

# POSITION PAPERS & ADDENDUMS

(Revised December 23, 2003)

**The El Dorado Business Alliance**  
**P.O. Box 128, Shingle Springs, CA 95682**

January 3, 2002

Bill Hetland/Lonnie Curtis  
El Dorado County Water Agency  
313 Fair Lane  
El Dorado, CA 95623

Re: Negotiation Issues for SMUD's Re-licensing of UARP

Dear Bill and Lonnie:

This letter is in response to your solicitation for comments on our community's needs as we enter into negotiations with SMUD on the Upper American River Project (UARP), located in El Dorado County (EDC). Members of the El Dorado Business Alliance (BA) feel very strongly that SMUD has, to date, received great benefits from this project – although often at the expense of EDC residents and ratepayers. This must change - if for no other reason than our County's great need for drought protection and additional water supplies and protection of our county-of-origin status. EDC has also lost a great deal of money, without compensation, to protect SMUD's original investment.

Historically SMUD has occupied the most economical and productive sites available in our county for producing energy and storing water. UARP includes 11 dams and 8 powerhouses, and 6 auxiliary dams and dikes. The fuel for this network of powerhouses comes from the snow and rain that falls each year over a 550 square-mile watershed. Of significance, of course, is that this water-shed is located in, and supported by, El Dorado County! Three large storage reservoirs, Union Valley, Loon Lake and Ice House, store approximately 400,000 acre-feet of water from average and wet winters for use in dry years. EDC residents have repeatedly expressed concern that not only does this water come from El Dorado County to be sent downstream for the Sacramento areas' benefits - but EDC residents and businesses have mandatory water meters – while Sacramento users do not. We've incorporated a water rationing system for low-rainfall years through self-imposed water-use cutbacks. Sacramento has not. Our newer subdivisions must incorporate water-recycling systems for plant irrigation to preserve our dwindling fresh water supplies. Sacramento does not. With such cheap water subsidized by El Dorado County's local citizens and businesses, it's clear Sacramentans do not feel the need to conserve or protect existing EDC water supplies.

Economically UARP has been a windfall for SMUD – though again, often at EDC's expense. According to SMUD's own brochure, "Each inch of precipitation from rain or snow produces about \$1 million worth of electricity". It also states, "UARP supplies some of SMUD's less expensive power. The cost of generating hydroelectricity is usually less than the cost of buying power from other utilities and agencies". This is sure good news for SMUD's ratepayers.

***The El Dorado Business Alliance is made up of the following organizations: The Building Industry Association of Superior California (BIASC), El Dorado Builders' Exchange, El Dorado County Joint Chambers Commission, El Dorado Forum, El Dorado County Association of Realtors (EDCAR) and Surveyors, Architects, Geologists and Engineers (S.A.G.E.).***

If you look at the precipitation in the UARP/EI Dorado County-area watershed – it's about 61 inches annually. Thus according to SMUD's brochure they gain about \$61 million worth of electricity annually and that does not include the benefits of snow pack melt and run-off from this county. And what does EI Dorado County get from this \$61 million windfall from their watershed? Well – we get about \$150,000 in property tax revenue from SMUD. Yet for this \$150,000 annually we *provide* SMUD with the following benefits:

- **Fire protection for UARP (EDC bears these costs)**
- **Fuels management for UARP (EDC bears these costs)**
- **Protection from illicit activities in power line corridors (security and emergency service provisions - -EDC bears these costs)**
- **Protection from illicit activities at reservoir sites corridors (security and emergency service provisions -- EDC bears these costs))**
- **Reservoir and power line road access, construction, security and maintenance (EDC bears these costs)**

Additionally, EI Dorado county has suffered *losses* due to UARP as follows:

- Reduction of land values and potential health hazards due to power line proximity
- Economic loss and inadequate water supply due to SMUD's occupation of prime reservoir sites
- Threat of serious economic and personal loss from drought due to lack of storage capacity and best sites taken by SMUD

The benefits that SMUD reaps for their paltry \$150,000 in annual taxes is staggering - especially when compared to another EI Dorado County utility, PG&E, which pays franchise fees to EDC for electricity, which is generally based on gross receipts and utility assets in our area. PG&E has provided EDC the following: \$543,000 in 2001; \$400,000 in 2000; and \$393,000 in 1999. Addition-ally, PG&E paid property taxes of \$825,000 in 2001, with 2002 projected to be about the same.

Finally, SMUD has indicated that the money they've made on the UARP was needed to pay for developing the UARP water and power system, however that would not be completely true. SMUD continues to carry UARP on its books, however the profits generated by the project have so far exceeded the income needed to pay for itself. SMUD simply has opted to leverage the project and keep it on their books.

In response to the issue at hand, what does EI Dorado County want from SMUD concerning UARP re-licensing, we offer the following:

- Expand the negotiating committee to include members of the public. The Business Alliance would like to see several well-informed members of the public, such as Doug Leisz, Albert Hazbun, Harry Dunlop, John Fraser or Fred Schaefer, included as active participants of the committee.

- Make it indisputably clear to SMUD that additional water storage in El Dorado County is critical. SMUD should use some of the water/power income from UARP to pay for additional storage in our county.
- Insist on a water/power project for El Dorado County that produces a revenue stream, drought protection and additional consumptive water rights.
- Insist that SMUD provide financial support to El Dorado County to offset the negative impacts of UARP to taxpayers of El Dorado County and leaves them whole (as noted in bulleted items on page 2 of this letter).
- Insist that SMUD provide power at a low rate for some of El Dorado County's public facilities such as pumping and water/wastewater treatment in the El Dorado Hills area.
- Although SMUD does not impose conditions on Sacramento, SMUD could certainly be more proactive in encouraging full water metering in the region within the near future, instead of allowing 20 more years for this to be fully implemented. Our county should point this out to SMUD.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide input into this very important matter. Members of the Business Alliance stand ready to assist you in anyway necessary to achieve a more positive outcome, in the upcoming negotiations with SMUD over the Upper American River Project re-licensing efforts.

Sincerely,

***Original signed***

Kimberly Beal, Chairperson

Cc: EDC Water Agency  
El Dorado Irrigation District  
El Dorado County Board of Supervisors  
El Dorado Business Alliance  
EL DORADO BUSINESS ALLIANCE DISTRIBUTION LISTS

## **THE JOINT CHAMBERS COMMISSION IS WORKING FOR YOU**

In the past month the Joint Chambers Commission has been actively working for our members. A position of support was taken regarding AB 2637 (Cardoza/Matthews/Cox); This assembly bill if passed would require comparable Air Quality Standards for the Bay Area that current are below those of the Sacramento Region. The Air Resource Board has concluded that prevailing winds transport Bay Area air pollution into San Joaquin, Sacramento and Solano regions. The research further concludes that these transported pollutants create significant and often overwhelming impacts on the air quality of the Central Valley region. The ARB has found that up to 27 percent of northern valley smog comes from the Bay Area. Bay Area Smog Check II would reduce Bay Area emissions by 13 tons per day.

A position to oppose rent control in mobile home parks in El Dorado County was taken by the Joint Chambers. Although the Commission is aware and concerned about the lack of affordable housing in El Dorado County, after much research and consideration, we reached the conclusion that rent control would be an inappropriate action. A copy of the position paper is available at the El Dorado County Chamber.

A regional meeting was held in Sacramento in March regarding the Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP 2025). Over 15 regional Chambers of Commerce including the Joint Chambers Commission attended this meeting. The group to support in concept the current plan formed a concession. The current plan in general includes productive means to address the transportation issues facing our region currently and in future years. A copy of the MTP 2025 is available for review at the El Dorado County Chamber.

April 4, 2002

The Honorable John Dutra  
Chair, Assembly Transportation Committee  
State Capital, Room 3091  
Sacramento, CA 95814

**RE; SUPPOORT --- Assembly Bill 2637 (Cardoza/Matthews/Cox)**

Dear Assembly Member Dutra;

We write to express our strong support for Assembly Bill 2637, which would require the adoption of the Smog Check II program in the San Francisco Bay Area.

Since 1990, the Air Resources Board has concluded that prevailing winds transport Bay Area air pollution into the San Joaquin, Sacramento, and Solano regions. The research further concludes that these transported pollutants create significant and often overwhelming impacts on the air quality of the Central Valley region. The facts speak for themselves:

The Latino Issues Forum found that the greatest numbers of asthma-related hospitalization are occurring in predominantly low-income communities of color. These communities include San Francisco, Oakland, Fresno, Sacramento, Modesto and Stockton – all recipients of Bay Area emissions.

The Bay Area's recently adopted Ozone Plan acknowledged a need to reduce emissions by 39 tons per day, but only reduced emissions by 12 tons per day. This 27-ton shortfall has led to a series of lawsuits that threaten to once again freeze federal transportation funding for the Bay Area.

Bay Area Smog Check II would reduce Bay Area emissions by 13 tons per day.

The ARB has found that up to 27 percent of northern San Joaquin valley smog comes from the Bay Area.

The enhanced Smog Check II test costs \$10 more than the Basic Smog Check test and repair costs average only \$9 more than under Basic Smog Check.

The San Joaquin, Sacramento and Solano areas are committed to doing their part to reduce emissions within their jurisdictions. However, these downwind regions cannot control Bay Area vehicle emissions; only the state can require Smog check II in the Bay area. Please support AB 2637 and put an end to the Bay Area exemption.

