



The County of El Dorado

Chief Administrative Office

Parks Division

Don Ashton, MPA - CAO

330 Fair Lane, Placerville, CA 95667
Phone (530) 621-5360 Fax (530) 642-0301

Memo

Date: February 11, 2021
To: Julia McIver, Parks Commissioner District IV
Lori Parlin, Supervisor District IV
From: Vickie Sanders, Parks Manager
RE: Chili Bar Study

I would like to follow up on the comments and recommendations from the Coloma Lotus Advisory Committee. I asked the consultant the following questions and these are the answers they provided.

1. How are the power lines, setbacks and easement and right of way being depicted on the plan?
Overhead power lines are shown on the plans. The preliminary title report prepared in 2007 as part of the property appraisal lists the following easements that might impact our study area:
 - a. Pacific Telephone and Telegraph Company (now AT&T) for operation and maintenance of communication lines in 1942. Exact location of easement not disclosed.
 - b. United States of America for operation and maintenance of communication Transmission facilities in 1951. Exact location of easement not disclosed.
 - c. Joe Carmelich for ingress and egress and incidental purposes in 1956. Exact location of easement not disclosed.
 - d. Joseph and Joan Stancil for road and incidental purposes in 1962. Located along White Water Drive.
 - e. An easement resulting from a judgement after trail in 1986. Exact location of easement not disclosed.

The other easements listed in the title report only effect Parcel 1 (conservation easement, environmental enhancement and mitigation program agreement, Deed of trust to secure debt) and Parcel 3 (interest of the Burke's), which are not part of our study area.

There is no indication that there is a PG&E easement on the site and our surveyor said that certain lines and power drops, typically near residences, do not have easements.

If anyone has additional information about the easements listed above or an electrical or power line easement, we would be happy to review it and update the report as necessary. I tried to look up the official records online and think I got the document numbers, but couldn't get copies of the actual documents. However, I think that if there was a description of the easement that would have been included in the title report.

2. The map that is presented in the report, does it cover 6.5 acres or 4.3 as they stated.
The study area we are looking at is 4.3 acres, but the topographic survey was completed on ~8 acres, from the private road north of the site to the river. It includes the entire lower terrace.
3. Did you meet with Elena?
Yes, I had a phone call with Elena, as noted in the references section of the report.
4. They are requesting more information on the conditions and cost to be completed to bring these up to structures up to a usable state.
More information will be provided a part of the feasibility report, in association with the potential uses for the site as described in our scope. The opportunities and constraints report only assessed which structures are suitable for re-use. The exact costs will depend on the actual use of the structures. The architectural report in appendix B provides more information on the improvements needed.