

PC 11/14/19
#5

November 6, 2019

To Whom It May Concern,

My wife and I have lived in El Dorado Hills for many years. The residents have voiced their opinion loud and clear that there has been enough growth and development in the community. When are the developers and local officials going to carry out our wishes? For how many years are we going to have to fight growth?

Albert and Paula Autry

Albert Autry
Paula Autry

695 Knight Lane, EDH



PC 11/14/19
#5



Charlene Tim <charlene.tim@edcgov.us>

4 pages

Fwd: CEDHSP Comments

Planning Department <planning@edcgov.us>
To: Charlene Tim <charlene.tim@edcgov.us>

Tue, Nov 12, 2019 at 10:12 AM

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

From: **John Burns** <johnburnsca@gmail.com>

Date: Mon, Nov 11, 2019 at 4:21 PM

Subject: CEDHSP Comments

To: <planning@edcgov.us>, <jvegna@edcgov.us>, <gary.miller@edcgov.us>, <jeff.hansen@edcgov.us>, <james.williams@edcgov.us>

Please find attached my letter of comments regarding the Central El Dorado Hills Specific Plan. Thank you.

John Burns



EDH project response 11-11-19 (1).docx
20K

John F. Burns
3203 Ridgeview Drive
El Dorado Hills, CA 95762

November 11, 2019

El Dorado County Planning Commission
and
Rommel Pabalinas
Long Range Planning Division
El Dorado County Community Development Agency
2850 Fairlane Court, Building C
Placerville, CA 95667

Subject: Comments on the Central El Dorado Hills Specific Plan Area

To all concerned parties:

What is the rush here? This project has languished for years; now it is suddenly put up for review, allowing less than two weeks for anyone to look at thousands of pages of documents. There is insufficient time for concerned community members to read, understand, and comment on these incredibly complicated plans? Or perhaps that is the purpose intended by the developer. Add in a federal holiday and the holiday season, and one can really minimize comments by the public that way.

I suggest that statutory minimums for project review are not being met, and that the affected community has not been allocated enough time to conduct an adequate review. Why El Dorado County is participating in this farce is beyond me. Is there something to hide? Clearly there are unanswered questions, as outlined below. It seems that the County is endorsing an effort to ramrod this project through without public debate or consideration, rather than having it all out on the table to be able to make a fair decision about a project that will permanently change the quality of life in the community.

I am requesting meetings be re-scheduled for January, allowing adequate review time for the affected public. I expect a written response to this request.

In February 2016 I sent an analysis of several points relative to the draft project proposal. These were answered in an incomplete and perfunctory manner, and evidently resulted only in a few corrections in the errata volume. Lacking time for a comprehensive analysis in the face of this rushed schedule of a planning commission meeting on November 14, I have summarized again several major issues with this project.

Please take note, consider, and respond:

1. Combining the “Serrano Westside” old golf course project and the “Pedregal” project is still not explained properly. The two projects have been thrown together even though the only common thread is that they both create traffic problems for EDH Boulevard, and they are owned by the same individual. These projects need to be considered separately for a number of reasons:
 - a. The properties have nothing in common in setting, hydrology, wildlife, proposed type of development, previous land use, and more. They are geographically distinct.
 - b. Tables do not segregate impacts by location and which project causes which impacts.
 - c. The Corps of Engineers did take notice and divided the project into two parts, as it should be. Note that they required permits for “Serrano Westside” and “Pedregal”. The Corps requires separate types of permits, and are processing them separately on different time lines. The same should be occurring with these two projects—if the Corps can find reasons to separate, so should the County.
 - d. Please explain why these projects are not separate, as they should be. Moreover, please explain why there is no description of what happens to the significant part of Pedregal bordered by Gillette on the north, existing Ridgeview residences on the west, a planned development on the south, and open space or apartments on the east.
2. The combination of these projects has created a horrible situation, pitting neighborhoods against each other. The Serrano folks afraid of asbestos now seemingly like the project because the development is moved off the reputed asbestos area. The project proponent plays up to these neighborhoods. As long it is not in the backyard of certain people, it is somehow acceptable (reflecting Next Door comments of late). Please explain what happened to the developments that were proposed for the alleged asbestos site and where they were moved?
3. The Corps of Engineers permitting is not complete. Many times, measures required for the federal review are different than CEQA measures. Allowing the projects to move ahead of the Corps review ignores the fact that many times different conclusions and measures are required. For example, the Corps requires a Historic Properties Management Plan or a Historic Properties Treatment Plan for cultural resources. Have these two plans been written and signed by all parties for each of the two projects? Shouldn't the measures for federal review and CEQA be in accord? Another reason to hold off this rushed approval attempt is to ensure that the two processes can be aligned. Please explain the status of these required reviews.
4. I reviewed dates of technical studies—some are almost ten years old. The EDH of today is very different than it was when the technical studies were undertaken. These should be re-done by an independent third party, not ICF or Parker's previous consultants, such as ECORP. Please explain how it is accurate to use out-of-date studies that no longer reflect current traffic impacts, etc.
5. There are numerous small technical errors. Taken as a whole they make one want question the overall quality of the document.

6. One of the other major issues is the wetland impacts. The delineation and other biological studies were undertaken during the many years of drought. The rain of the last few years has dramatically changed the impact areas, with springs and seeps on the Pedregal side refreshed and many different wildlife species present.
7. The technical studies never state that the Pedregal project area is at the headwaters of a drainage system fed by the many springs and seeps on the ridge above and slope, partially covered by the existing houses, and that this water remains in areas to be developed. By not recognizing that they are proposing to build on significant seeps and springs, the project developers are endangering people with future damages to roadways, buildings and structures. The water is so plentiful coming in through where the apartments are proposed is that they are leaving problems for future owners and occupants. Indeed, there is no recognition that a good portion of the apartment site was formerly partially covered by a reservoir called "Mormon Reservoir." Since there are no creeks or ditches feeding the area, it is obvious that the reservoir was created by putting a dam on the lower end and letting it fill with the waters off the slope. Historic maps show a drainage heading southward from the former reservoir site. Why are the ditches on the west side of El Dorado Hills Blvd. so deep and wide? It is natural water flow from the seeps and springs at the headwaters of a large drainage system—this is quite simply not a great place for apartments.
8. What would the Corps of Engineer think about such different and much more extensive wetlands impacts than what the project proponent has conveyed to them? If the Corps had all the facts, it may change their ideas about the issuance of a permit. Please explain when the Corps will be given all the facts about these wetlands.
9. Has the Corps of Engineers ever reviewed the promises made by Parker in the 1980s for protecting cultural and biological resources? Perhaps they should be encouraged to check compliance before issuing two new permits to them? I believe this is a question for that agency, and it will be asked of their staff. Please explain whether the Corps has been asked for this review and how they replied.

I look forward to your full and complete response to these comments.

Sincerely,

John F. Burns

John F. Burns

johnburnsca@gmail.com