Sincerely,

El Dorado County Chamber

El Dorado Hills Chamber      Shingle Springs/Cameron Park Chamber

April 15, 2002

Senator Sheila Kuehl  
Chair, senate Natural Resources Committee  
Room 407  
State Capital  
Sacramento, CA 95814  
VIA FACSIMILE: (916) 323-2232

**Re: SB 2078 (Torlakson) – SUPPORT**

Dear Senator Kuehl:

The El Dorado County Chamber of Commerce would like to express its strong support of SB 2078. The South Fork of the American River is California's most popular whitewater resource and, as such, is home to one of our county's largest tourism industries. We believe this legislation recognizes the importance of the American River to the people of the state of California as well as to our local community. A prohibition of new dams and diversions on this river between Chili Bar and Folsom Reservoir makes economic and environmental sense. It allows for all the current beneficial uses – domestic and municipal water supply, irrigation and recreation of all types – to continue to be maintained for the good of our community.

We ask for your support of this important legislation. Please vote AYE on SB 2078 when it comes before you in Senate Natural Resources. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Laurel Brent-Bumb  
Chief Executive Officer

April 15, 2002

Chairman Dave Solaro and Honorable Supervisors  
El Dorado County Board of Supervisors  
330 Fairlane  
Placerville, CA 95667

**Re: SB 2078 (Torlakson) – SUPPORT**

Dear Chairman Solaro and Honorable Supervisors;

We understand that you are being asked to send a resolution in support of SB 2078 to the California State Senate. The El Dorado County Chamber of Commerce would like to express its strong support of SB 2078. As you well know the South Fork of the American River is California's most popular whitewater resource and, as such, is home to one of our county's largest tourism industries. We believe this legislation recognizes the importance of the American River to the people of the state of California as well as to our local community. A prohibition of new dams and diversions on this river between Chili Bar and Folsom Reservoir makes economic and environmental sense. It allows for all the current beneficial uses – domestic and municipal water supply, irrigation and recreation of all types – to continue to be maintained for the good of our community.

We ask for your support of this important legislation by adopting a resolution of support. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Laurel Brent-Bumb  
Chief Executive Officer

April 22, 2002

Chairman Dave Solaro and Honorable Supervisors  
El Dorado County Board of Supervisors  
330 Fairlane  
Placerville, CA 95667

**Re: SB 2078 (Torlakson) – Rescinding Support letter dated April 15, 2002**

Dear Chairman Solaro and Supervisors;

The El Dorado County Chamber of Commerce at this time is rescinding our support of SB 2078. We feel our original interpretation of the bill as written requires further clarification. The Chamber continues to support in concept the prohibition of new dams and diversions on the river between Chili Bar and Folsom Reservoir. The South Fork of the American River is California's most popular whitewater resource and, as such, is home to one of our county's largest tourism industries. We recognize the importance of the American River to the people of the state of California as well as to our local community.

Sincerely,

Laurel Brent-Bumb  
Chief Executive Officer

April 22, 2002

Senator Sheila Kuehl Chair, Senate Natural Resources Committee  
Room 407  
State Capital  
Sacramento, CA 95814  
VIA FACSIMILE: (916) 323-2232

**Re: SB 2078 (Torlakson) – Rescinding Support letter dated April 15, 2002**

Dear Senator Kuehl:

The El Dorado County Chamber of Commerce at this time is rescinding our support of SB 2078. We feel our original interpretation of the bill as written requires further clarification. The Chamber continues to support in concept the prohibition of new dams and diversions on the river between Chili Bar and Folsom Reservoir. The South Fork of the American River is California's most popular whitewater resource and, as such, is home to one of our county's largest tourism industries. We recognize the importance of the American River to the people of the state of California as well as to our local community.

Sincerely,

Laurel Brent-Bumb  
Chief Executive Officer

## **JOINTS CHAMBERS COMMISSION DOES THEIR HOMEWORK**

### **Vote Yes on Measure A**

What is Measure A? It is a \$265,000 million general obligation bond that will be on the March General Election Ballot. It will provide funding for classroom and facility improvements and construction for American River, Cosumnes River and Sacramento City colleges and Folsom Lake and El Dorado centers, as well as the development of educational centers in high enrollment growth areas of North Natomas, Davis, West Sacramento, Rancho Cordova and Elk Grove/Laguna. The colleges of the Los Rios District are expected to grow from 70,000 students today to 100,000 students over the next 15 years. The colleges are already at capacity and will not be able to handle this enrollment growth. The cost of the bond will be an average of \$9.96 per \$100,000 of assessed valuation on all property owners. The colleges fill an important need in the region, providing affordable, top quality education and job training opportunities for area residents. For many people, Los Rios colleges offer the only affordable option for learning new skills that will help them achieve personal and professional success.

### **Yes on ACA 4 (Prop 42)**

The Joint Chambers Commission support the dedication of additional monies for transportation and strongly support the provision that provide an injection of new monies to cities and counties for preservation of the existing transportation system. Prop. 2 is critical to address the identified backing of 411 billion for preserving city streets and county roads. A good transportation system is one of the most basic needs of business and consumers. Prop 42 is the first step in establishing an ongoing, predictable and stable source of funding to address California's continuing pressing transportation problems. California's future is dependent on the repair, growth and maintenance of our infrastructure. Prop 42 will help provide critical funding. It will make sure taxes collected from transportation users are used for transportation purposes.

**Joint Chambers Commission endorses Measure A.**

We encourage our members to vote YES on A.

What is Measure A? It is a \$265,000 million general obligation bond that will be on the March General Election Ballot. It will provide funding for classroom and facility improvements and construction for American River, Cosumnes River and Sacramento City colleges and Folsom Lake and El Dorado centers, as well as the development of educational centers in high enrollment growth areas of North Natomas, Davis, West Sacramento, Rancho Cordova and Elk Grove/Laguna. The colleges of the Los Rios District are expected to grow from 70,000 students today to 100,000 students over the next 15 years. The colleges are already at capacity and will not be able to handle this enrollment growth. The cost of the bond will be an average of \$9.96 per \$100,000 of assessed valuation on all property owners. The colleges fill an important need in the region, providing affordable, top quality education and job training opportunities for area residents. For many people, Los Rios colleges offer the only affordable option for learning new skills that will help them achieve personal and professional success.

El Dorado County Chamber

Shingle Springs/ Cameron Park Chamber

El Dorado Hills Chamber

January 30, 2002

Mr. Frank Mosbacher  
United States Forest Service  
Rural Community Assistance Program  
100 Forni Road  
Placerville, CA 95667

Dear Mr. Mosbacher,

I am writing this letter in support of the never-ending efforts of the Gold Bug Park Development Committee to maintain and improve the park. It is the opinion of the El Dorado County Chamber of Commerce that the park is a *tourism gold mine*.

As I am sure you are aware, the park attracts over 10,000 school children and 60,000 park users each year. With the enhancement of the stream bed area with additional picnic areas and plantings, the park becomes even more of an attraction to locals and tourists alike.

We would strongly encourage the Forest Service to support funding a plan and project to complete these improvements. The economic impact for the City of Placerville and the County of El Dorado can only improve along with Gold Bug Park

Should you wish to discuss our support further or if you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me. Thank you for your consideration of our letter.

Sincerely,

Laurel Brent-Bumb  
Chief Executive Officer  
El Dorado County Chamber of Commerce

The Joint Chambers Commission represents over 1,700 businesses in El Dorado County. As the largest business organization in El Dorado County, the **Joint Chambers Commission opposes AB 680 (Steinberg)**.

The introduction of Assembly Bill 680 has sharply focused the attention of our region's decision makers to investigate ways in which local governments might develop revenue sharing strategies to fund solutions to regional problems. In this regard, AB 680 is a landmark effort.

However, the Joint Chambers Commission believes strongly that state legislation should serve to enable locally developed consensus with respect to regional goals and objectives, rather than forcing a state mandated approach upon local government. To summarize the Joint Chamber's belief: *without shared values and a shared vision, local governments will not willingly share revenue.*

Additionally, critics of the "fiscalization of land use" claim that sales tax sharing will stop local governments from competing with one another over big box retailers, auto malls and shopping malls. There is no consensus that regional sales tax sharing will solve this occurrence. Furthermore, AB 680 is not required to establish local tax sharing agreements, since state law already allows individual counties to enter into sales tax sharing agreements among cities within its boundaries.

El Dorado County Board of Supervisors  
330 Fair Lane  
Placerville, CA 95667

**Ref: Mobile Home Park Rent Control**

Honorable Supervisors:

The El Dorado County Joint Chambers Commission would like to go on record as opposing any form of rent control in El Dorado County. Many of our members have spent numerous hours in discussion reviewing the issues, pro and con, surrounding rent control. Based on this research it is our opinion that rent control is an ineffective method of meeting affordable housing needs. In fact the evidence shows that rent control usually has the opposite effect by restricting the free marketplace and competition, and discouraging private investment in affordable housing units.

We believe that rent control also discourages owners from providing optimum upkeep of the controlled property because they are already guaranteed cost-of-living increases. In fact, if you recall a recent county survey showed that local mobile park rents had only increased slightly over the cost-of-living index, as did most if not all housing units within El Dorado County. Recent testimony provided to you by tenants has focused on the fact that renters are having difficulty paying for items such as utilities, medical care and even food. It is simply unfair to force any landlord to subsidize tenants who are having a difficult time meeting monthly expenses.

The Joint Chambers Commission would encourage the Board of Supervisor's not to postpone a decision on this matter by seeking a vote of the public. Based on the tremendous amount of data and testimony that your board has received over the past year, you are uniquely qualified to make this decision.

The Joint Chambers Commission is aware and concerned about the lack of affordable housing throughout El Dorado County. However, we believe the most effective way to address this problem is through planning and the General Plan Process.

Sincerely,

El Dorado County Chamber

El Dorado Hills Chamber

Shingle Springs/Cameron Park Chamber

May 9, 2002

The Honorable Richard Alarcon  
California State Senate  
State Capitol, Room 4035  
Sacramento, CA 95814

**RE: SB 1968 OPPOSE**

Dear Senator Alarcon,

The El Dorado County Joint Chambers Commission that represents over 1,700 member businesses is writing to inform you of our opposition to your SB1968.

