veerkamp <bosthree@edcgov.us>, Ellen Van Dyke <vandyke.5@sbcglobal.net>
Cc: Shawna Purvines <shawna.purvines@edcgov.us>, oakstaff@californiaoaks.org

Public comment, BOS 7/14/15 item 30, file no. 12-1203

Dear Supervisors,

This item needs to be removed from the Consent Calender.

Please do not rush the Resolution of Intention to make changes to the General Plan biological policies brought to you by staff and the consultant. While you consider it "draft" and it can be changed, once you adopt it, the horse has left the barn. The policies will have been set to move forward the environmental review process. Then you are on your way to an expensive EIR, and challenges to the EIR. Let's be real, here. We know that those policies are not likely to change once the environmental review is under way.

There is no going back once you approve 100% clearcutting of oaks as THE option.

As the former Senior Planner working on the OWMP and the INRMP, eliminating PAWTAC - an advisory body of experts on natural resources - is ill-advised. Who on your staff is a natural resources expert? That knows everything from fish and wildlife to oak trees and other habitat to watersheds? The staff member assigned to this is not someone with an education in ecosystems or biology. Although I have been an environmental planner/scientist for 14 years, and have a BA and MA in a related field, I am not an ornithologist, botanist, or fisheries expert - I rely on expert third-party advisors to provide me with scientific information. And not necessarily ones that are paid to tell you what you want to hear. You should too.

You DO understand that the policies that you are eliminating or changing are MITIGATION for development, approved by the voters in the 2004 General Plan? You DO understand that many, many of the policies that you are eliminating or changing were NEVER implemented, don't you? Therefore, El Dorado County is out of compliance with CEQA, and anything tiered off the GP is out of compliance with CEQA.

I am requesting that you do the following:

- 1) Take this item off of Consent.
- 2) Do NOT adopt this ROI (118-2015), but send it back and direct staff to have the motion and your intentions accurately reflected in a revised ROI.
- 3) Utilize the time required to correct this ROI to simultaneously allow the public to review the final drafted policies.

By rushing this through, you are limiting public involvement and causing the public to be challengers of your amended GP, rather than champions of it. I urge you to do the right thing for this County. Supervisor Ranalli, you represent me, and I expect you to represent all of your constituents - including me. More time is something the County has the luxury of - you can delay this.

Very sincerely,
Monique Wilber
Shingle Springs