As you know, SB 813 was enacted in 1983 and provided far-reaching reforms in education. Among its many provision was the reduction in years from three to two for a probationary teacher to receive permanent status (tenure). In exchange for the reduction in years, school districts are permitted to dismiss a probationary teacher without cause.

Current law requires school districts notify all certificated employees by March 15 if they are to be rehired or not. As a result, school districts are given only 16-18 months to determine if an individual has the qualities to be a food teacher and should be granted tenure by the district.

SB 1968 states that probationary teachers are to be given the reason for dismissal and creates a two-person panel in the event of a non-reelection. Once a teacher is given a reason for dismissal, a variety of issues arise that, in effect, grant the probationary teacher due process. Every job that we are aware of has a probationary period. With the importance of teaching our youth and the high-stakes accountability system we currently have in place, a two-year probationary period is the minimum of what should occur.

In essence, SB1968 makes all probationary teachers ermanent the day they are hired. With the tremendous need for new teachers as a result of class size reduction, student growth, low-performing schools and other legislative reforms, school districts must not be put in the position of being required to hire probationary teachers and effectively granting them permanent status immediately.

Sincerely,

El Dorado County Chamber

El Dorado Hills Chamber      Shingle Springs/Cameron Park Chamber

May 9, 2002

The Honorable Virginia Strom-Martin  
California State Assembly  
State Capitol, Room 3146  
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Assembly Member Strom-Martin

The El Dorado County Joint Chambers Commission that represents over 1,700 member businesses is writing to inform you of our organization's opposition to your AB 2160 as amended April 11.

AB 2160 proposes to expand the scope to collective bargaining beyond the current statutory scope of "wages, hours of employment and other terms and conditions of employment. Specifically, AB2160 proposes to expand the definition of "terms and conditions of employment" to include "the process" for virtually every professional and policy matter before a school district.

The Joint Chambers Commission strongly believes that teachers should be active participants in decisions regarding professional issues. However, we are equally strong in our belief that this participation should not occur through the collective bargaining process.

The measure also would undermine the current system of school accountability. Under the current Public School Accountability Act, governing boards and administrators – not teachers – are held accountable for meeting performance goals. This bill shifts decision-making authority to union representatives without shifting accountability.

We believe that all professionals, as well as parents, must work together in a collaborative manner, rather than an adversarial manner, to provide the best educational opportunities for our children. AB2160 takes the opposite direction.

We respectfully request your "NO " vote on AB 2160.

Sincerely,

El Dorado County Chamber of Commerce

El Dorado Hills Chamber Shingle Springs/Cameron Park Chamber

May 9, 2002

Senator Sheila Kuehl Chair, Senate Natural Resources Committee  
Room 407  
State Capital  
Sacramento, CA 95814  
VIA FACSIMILE: (916) 323-2232

**Re: SB 2078 (Torlakson)**

Dear Senator Kuehl,

The El Dorado County Joint Chambers Commission has taken a position to oppose SB2078 as written. We will reserve our final decision upon reviewing the final version of the bill. We would like to commend Senator Torlakson and the committee for pulling the bill to address the concerns of our community.

The Joint Chambers Commission recognizes the importance of the American River as a whitewater resource for our county's largest tourism industry and we continue to support the rafting industry. However, we realize the critical importance of the American River to our current beneficial uses - domestic and municipal water supply, irrigation and continued access for the good of our community.

We look forward to reviewing the final version of this bill and thank you again for your conscientious effort to work with El Dorado County toward an amicable resolution.

Sincerely,

El Dorado County Chamber of Commerce

El Dorado Hills Chamber Shingle Springs/Cameron Park Chamber

cc: Chair Dave Solaro  
Honorable Supervisors

May 10, 2002

The Honorable Dede Alpert, Chair  
Senate Appropriations Committee  
State Capitol Building, Room 5050  
Sacramento, CA 95814

**SB 1645 – OPPOSE UNLESS AMENDED**

Dear Senator Alpert,

The El Dorado County Joint Chambers represents over 1,700 member businesses a large percentage that make their livelihoods caring for the wildlife and natural resources on their property while producing safe, plentiful and healthy food, clothing, and shelter for the people of California. We are opposed to SB 1645, Byron Sher. If this legislation passes as written, it will eliminate our agricultural and rural members' ability to keep non-game depredating mammals from damaging their crops or property.

Currently Fish and Game code has provisions that allow property owners, tenants, or their employees to control non-game mammals that are causing damage to property. Farmers and ranchers, along with many other affected property owners, must be able to control these depredating animals without licensing or permitting from the Department of Fish and Game. By removing the agriculture exemption this bill imposes a hardship on farmers and ranchers.

SB 1645 is too far reaching and could affect our members' need to control rodent burrows in their stockponds. SB 1645 takes the elimination of trapping too far and to an unreasonable point. Controlling non-game mammals and rodent controls are necessary for many segments of agriculture including livestock operations, vineyards, orchards, and row crops.

Property owners, tenants, and their employees should be able to protect their crops and property from damaging non-game mammals. We urge you to vote "NO" on SB 1645 when it is heard in your committee on May 13, 2002 unless it is amended to re-instate the trapping licensing exemption in Fish and Game Code Sections 4152 and 4180.

Sincerely,

El Dorado County Chamber of Commerce

El Dorado Hills Chamber      Shingle Springs/Cameron Park Chamber

cc:      Senator Thomas Oller  
            Senator Byron Sher

June 3, 2002

The Honorable Rico Oller  
California State Senate  
State Capitol, Room 2048  
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Senator Oller,

On behalf of the El Dorado County Joint Chamber's Commission, We would like to lend our full support to the passage of AB 2958, legislation that would uphold telecom's most successful regulatory policy, the New Regulatory Framework (NRF).

The main focus of the El Dorado County Joint Chamber's Commission is to be dedicated to economic development and community service that preserves the quality of life within this region. We were here when the telecommunications monopolies were broken up and the market became competitive. With more players, there were new services available and wider deployment to our communities.

NRF was created by the California Public Utilities Commission more than ten years ago in response to the newly dynamic and competitive telecommunications market. Instead of stifling investment through profit regulation, NRF sought to provide companies the incentive necessary to invest their profits in California's infrastructure.

AB 2958 would uphold the quality of service and low rates that has kept California on the cutting edge of the high-tech industry. Through the CPUC's regulation of service quality and price caps, NRF ensures a consistently high standard for California's telecommunications industry.

Nearly 40 other states have regulatory policies similar to NRF working for them. Don't let California fall behind, especially given the critical status of our economic climate.

Please join the El Dorado County Joint Chamber's Commission in supporting the passage of AB 2958.

Sincerely,

Laurel Brent-Bumb  
Chief Executive Officer  
El Dorado County Chamber  
Representing,

El Dorado County Chamber of Commerce

Shingle Springs/Cameron Park Chamber

El Dorado Hills Chamber

**EL DORADO COUNTY JOINT CHAMBERS IS WORKING  
TO PROTECT BUSINESS AND THE COMMUNITY**

**The Joint Chambers Commission continues to examine the plethora of bills being written. The Commission has been hard at work examining, dissecting and forming positions on the following bills.**

**Recommendation to oppose: SB 1968 (Aarcon)**

This is education legislation that effects due process. The EDCOE also opposes this bill. The bill if passed would restrict the ability of management to release individuals it declines to re-elect following the probationary period. The bill opens the door for more frivolous lawsuits and ties the hands of management when choosing what teaching staff will be retained.

**Recommendation to oppose: AB2160 (Goldberg)**

This is education legislation that expands the scope of bargaining powers for teachers beyond wage and benefits. The Joint Chambers Commission's opinion is that the legislation expands the bargaining powers beyond what is a reasonable scope for the unions. It would include into law things like choosing textbooks.

**Recommendation to oppose as written: SB2078 (Torlaksen)**

This is a bill that would enhance the rafting industry's rights to water releases. Our chamber recognizes the importance of the rafting community to our economy. We do however have concerns with the verbiage in this bill that would effect water rights for EID and the Water Agency. We recommend opposing as written while reserving our final decision upon review of the final version of the bill that is in the process of being rewritten.

**Recommendation to oppose: SB1645 (Sher)**

This bill addresses trapping fur-bearing mammals or non-game mammals injurious to crops or other property. If passed it would prohibit any person from trapping or exterminating any fur bearing nuisance or predatory animal without the help of a licensed pest control person. Fur-bearers include badger, beaver, gray fox, muskrat and raccoon. Non-game mammals include coyote, bobcat, skunk, opossum, weasel and ermine.

For more information on these positions please contact the El Dorado County chamber at (530) 621-5885. We encourage you to contact your legislators regarding these very important bills.

JULY 3, 2002

The Honorable Gray Davis  
Governor, State of California  
State Capitol, First Floor  
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Governor Davis:

You are certainly well aware of Assembly Bill 1493, the not so cleverly disguised AB 1058, which directs the California Air Resources Board (CARB) to adopt regulations that “achieve maximum feasible reduction of greenhouse gases emitted from motor vehicles.”

**While we believe the authors of this measure were acting with good intentions, We have great concern that AB 1493 will inflict severe harm upon California’s small businesses and working people with very little benefit to anyone.**

Governor Davis, the drivers of cars, small trucks, and minivans are not criminals. They are the men and women who make California what it is, who fuel its economy. It is simply not right for the Air Resources Board to be given such vast powers to punish the residents of California with no substantive benefit.

We respectfully request that you veto AB 1493.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

El Dorado County Chamber of Commerce

Shingle Springs/Cameron Park Chamber

El Dorado Hills Chamber

## **Joint Chamber's Commission of El Dorado County Position Statement - THE CALIFORNIA WILD HERITAGE ACT OF 2003 - S. 1555**

The El Dorado County Joint Chamber's Commission has taken the position of 'Oppose Unless Amended' on The California Wild Heritage Act of 2003 introduced by U.S. Senator Barbara Boxer. In its current form, Joint Chamber's believes the California Wild Heritage Act of 2003 may jeopardize forest environments, inhibit the Forest Service from meeting recreational demands and significantly harm local economies. It is vital that this Act be carefully evaluated for negative long-term impact on rural communities.

The Joint Chamber's suggests the following criteria for determinations of limited use designations proposed in the California Wild Heritage Act of 2003.

- 1. Local governments must support designations.** Local governments are representative of local citizens, charged in part with the responsibility of providing for the general welfare of the citizens. Local citizens have the greatest impact from wildfire and economic losses. Local government officials are an invaluable resource for evaluating the need for additional primitive land uses according to the following listed criteria.

Only areas supported by local governments should be included in the Act. The Boards of Alpine, Colusa, El Dorado, Glenn, Lake, Mariposa, Plumas, San Bernardino, Shasta and Trinity Counties unanimously oppose additional wilderness or Wild and Scenic River designations within their counties; Alpine and Lake Counties reserving the right to support a portion of Noble Canyon, Snow Mountain, Yuki Mountain and Sanhedrin Mountain. San Bernardino County conditionally supports designation of Deep Creek as a Wild and Scenic River. The Boards of Butte and Inyo counties have requested additional information before considering support for the California Wild Heritage Act of 2003. The North Fork of the American River, Duncan Canyon and the Granite Chief Wilderness all within Placer County are the only areas to receive unanimous support from the County Boards of Supervisors but information to date indicates the Board has yet to support the Act.

- 2. The exclusive use of fire must be capable of preserving and protecting the landscape's natural features in perpetuity.** Prescribed and natural fire maintained the landscapes for thousands of years until the late 1800's. Today, the artificial vegetative density of most of the federal lands, combined with tighter air quality standards, prevents fire from being widely used. Inclusion of the 1964 Wilderness Act provision that permits necessary measures for the control and prevention of fire, insects and diseases creates a false expectation that other methods to preserve and protect will be permitted.

Today's wildfire explosion exemplifies the need to actively safeguard forested areas. Justification for mechanized fuels treatment is increasingly difficult in general forests and may never be a priority for designated wilderness. Therefore, areas being designated in this legislation must be first evaluated for conditions that permit re-introduction of fire. Where conditions preclude re-introduction of fire, areas must be pre-treated prior to designation. Additionally, the total area being designated when combined with existing designations cannot exceed the total acreage that can realistically be treated by fire given budget challenges and air quality standards.

3. **Designations must be consistent with historical and present uses.** The designations prescribed in this legislation limit uses to non-motorized. Prohibitions include motor vehicles such as snowmobiles, motor homes, and off-highway vehicles, and motorized equipment such as chainsaws and mountain bikes. Additionally, commercial enterprises are prohibited along with roads (both temporary and permanent) and structures. New land use designations should not preclude historical and present uses. RCRC believes conflicting historical and present uses, where they exist, should be exempted in this legislation.
4. **Designations must contribute to the future anticipated demand for national forest uses.** Recreational activities have been the fastest growing uses of national forests and remain a principal and growing use. Since 1950, recreational visitors have increased from 69 million to nearly 800 million within the Sierra Nevada national forests. This activity must be reflected in land use decisions.

The designations proposed in this legislation will reduce the opportunities for developed camping, and vehicular activities, placing more concentrated use on the remaining facilities. Future needs for utility corridors and cell-phone towers must also be considered, as must future water development and storage potential.

5. **A balance of multiple uses must be maintained within reasonable geographic vicinity.** The American public is diverse as is their expectation of national forest usage. The public is best served where a diversity of recreational and commercial opportunities are offered within reasonable driving distances. Rural economies are stabilized through diversified resource uses. Areas proposed in this legislation must be evaluated in terms of providing geographically diversified uses of the natural resources.

The Act also includes annual appropriations for land acquisitions and agency authority to designate acquired lands as wilderness without Congressional approval. The focus will likely include current private land inholdings.

The California Wild Heritage Act of 2003, introduced by U.S. Senator Barbara Boxer establishes 2.5 million acres in wilderness areas, 66 thousand acres in wilderness study areas, 21 thousand acres in potential wilderness areas, 75 thousand acres in salmon restoration areas, 525 miles in wild and scenic rivers, 79 miles in wild and scenic study areas, 17 thousand acres in a lower Sacramento river conservation area, and 29 thousand acres in ancient bristlecone pine forest. Each designation significantly limits management and land use. The California Wild Heritage Act of 2003 will seriously harm rural communities if not carefully evaluated for long-term effects.

Opposition has continued to mount with the reintroduction of this legislation; as evidenced by our consistently growing Coalition listed below. With over 51% of El Dorado County designated as National Forest or Bureau Land Management lands the people of El Dorado County are proud stewards of the natural beauty that is our homeland.

Sincerely,

Laurel Brent-Bumb,  
on behalf of the Joint Chamber's Commission of El Dorado County

El Dorado County Chamber  
El Dorado Hills Chamber Shingle Springs/Cameron Park Chamber

Listed below are additional members of the coalition in opposition of The California Wild Heritage Act of 2003 - S. 1555:

**Back County Horsemen**  
**Calaveras County Board of Supervisors**  
**CET&LC** (California Equestrian Trails & Lands Coalition)  
**CRCD** (Coarsegold Resource Conservation District)  
**El Dorado County Board of Supervisors**  
**El Dorado County Business Alliance**  
**Jeepers Jamboree**  
**Assemblyman Tim Leslie**  
**Assemblyman Alan Nakanishi**  
**North Fork Chamber**  
**Senator Rico Oller**  
**Recreation and Equestrian Coalition**  
**RCRC** (Regional Council of Rural Counties)  
**SAMS**  
**Sierra Resource Conservation District**  
**South Lake Tahoe Chamber of Commerce**  
**TAMBA** (Tahoe Area Mountain Bicycling Association)  
**Farm Bureau**  
**BIA of Superior California**  
**SAGE**  
**El Dorado County Board of Realtors**  
**El Dorado Forum**  
**El Dorado Builders Exchange**

May 6, 2003

Chairman Helen Baumann  
County of El Dorado -Board of Supervisors  
330 Fair Lane  
Placerville, CA 95667

Dear Chairman Baumann,

On behalf of the El Dorado County Joint Chambers Commission and the Sacramento Metropolitan Chamber, I am writing to endorse the El Dorado County Board of Supervisors letter to Governor Gray Davis, dated May 13, 2003, encouraging him to enact measures to reform California's current Workers' Compensation System.

The El Dorado County Joint Chambers Commission and the Sacramento Metropolitan Chamber support comprehensive, systematic worker's compensation reforms to lower premium levels without reducing benefits for injured workers. Joint Chambers and Sac Metro Chamber support proposals to address a number of vital issues, including skyrocketing medical costs, permanent disability issues, and fraud.

California's workers' compensation costs ranked first in the nation, even before the enactment of last year's AB 749, which raised benefits for injured workers. The pure premium rate for worker's compensation has increased significantly in recent years, and rate increases will be even greater in the coming years due to the lack of systematic reforms to offset the benefit increases in AB 749.

We commend your proactive position and concern for the business community in El Dorado County, the region and the State.

Sincerely,

Laurel Brent-Bumb, CEO  
El Dorado County Chamber  
On behalf of;

El Dorado County Chamber of Commerce

Shingle Springs/Cameron Park Chamber    El Dorado Hills Chamber

Sacramento Metropolitan Chamber

cc: Honorable Gray Davis, Governor  
Honorable Rico Oller, California State Senate  
Honorable Tim Leslie, California State Assembly  
Honorable Alan Nakanishi, California State Assembly

May 07, 2003

TO: Members, Assembly Public Safety Committee

FROM: El Dorado County Joint Chambers Commission

**SUBJECT: AB 1438 (LONGVILLE) EXPEDITED PROCESS: COPIES OF SEIZED  
BUSINESS RECORDS - SUPPORT  
SCHEDULED FOR HEARING: APRIL 22, 2003**

The Joint Chambers Commission **SUPPORTS AB 1438 (Longville)**, as proposed to be amended, which establishes an expedited process where a business may obtain copies of important business records, including computer records, seized by a government agency during an investigation.

The several sections of the California Labor code, along with many other sections of California law, permit the seizure of business records, including computer hard drives, during the investigation of alleged wrongdoing on the part of the employer. It can take months, or even longer, to get these records back, even in cases where no violations were ever found to have occurred.

Businesses of all sizes have reported suffering significant financial losses, and even the loss of their business, if they, or an employee, become the target of an investigation in which their records are seized.

California currently does not have a viable process where a business can obtain a copy of the seized records prior to the conclusion of the investigation. Without day-to-day business records, a company entity is unable to operate. Employers are unable respond to even simple requests for information such as confirmation of orders; answering employment verification requests or even to access the data necessary to authorize the timely distribution of employee paychecks.

The Joint Chambers Commission believes that **AB 1438** will correct this problem and provide a process where a business can obtain access to the records within 72-hours of making a request ensuring a company can make copies of critical business records necessary to keep their company in operation.

cc: The Honorable John Longville  
Ann Richardson, Governor's Office

June 5, 2003

To: Whom It May Concern

Re: Workers' Compensation

On behalf of the El Dorado County Joint Chambers Commission and the Sacramento Metropolitan Chamber, I am writing to endorse the El Dorado County Board of Supervisors letter to Governor Gray Davis, dated May 13, 2003, encouraging him to enact measures to reform California's current Workers' Compensation System.

The El Dorado County Joint Chambers Commission and the Sacramento Metropolitan Chamber support comprehensive, systematic worker's compensation reforms to lower premium levels without reducing benefits for injured workers. Joint Chambers and Sac Metro Chamber support proposals to address a number of vital issues, including skyrocketing medical costs, permanent disability issues, and fraud.

California's workers' compensation costs ranked first in the nation, even before the enactment of last year's AB 749, which raised benefits for injured workers. The pure premium rate for worker's compensation has increased significantly in recent years, and rate increases will be even greater in the coming years due to the lack of systematic reforms to offset the benefit increases in AB 749.

We urge your proactive position and encourage your support for the business community in El Dorado County, the region and the State.

Sincerely,

Laurel Brent-Bumb, CEO  
El Dorado County Chamber  
On behalf of;

El Dorado County Chamber of Commerce

Shingle Springs/Cameron Park Chamber    El Dorado Hills Chamber

Sacramento Metropolitan Chamber

June 12, 2003

The Honorable Dianne Feinstein  
United States Senator  
1 Post Street, Suite 2450  
San Francisco, CA 94104

**RE: SUPPORT S. 1125, THE "FAIR ACT"**

Dear Senator Feinstein;

On behalf of the Joint Chambers Commission of El Dorado County, I am writing to ask for your support and co-sponsorship of S. 1125, the "Fairness in Asbestos Injury Resolution Act of 2003."

Last year, I wrote to you regarding the need for a solution to our nation's broken asbestos claims system. Since then, the situation has grown even more desperate for asbestos health victims, the businesses, workers and shareholders wrapped up in this calamity, and our overburdened courts. Fortunately, a bi-partisan framework solution to this crisis is now available.

S. 1125 is a work in progress, but provides the framework needed to ensure the truly sick are adequately and expeditiously compensated through a privately financed national trust.

Additionally, the legislation would provide much needed certainty and finality for asbestos defendants, sparing our economy from further unnecessary bankruptcies and lost jobs.

Last, the legislation spares our courts from the "elephantine mass" of asbestos plaintiffs by moving all claims to a special 5-judge panel in the federal government. This would also preserve more funds to help the sick, which see nearly half of every award under the present system siphoned away to pay administrative/court costs.

Most importantly, the "FAIR Act" institutes national medical standards to ensure that sick people are the priority, and will receive most of the compensation. This is so critical given the RAND Institute's finding that up to 90% of all present claimants are not "functionally impaired."

I hope that you will consider joining Democrats Zell Miller and Ben Nelson as a co-sponsor of this legislation. Again, it is critical that Congress forge a solution to the asbestos litigation crisis this year. We believe you may have found that solution in S. 1125.

Sincerely,

Laurel Brent-Bumb, CEO  
On behalf of:

El Dorado County Chamber of Commerce

Shingle Springs/Cameron Park Chamber

El Dorado Hills Chamber

July 9, 2002

Senator Dianne Feinstein  
1 Post Street #2450  
San Francisco, CA 94104

Dear Senator Feinstein,

Senator Barbara Boxer has proposed legislation to designate millions of acres of public land throughout the state as "Wilderness Areas." Her proposal would severely restrict most beneficial activities on the apportioned areas, letting nature take its course without human intervention. While this may seem harmless at first, further scrutiny shows that the senator's plan would threaten human life and livelihood, while precluding management practices needed to enhance forest health and wildlife habitat.

Under this Wilderness Area designation, many outdoor recreation enthusiasts would be shut out of some of their favorite places because of new restrictions, which accompany Wilderness designation. Off-highway vehicle, mountain bike activities and cross-country ski trail maintenance would be prohibited. Sierra at Tahoe would lose all opportunities for expansion, even the grooming of cross-country ski trails. By closing these public lands to large segments of the public, Senator Boxer would rob many people of the opportunity to enjoy nature. While the able-bodied would still be allowed to backpack into the wilderness, the elderly and disabled who rely on vehicle access would be excluded. Adding the Caples and Meiss areas to Wilderness would eliminate most of the remaining crest area between Highway's 50 and 88 from public recreation uses other than Wilderness. Desolation and Mokelumne Wilderness areas already include the major part of the Sierra crest in this area.

Local businesses up and down the Sierras fear this plan. As it is, our vital resources-based industries such as forest products and beef production operations have been crippled by unbalanced regulations over the past decade. Not only are timber harvesting and grazing crucial to maintaining healthy forests and meadows, but they also provide consumers with every-day products and generate jobs for the working people who live nearby. We need to encourage these vital enterprises, not push them out of business.

Ironically, rather than preserve the pristine areas we all treasure, wilderness designations actually threaten the areas' chance of both surviving and recovering from fire. When wildfire spreads out of control, it destroys wildlife habitat, burns fertile topsoil, and opens the door to massive erosion that can severely harm entire watersheds. Without allowing motorized vehicles access to remove dead trees and begin reforestation efforts, such lands are often left scarred for decades. In most locations, the environmentally sound solution is to greatly increase mechanical thinning treatments, not preclude them.

Unfortunately, Wilderness Areas even ban helicopter access except for emergencies. This not only prohibits ecologically sensitive helicopter logging, but it also prevents local water agencies from performing required monitoring during the winter and hampers search and rescue efforts.

Sen. Dianne Feinstein  
July 9, 2002  
Page two

Senator Boxer's bill would discriminate against the aged and infirm, jeopardize already-fragile rural economies, cut off renewable sources of forest products, eliminate vital cattle grazing opportunities, hinder water supply management, and endanger both human and animal life with the increased likelihood of catastrophic wildfire.

Sincerely,

El Dorado County Chamber of Commerce

Shingle Springs/Cameron Park Chamber

El Dorado Hills Chamber

cc: Senator Barbara Boxer  
Rep. John Doolittle  
Rep. Doug Ose  
Rep. Richard Pombo  
Rep. George Radanovich  
El Dorado County Board of Supervisors

July 08, 2003

Re: AB 1426 (Steinberg)

Senator Rico Oller  
State Capitol Building  
State Capitol Room 4048  
Sacramento, CA 95814

Honorable Rico Oller:

The El Dorado County Chamber of Commerce is strongly opposed to the passage and enactment of AB 1426 as introduced by Assemblyman Darryl Steinberg of Sacramento.

In its current form AB 1426 mandates that jurisdictions within the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG), which includes El Dorado County, be required to issue a total of 10% of all new housing units over a 5-year period for “low” or “very-low” income units. (Note: This defining language appears to arbitrarily change within the bill to include “moderate” income in some sections.) We support the recent votes of opposition to AB 1426 by our Assemblymen Tim Leslie and Alan Nakanishi, and we join the cities of Elk Grove, Folsom, Roseville and Lincoln in their opposition to this legislation.

There are numerous problems with this bill including the negative precedent it sets on state legislators to vote to enforce regional mandates on local and regional (SACOG) governments in areas where the majority of those legislators are not residents. If this situation is encouraged it will have negative affects on all local planning efforts, including El Dorado County (EDC), as the language of AB 1426 adds new and incompatible elements to EDC’s current general plan and EIR processes, including the development of Housing and Land Use Elements.

Specific issues that support the Business Alliance’s opposition to AB 1426 include:

- AB 1426 encourages inclusionary housing policies, which all members of the Business Alliance are on record as opposing (ref: *Vision for El Dorado County: Position on Issues for the Proposed General Plan*, released April 10, 2003) because they are not successful in encouraging development of affordable housing units.
- AB 1426 states that the requirements of the legislation cannot be a substitute for other affordable housing requirements, but *must be added to them*. This requirement penalizes those who have already applied other affordable housing methods by mandating that they provide even more.
- The funding sources provided for in AB 1426 are not reliable, readily available or workable overall. For example, Article 3 – *Incentives* – states that if the county meets certain requirements, then the county will “...receive priority eligibility in the award of competitive state grants or loans for infrastructure projects...” However this is no guarantee that those funds will be available when needed, and competition from within the SACOG region could displace EDC from receiving any funding benefits. If a goal is not economically feasible or attractive to project developers, the net result will be that nothing will get built.

- AB 1426 introduces extensive new layers of bureaucracy (and accompanying costs) into the county planning/ building process as demonstrated in the following requirements:
  1. *“...each city and each county in the region ..prepare and submit to the California Tax Credit Allocation Committee an annual report...”*
  2. Affected jurisdictions must *“...submit a report to the Legislature regarding the number of affordable residential units in the region”*
  3. *“This bill would, among other things, authorize the establishment of a (new!) joint powers agency...”*
  4. Another section of AB 1426 adds to each county’s responsibility a provision that they must provide relocation assistance under specified conditions.

All these items will further burden cities and counties with the need for additional staff and funding to implement the bill’s mandates. With state, city and county budget shortfalls at historic highs most jurisdictions are being forced to lay off existing personnel or are under hiring freezes. This is not the time to mandate new programs, staff and expenditures.

- Affordable housing is impacted by several components that AB 1426 ignores, fails to consider, or cannot apply to El Dorado County (EDC) including the fact that many housing units are unaffordable because fees are already so high. In EDC at least \$30,000 or more is already loaded on new homes due to fees and this could double under new General Plan mandates. EDC is having difficulty providing affordable housing for local *moderate*-income earners such as teachers, police and firemen, as well as low and very-low income earners. Applying more fees to support the new regulatory and program costs of AB 1426 will not help to alleviate high housing costs or make homes more affordable.
- One requirement of AB 1426 states: *“Residential rental units required or caused to be affordable (by the bill)...shall remain affordable for at least 30 years”* and goes on to set rules for “spending” any recapture of profits from the subsequent sale, mandating use of the profits for more low income housing. Collectively the Business Alliance is not aware of any of its members who would agree to such stringent constraints on an investment in any community. This language is prohibitive to most, if not all, investors - unless a tax credit program can be applied.
- AB 1426 would necessitate El Dorado Hills housing (where most of our high-density projects are located under approved, *existing* development agreements) to be included as the basis for developing 10% additional low- to very-low income homes, even though approved, existing development agreements cannot be modified to force inclusion of the required 10% of low to very-low income housing. This will force the county to place the 10% elsewhere, *without a development funding source*.
- As currently constructed AB 1426 – Article 2 titled *Housing Development Approvals* – ties a jurisdiction’s performance of the bill’s goals to the period January 1, 2004 to December 31, 2007. El Dorado County will not have a new General Plan adopted until well into 2004 at best, although a Housing Element has already been drafted and submitted to the State for review. Implementation of this bill would force another delay on the county’s schedule for approving its new General Plan by forcing new rules onto the county.

- Article 2 also sets forth the period of January 1, 1999 to January 1, 2004 inclusive as the time period for setting a construction standard by which at least 50% of affordable housing units is to be compared. Yet El Dorado County has been under a court Writ of Mandate that has prohibited approval of virtually any new subdivision units from 1999 to present (July 2003).
- Section 65965 3 (A) allows a city or county to count rehabilitated units under certain conditions as part of the 10% affordable housing requirements. Although this appears to be a mitigating benefit to complying with AB 1426, it is a specious argument considering the vast majority of EDC's development has taken place on the county's west slope where few older units exist to be rehabilitated. This development pattern is similar in other affected rural areas as well.
- Section 65965.5 (a) states that "...10% of the multifamily zoned sites identified in the housing element ... shall be provided by right and conditioned upon density and development standards ...with at least one-half of those sites having density and development standards to accommodate very low income households." As currently set forth in EDC's new Housing Element, multi-family zoned property allows densities above 5 dwelling units per acre (DUA). We would need 6-10 DUA to make it financially feasible to build housing for low-to-moderate income households. AB 1426 effectively restricts 50% of our current multi-family-designated lands resulting in an over-provision of very-low income housing, while depriving the county of much-needed *moderate-income* housing.
- Section 2 of Article 4 – *Contingency and Sunset*- states that by passing AB 1426 the Legislature "...declares that a special law is necessary....due to the unique fiscal, jurisdictional[situation]....in the greater Sacramento region." This statement accepts as fact an unsubstantiated declaration by the bill's author. The bill should clarify or reference exactly what the "unique" situation is in the Sacramento region and should be supported by data.

To recap: the El Dorado County Chamber believes AB 1426 is counterproductive to the goals of providing affordable housing because it is punitive rather than incentive based and it relies on mandates that are doomed to fail in achieving the bill's purported goals. The arbitrary 50% rule in this bill is applied throughout the Sacramento region yet this broad-brush approach is incompatible with El Dorado County's needs. AB 1426 conflicts with our area's zoning standards and our developing General Plan, and will negatively affect EDC residents' ability to plan their own community according to local preference and standards. Also, as mandated by the State, our GP Housing Element will already address the wide range of income level housing needs of our community.

The El Dorado County Chamber is strongly opposed to AB 1426 and requests that El Dorado County be omitted from this legislation. We urge our Board of Supervisors and the City of Placerville, by copy of this letter, to join us in opposing AB 1426.

Sincerely,

Laurel Brent-Bumb  
Chief Executive Officer

cc: Assemblyman Darryl Steinberg  
Assemblyman Tim Leslie  
Assemblyman Alan Nakanishi  
EDC Board of Supervisors  
Placerville City Council

**FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE**

July 24, 2002

**The El Dorado County Joint Chambers Commission Opposes Boxers Bill**

Senator Barbara Boxer has proposed legislation to designate millions of acres of public land throughout the state as "Wilderness Areas." Her proposal would severely restrict most beneficial activities on the apportioned areas, letting nature take its course without human intervention. While this may seem harmless at first, further scrutiny shows that the senator's plan would threaten human life and livelihood, while precluding management practices needed to enhance forest health and wildlife habitat.

Under this Wilderness Area designation, many outdoor recreation enthusiasts would be shut out of some of their favorite places because of new restrictions, which accompany Wilderness designation. Off-highway vehicle, mountain bike activities and cross-country ski trail maintenance would be prohibited. Sierra at Tahoe would lose all opportunities for expansion, even the grooming of cross-country ski trails. By closing these public lands to large segments of the public, Senator Boxer would rob many people of the opportunity to enjoy nature. While the able-bodied would still be allowed to backpack into the wilderness, the elderly and disabled who rely on vehicle access would be excluded. Adding the Caples and Meiss areas to Wilderness would eliminate most of the remaining crest area between Highway's 50 and 88 from public recreation uses other than Wilderness. Desolation and Mokelumne Wilderness areas already include the major part of the Sierra crest in this area.

Local businesses up and down the Sierras fear this plan. As it is, our vital resources-based industries such as forest products and beef production operations have been crippled by unbalanced regulations over the past decade. Not only are timber harvesting and grazing crucial to maintaining healthy forests and meadows, but they also provide consumers with every-day products and generate jobs for the working people who live nearby. We need to encourage these vital enterprises, not push them out of business.

Ironically, rather than preserve the pristine areas we all treasure, wilderness designations actually threaten the areas' chance of both surviving and recovering from fire. When wildfire spreads out of control, it destroys wildlife habitat, burns fertile topsoil, and opens the door to massive erosion that can severely harm entire watersheds. Without allowing motorized vehicles access to remove dead trees and begin reforestation efforts, such lands are often left scarred for decades. In most locations, the environmentally sound solution is to greatly increase mechanical thinning treatments, not preclude them. Unfortunately, Wilderness Areas even ban helicopter access except for emergencies. This not only prohibits ecologically sensitive helicopter logging, but it also prevents local water agencies from performing required monitoring during the winter and hampers search and rescue efforts.

Senator Boxer's bill would discriminate against the aged and infirm, jeopardize already-fragile rural economies, cut off renewable sources of forest products, eliminate vital cattle razing opportunities, hinder water supply management, and endanger both human and animal life with the increased likelihood of catastrophic wildfire.

Sincerely,

El Dorado County Chamber of Commerce  
Shingle Springs/Cameron Park Chamber                      El Dorado Hills Chamber

July 29, 2003

California Dept. of Parks and Recreation  
Planning and Local Services Section  
P.O. Box 942896  
Sacramento, CA 94296-0001

Subject: Two Proposals for the Recreation Trails Grant Program:  
Shared Use Bridge Proposal – Olmstead Loop Trail  
Rehabilitation of Trailhead Facility Proposal – Cool Staging Area

To Whom It May Concern:

El Dorado County Chamber of Commerce strongly supports the grant proposal developed by the Sierra Economic Development District (SEDD) and Auburn State Recreation Area to fund the Shared Use Bridge Proposal on the Olmstead Loop Trail, and the Rehabilitation of Trailhead Facility Proposal at the Cool Staging Area in the Cool/Pilot Area.

The communities of Cool and Pilot Hill recently completed a community action plan with the assistance of SEDD. Among other things, this plan identified the enhancement of the local trails system as a key priority. These grant proposals will allow the communities of Cool and Pilot Hill to enhance and upgrade the area's unique local trail system and improve the restroom facility located near the trailhead. The Cool Staging Area and the Olmstead Loop Trail are vital components of our local trail system. The Cool Staging Area is the only local staging area open to the public and the Olmstead Loop Trail is a hub to many other trails that provide access into the American River Canyon, the City of Auburn and the greater Cool/Pilot Hill area. This area is growing in popularity and providing adequate facilities to our users and a safe shared use trail is essential to meeting key priorities identified through the community action plan.

Cool and Pilot Hill are located in the High Sierra sub-region of El Dorado County, a region that has historically depended on the timber and agriculture sectors for its economic vitality. While these industries continue to be important, our region must diversify its economic base. By funding this grant, it will build local capacity for addressing our economic diversification needs. Grant funding, such as that available through the Recreation Trails Grant Program will be essential to our success.

Thank you in advance for your consideration in funding these two projects. Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Laurel Brent-Bumb  
Chief Executive Officer

August 11, 2003

Representative John T. Doolittle  
United States House of Representatives  
4230 Douglas Blvd. Suite 200  
Granite Bay, CA 95746

Dear Representative Doolittle:

This letter is written in support of a federal earmark project recently submitted by Folsom Lake College (FLC). FLC's service area encompasses the City of Folsom and El Dorado County, as well as parts of eastern Sacramento County. The college is expected to serve 15,000 - 20,000 students by 2010. FLC is a component of the Los Rios Community College District. Los Rios is the second largest community college district in the state with 67,000 students enrolled at its four colleges-American River, Consumnes River, Folsom Lake and Sacramento City. The district serves 1.6 million people living in a 2,400 square mile area.

The project's propose is to review the region's projected economic development with the educational and job training programs in the community and region. The objective is to develop a coordinated plan that will match economic development with education and training programs to ensure the availability of a well-trained workforce as the region's economy develops and expands.

As this project is undertaken, Folsom Lake College will develop business and educational partnerships with essential business communities, educational institutions and workforce planners. Local Chambers of Commerce, economic and workforce development agencies, local high schools, and businesses will be engaged to identify and address career ladder training needs and education programs of local employers.

In order to be an important contributor to the economic development in El Dorado County and the rest of the service area, FLC has been and will continue to work closely with business leaders to determine which programs will most effectively serve the region. While the City of Folsom has experienced substantial economic growth and job creation, rural areas of El Dorado County have not kept pace. Phase I of this proposal will assess the potential for economic growth and evaluate educational programs that will foster that growth. Phase II will involve the preliminary development and implementation of the most effective educational programs to foster economic development in El Dorado County.

Given the current fiscal state of affairs of our community and state, more partnership efforts throughout our communities are encouraging to manage and address educational and economic development needs. I urge you to consider supporting this project that will enable our community to strengthen its economic development opportunities.

Sincerely,

Laurel Brent – Bumb

Chief Executive Officer

August 14, 2002

Honorable Sheila Kuehl, Chair  
Senate Natural Resources and Wildlife Committee  
California State Senate, District 23  
State Capitol Building Room 4032  
Sacramento, California 95814

Dear Senator Kuehl,

**A.B. 1130 - OPPOSED**

The El Dorado County Joint Chambers represents over 1500 member businesses. While many are making their livelihoods producing food, clothing, and shelter for the people of California, they care for the wildlife and natural resources on their property. We are opposed to AB 1130 (Dickerson) that would create a Sierra Nevada Conservancy. It is in the best interest of the agricultural community in El Dorado County to actively oppose both the bill and the concept.

Our concern is based primarily on the fact that the proposed conservancy would be a new regional entity with the authority to acquire land. More government ownership of private land is totally unjustified, especially in El Dorado County, which has 51% of its ownership by the federal government alone. Furthermore, if the easements restrict or take agricultural land out of production, the economic impact on our rural county could be significant. This could mean that a non-elected regional entity, with a majority of gubernatorial appointments, could decide the land uses on vast tracts of land over the objections of the local elected officials.

In addition to the loss of local control over land use planning, we are also specifically concerned about the provisions that grant land use authority under the Subdivision Map Act to merge or split parcels and adjust boundary lines. Further we are also concerned about the possible use of conservancy funds to acquire water rights. As a watershed source, El Dorado County protects its water rights and should not confer water use planning to one more un-elected body of government.

For these reasons, El Dorado County Joint Chambers Commission respectfully urges you to vote "NO" on A.B. 1130 when it is heard in your committee.

Sincerely,

El Dorado County Chamber of Commerce

Shingle Springs/Cameron Park Chamber

El Dorado Hills Chamber

cc: Honorable Dick Dickerson  
Honorable Rico Oller  
Honorable Tim Leslie  
El Dorado County Board of Supervisors

August 16, 2002

President George Osborne  
Board of Directors  
El Dorado Irrigation District  
2890 Mosquito Road  
Placerville, CA 95667

Dear President Osborne and Directors,

The Joint Chambers Commission of El Dorado County would like to express its enthusiastic support for the efforts of EID in seeking an exemption in regard to body contact in Sly Park Lake. We strongly believe that body contact recreation while, maintaining water quality standards at the lake, is a valuable asset to the entire county. The Sly Park recreation area has a significant economic impact on our community and provides a wonderful and safe place for all of the residents in El Dorado County to enjoy.

We applaud your efforts and continue to provide our support.

Sincerely,

Laurel Brent-Bumb, CEO  
On behalf of;

El Dorado County Chamber of Commerce

El Dorado Hills Chamber      Shingle Springs/Cameron Park Chamber

August 20, 2002

TO: The Honorable Gray Davis  
Governor, State of California  
State Capitol, First Floor  
Sacramento, CA 95814

FROM: Joint Chambers Commission of El Dorado County

SUBJECT: **SB 1661 (KUEHL) NEW EMPLOYER/EMPLOYEE TAX MANDATE-OPPOSE**

The Joint Chambers Commission strongly OPPOSES **SB 1661** (Kuehl), as amended June 24, 2002, mandating the establishment of a new paid leave entitlement program funded by billions of dollars in new taxes levied on all California employers and their workers.

**SB 1661 establishes a 12-week paid family leave entitlement program for all California workers.** The 12 weeks annually would be available to care for ill children, spouse, parent, or domestic partner as well as for leave for the birth, adoption, or foster care placement of a child.

In order to pay for the mandated Family Leave Temporary Insurance (FTDI) paid leave entitlement program, SB 1661 institutes two new taxes; increases the current state disability insurance (SDI) tax formula, along with mandating a new 14 percent "administrative fee" on large self insured employers.

**SB 1661 sends California workers and their employers a \$2 billion tax bill in 2004.** Along with increasing the maximum SDI tax rate, SB 1661 establishes the new FTDI tax that will be assessed in addition to SDI tax contributions. As a result, California workers will pay SDI/FTDI taxes of \$698 in 2004 and \$726 in 2005--a 67 percent increase in worker SDI taxes in 2004 alone. Moreover, **SB 1661** mandates that employers also match dollar for dollar the higher worker FTDI premium amount. By 2005, the combined tax burden of the paid leave entitlement on California employers and their workers will reach \$2.22 billion.

**SB 1661 erases important employer rights contained current state and federal family leave laws.** Current state and federal family leave laws only apply to employers with 50 or more workers and permit qualified employees to take up to 12 weeks of *unpaid* family leave. The leave is unpaid to prevent abuse of the leave laws. **SB 1661** eliminates the 50 or more worker coverage level requirement; eliminates requirement of 1250 hours on the job in the previous twelve months before eligible for leave; eliminates employer right to designate leave as family leave; only permits certification of worker or family member need for leave to go to the Employment Development Department (EDD); and eliminates important notification requirements.

**California small businesses are harmed by the elimination of the size requirement.** Keep in mind that SDU benefits are portable and move with the worker if the worker changes jobs. If a worker has sufficient SDI contributions, SB 1661 entitles a worker just hired on Monday by a very small company to take up to twelve weeks of paid leave beginning Tuesday to care for a family member.

**SB 1661's** new paid leave benefit, paid for by new mandated taxes, is impermissible under federal law. The federal Employment Retirement and Income Security Act (ERISA) forbids states from establishing mandated employee welfare benefits such as those contained in **SB**

**1661.** A paid leave benefit it is an employee welfare benefit under ERISA. Regardless of how the benefit is created or funded, it would still be an employee benefit under ERISA and would therefore be preempted.

**SDI Trust Fund is nearly bankrupt.** According to EDD, the SDI Trust Fund reserve adequacy level has dropped alarmingly. Recent legislation permanently linked the level of SDI benefits to workers' compensation benefits. Enactment of AB 749, Ch. 6, Statutes of 2002 steeply increased both benefits levels. EDD information shows that as of December 31, 2001, the SDI Trust Fund reserves plummeted to only 15.4—a drop of nearly 70 percent. Even the most optimistic estimates by EDD indicate SDI Trust Fund reserves to be less than 30% for the next several years. This level of reserves is well below the 45% reserve level mandated by law for fund adequacy.

**Legislation like SB 1661 makes California less competitive with similarly situated businesses in other states.** California employers believe that bills like **SB 1661** make it even more difficult, and certainly much more expensive, to do business in California. It is for these reasons and more The Joint Chambers Commission urge a “NO” vote on **SB 1661** (Kuehl).

Sincerely,

El Dorado County Chamber of Commerce

Shingle Springs/Cameron Park Chamber    El Dorado Hills Chamber

## The El Dorado Business Alliance

August 21, 2003

El Dorado County Board of Supervisors  
330 Fair Lane  
Placerville, CA 95667

Re: **SB 711 – Oak Tree Ordinance**

Honorable Board Members:

Santa Monica Senator Sheila Kuehl (D) has authored Senate Bill 711, which would require permits, fees and double mitigation for the cutting of *any* oak tree in California. SB 711 would require that the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) apply to timberland and oak woodland agricultural conversions. One can only assume that Ms. Kuehl is attempting to remedy a local problem with a statewide mandate, or she is uninformed about the millions of oak trees that exist in El Dorado and other rural counties. Either way this proposal speaks to the necessity for planning such as this to be done on a local (county-wide) basis.

El Dorado Business Alliance (BA) member organizations have expressed strong concern about SB 711 becoming law locally and throughout California. Although restrictions such as those presented in this bill, may serve communities in Southern California or the even the Bay Area, they are certainly not appropriate for El Dorado County. The negative effects of this legislation on California's residents, commerce and agriculture industries, could be devastating. Not only would enactment of the proposed restrictions be a bureaucratic nightmare, but at a time when California is reeling from budgetary short-falls, the costs could be unbearable. Statewide programs such as this would require creation of an agency to oversee the program, (or more unfunded mandates for counties), and staff and enforcement personnel to make it functional and cohesive, all at potentially enormous costs. With a reported 12,000 businesses closed, leaving or already left California this year alone, it is inconceivable that our legislature would continue to propose such far-reaching, unnecessary and expensive new programs.

It is the position of the El Dorado Business Alliance that a (oak) tree ordinance should be developed based on local needs. It should be locally enacted and it should be locally enforced as deemed to be necessary by area residents. We ask the El Dorado County Board of Supervisors to consider sending a letter to Senator Sheila Kuehl, and/or our elected representatives, opposing such legislation in El Dorado County.

Sincerely,  
Kimberly Beal, Chairperson

Cc: Senator Rico Oller  
Assemblyman Tim Leslie  
Assemblyman Alan Nakanishi  
Business Alliance  
Distribution Lists

***The El Dorado Business Alliance is made up of the following organizations: The Building Industry Association of Superior California (BIASC), El Dorado Builders' Exchange, El Dorado County Joint Chambers Commission, El Dorado Forum, El Dorado County Association of Realtors (EDCAR) and Surveyors, Architects, Geologists and Engineers (SAGE).***

September 09, 2002

The Honorable Diane Feinstein  
One Post Street, Suite 2450  
San Francisco, CA 94104

Dear Senator Feinstein,

Legislative reform is being proposed that would reform the current asbestos litigation system and preserve needed funds for those who contract asbestos related diseases in the future. I urge you to support asbestos litigation reform.

The economic effect of asbestos litigation is unbelievable. Because of the enormous number of lawsuits being filed, more than 50 companies have been forced into bankruptcy. If not reformed, more will follow. This issue is especially concerning to us in California, where despite little or no direct connection to asbestos, companies are being targeted and thousands of jobs in our state are at stake.

We support reform that will:

1. Eliminate the consolidation of sick and non-sick plaintiffs.
2. Eliminate the concentration of thousands of claims in jurisdictions that have no connection with those claims.
3. Liberalize statutes of limitations to remove the incentive for premature filings.
4. Establish objective medical criteria for asbestos-related impairment.

These remedies would not circumvent the court system or involve new government spending. They would allow for those who suffer from asbestos-related diseases to get their day in court, while avoiding unnecessary bankruptcies and the devastating effects that those have on our economy.

Thank you for your consideration on this issue.

Sincerely,

Laurel Brent-Bumb, CEO  
On behalf of:

El Dorado County Chamber of Commerce

Shingle Springs/Cameron Park Chamber    El Dorado Hills Chamber

September 4, 2003

Dear

The El Dorado Joint Chambers Commission represents over 1,700 member businesses in El Dorado County. We are writing to inform you of our opposition to SB 2 (Burton) and or any new state laws mandating employer-paid health insurance.

California businesses cannot afford the multibillion-dollar tax increases that the proposed universal health care mandates would require. Businesses like those in El Dorado County across the state would like to be able to provide health care to all of their employees and their families, but for many employers the costs are simply too high.

Rather than mandating that employers provide health care coverage, the Legislature must focus on helping to lower health care costs so employers can afford to provide their employees with a voluntary benefits package.

The cost of doing business in California is rising, even as the economy is slowing. California employers already pay the highest workers' compensation rates in the nation and are faced with numerous labor laws unique to the state. We cannot afford anymore-costly new mandates.

Many businesses like those in El Dorado County are already suffering during this economic downturn and are faced with tough employment decisions. Now is not the time to impose additional costly mandates that will further slow job creation. Please **oppose** All employer health care mandates that come before you.

Sincerely,

Laurel Brent-Bumb, CEO  
On behalf of;

This letter will be sent to the Health Care Conference Committee as well as our state elected officials. A cc will be sent to Gov. Davis.

**The El Dorado Business Alliance**  
P.O. Box 128, Shingle Springs, CA 95682

**POSITION PAPER: EL DORADO COUNTY WATER**

The El Dorado Business Alliance holds the firm belief that local water resources are one of the most important issues facing El Dorado County today. Wise management of this valuable resource is critical and extensive consideration of methods for securing adequate water supplies needs to be a focal point for countywide planning. Water issues that must be addressed include but are not limited to: Water rights; Water storage; Drought protection; Water distribution; Water conservation/Recycled Water; and Hydroelectric power generation; Provisions and protections for water use for agricultural, residential, industrial, environmental, commercial and recreational needs. On October 23, 2002 the El Dorado Business Alliance (BA) adopted the following positions on water issues in El Dorado County.

1. **WATER/LAND USE POLICIES:** Water has become a means of controlling growth in many California communities, sometimes with disastrous results. The BA believes that community leaders, and elected leaders, must disengage water development from pro- or anti-growth platforms, and should pursue obtaining additional water supplies and storage. To do otherwise will eventually harm the many businesses and individuals that rely on water to survive and grow, such as agriculture, commercial services, recreation, tourism, “gentleman” farming and residents.  
*The BA supports water policies that respond to the needs generated by good land-use planning, and opposes policies that would stop growth by limiting water supplies to the community.*
  
2. **DROUGHT PROTECTION:** The BA believes a drought affecting El Dorado County is imminent and unavoidable according to reliable and current statistical data.  
*The BA urges community leaders, organizations and elected officials to address this fact and establish goals and programs that will minimize the negative effects of a drought on local citizens, business, agriculture and tourism, and will offer protection to the public when such a drought occurs.*
  
3. **WATER SUPPLIES:** The BA believes that water is the lifeblood of any community - as it supports the local economy, residential citizens, agricultural production, recreation and tourism needs, and it provides for environmental enhancements. Excess water should be stored for future needs, sold at a profit and used for power generation that can also be sold at great benefit to the local community.  
*It is the BA position that El Dorado County establish and maintain excess water supplies as allowed by law, to support its growing agricultural, recreational, tourism, economic and population bases.*

*The El Dorado Business Alliance is made up of the following organizations: The Building Industry Association of Superior California (BIASC), El Dorado Builders’ Exchange, El Dorado County Joint Chambers Commission, El Dorado Forum, El Dorado County Association of Realtors (EDCAR) and Surveyors, Architects, Geologists and Engineers (S.A.G.E.).*

4. **WATER RIGHTS:** All waters impounded at Folsom Dam Reservoir from the Upper American River are subject to conditions imposed by the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) in 1958 by its decision D893. This decision recognized and reserved a prior statutory right in favor of El Dorado County as the county-of-origin of these waters. The SWRCB decision used language that the water rights it was permitting were "subordinate" to the county-of-origin rights, and it adopted and announced a hierarchy of rights that implemented California's county-of-origin law -- in an expressed subordination by which El Dorado County's rights were deemed superior to all others.  
*The Business Alliance believes that these historical facts guarantee El Dorado County access to additional water supplies to meet the county's growing needs and the BA urges local leaders to continue to pursue ratification of these early decisions. Further the BA urges El Dorado County and its water purveyors to exercise all available water rights including prior and future contracts that benefits El Dorado County's water supplies.*
  
5. **WATER STORAGE:** Additional water storage is widely accepted as the solution to two major concerns in El Dorado County: water supplies for local agricultural, economic, recreational and residential needs, and much-needed drought protection.  
*It is the BA position that El Dorado County purveyors should catalog those areas that have been previously identified as potential future water storage sites in order to preserve them from conflicting and/or competing land uses. The BA also believes that the County Water Agency, as part of its water master plan, should investigate additional water storage locations in the county, preferably off-stream storage.*
  
6. **WATER DISTRIBUTION:** Much of El Dorado County's water distribution systems are decades old, and were originally constructed with mining and agricultural needs in mind. Through time the system has developed into one that provides water for residential, commercial and recreational uses, in addition to agricultural uses - necessitating new capital improvements to maintain and protect uninterrupted water service. EID has limitations in water conveyance between its eastern and western service areas. Better conveyance should be a priority item.  
*It is the position of the Business Alliance that El Dorado County water purveyors should conduct all studies necessary to inform the public of each water districts' distribution system status, and the costs to maintain, repair or extend the water systems as needed, so that the public can make educated choices on the necessity to finance their water distribution systems.*

7. **WATER CONSERVATION:** El Dorado County has been a leader in the state for conserving water through continued education and water district incentives or mandates. EID's western service area includes the largest residential project in the state receiving recycled water for landscape irrigation.

It is the position of the Business Alliance that water purveyors and community leaders should continue to promote recycled water use wherever feasible. The BA also believes El Dorado County officials should encourage neighboring communities to integrate recycled water systems into development projects. In the course of meeting on regional water issues, El Dorado County leaders should encourage the Sacramento region to incorporate water meters as a means of encouraging water conservation in every home and business firm in the area.

8. **HYDROELECTRIC GENERATION:** The El Dorado Irrigation District (EID) has taken ownership of water projects that may allow additional income to be derived from the development and maintenance of hydroelectric generation facilities for the financial benefit of El Dorado County. The Business Alliance supports the pursuit of local power generation facilities that would help to offset the cost of water development and maintenance for local residents. Additional storage should be investigated with consideration to provide additional hydropower generation. Further the Business Alliance offers its continued assistance in informing the public about this issue to further stimulate public debate.

###

###

October 31, 2002

Kathryn Mathews, Executive Director  
El Dorado County Transportation Commission  
550 Main Street Suite 107  
Placerville CA 95667

Dear Ms. Mathews,

The El Dorado County Chamber of Commerce is in full support of a non-motorized transportation planning effort for the City of Placerville. The City of Placerville is in great need of this type of planning effort, as Caltrans is planning for a widening of State Route 50 through Placerville, acquiring the right of way once planned for use as a non-motorized trail. The City of Placerville has many transportation problems in the downtown center including traffic congestion and limited mobility for pedestrians and bicyclists. Any improvement that will help increase the mobility of the citizens and tourists in the downtown district would be very helpful. The El Dorado County Chamber believes there is a community benefit to increased use of alternative transportation modes and recognize the significance of having an adopted plan in place, as it would provide for eligibility of state and federal funds.

Non-motorized transportation planning efforts like the proposed project in the City of Placerville help improve our air quality, decrease congestion, enhance communities and improve the health of our citizens.

Sincerely,

Laurel Brent-Bumb  
Chief Executive Officer

November 15, 2002

Mr. John Driscoll, City Manager  
City of Placerville  
487 Main Street  
Placerville, CA 95667

Dear Mr. Driscoll,

The Joint Chambers Commission of El Dorado County has reviewed the proposed Highway 50 Operational Improvement Project. Although it is apparent that this is not the ultimate solution to our Highway 50 woes we find the project to have merit. We would encourage the City Council to vote in favor of moving forward with this project.

It is our hope that the City of Placerville, DOT and Caltrans will continue to work diligently toward a progressive and permanent solution to resolving the serious transportation issues our community faces on the Highway 50 corridor.

If you have any question please contact me. Again, we support the proposed project and encourage the City Council to vote yes.

Sincerely,

Laurel Brent-Bumb, CEO  
On behalf of:

El Dorado County Chamber of Commerce

Shingle Springs/Cameron Park Chamber

El Dorado Hills Chamber