

POSITION PAPERS & ADDENDUMS

(REVISED NOVEMBER 17, 2004~ CONTAINS ONLY 2004)

The El Dorado County Joint Chambers of Commerce along with the California State Chamber are urging all California businesses to write their lawmakers today to appeal for immediate action on the Governor's workers' compensation package. The Governor has called on the Legislature to enact this package, which includes the complete system overhaul advocated by the Chamber, by March 1.

'The fastest way for California businesses to experience real workers' comp reform and see a significant reduction in their costs is for the Legislature to pass Governor Schwarzenegger's workers' compensation bills immediately. All Californians should write today to turn up the heat on their lawmakers to fix this broken system by March 1, so that California employers can experience real cost savings as soon as this summer.

The Governor's workers' compensation bills, SBX4 3 (Poochigian; R-Fresno) and ABX4 1 (Maldonado; R-Santa Maria), were introduced in a special session. If passed, they would go into effect 90 days after being signed into law.

During his State of the State address, Governor Schwarzenegger stressed the need for the Legislature to act immediately on his proposal to bring California workers' compensation standards and costs in line with the rest of the country. His plan would do this, and lower costs to employers by:

- Overhauling permanent disability ratings;
- Streamlining the system to improve efficiency and save costs;
- Using more objective criteria in evaluating injuries;
- Reforming the indemnity side of the system;
- Cleaning up and clarifying language in the bills passed last year;
- Improving on the medical cost containment started in the last session;
- Expanding utilization controls; and
- Reforming penalty structures that give applicant attorneys incentives to file frivolous litigation.

Governor Schwarzenegger set a March 1 deadline for lawmakers to deliver real workers' comp reform to his desk, so that he has time to qualify an initiative for the November election if his bills are not passed.

'Modest reform is not enough,' said Schwarzenegger. 'If modest reform is all that lands on my desk, I am prepared to take my workers' comp solution directly to the people, and I will put it on the ballot in November.'

The Joint Chambers is encouraging business owners to write their legislators, both those who have supported and those who have opposed comprehensive reforms in the past, to urge them to pass the Governor's reforms immediately.

In your letter, please emphasize the real-world impact that California's highest-in-the-nation workers' comp costs have had on your operations, and the hard choices you have been forced to make. Please send letters to your lawmakers today.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF MEASURE “H”

“Measure “H” will be a benefit to our community.” Many of our **“COMMUNITY”** needs that currently are un-funded can be paid for with this additional revenue.

We respectfully request your support of Measure “H” which will raise the Hotel/Motel tax in the unincorporated areas of El Dorado County from its current rate of 8% to 10%. This rate would apply to stays of 30 days or less by business travelers, tourists and other guests in our community. **This tax is imposed on visitors, not on residents of El Dorado County.**

The current rate of 8% is lower than any of the surrounding communities. The City of Placerville is 10%, the City of South Lake Tahoe and the City of Sacramento are 12%. The proposed increase would generate approximately \$170,000 of additional revenue annually.

You should support this measure for the following reasons:

- Residents do not pay this tax, yet we get the benefits of the additional revenue to support local needs.
- The funds will pay for **“Veterans’ Needs”, “Parks and Recreation”, “Fire Services”, “Road Maintenance”, “Cultural Arts”, “Sheriffs’ Deputies”,** and other services that we use.
- Finally this measure will help promote El Dorado County as a tourist destination location, thus helping local economic development and job creation.

It simply makes good economic sense. That is why the Veterans Affairs Commission, Joint Chambers Commission, Friends of Our Community, Whitewater Rafting Association, Farm Trail, Arts Council, Agriculture Council, and the Visitors Authority all stand in support of the measure and urge you to vote in favor of measure “H”.

Signors:

- 1. On behalf of Friends of Our Community**
Retired Agricultural Commissioner, Bill Snodgrass
- 2. On behalf of the Veterans Commission**
Doc League
- 3. On behalf of the Joint Chambers Commission**
Dr. Vicki Barber
- 4. On behalf of Farm Trails**
President of Farm Trails, Darrell Bray
- 5. Sheriff Jeff Neves**

March 5, 2004

Mr. Jon Morgan
El Dorado County Air Pollution Control District
2850 Fairlane Court
Placerville, CA 95667

Re: AB 2766 Grant Program – Apple Hill Shuttle

El Dorado County Chamber of Commerce supports the El Dorado County Transit Authority request for AB 2766 grant program funds to implement a shuttle in the Apple Hill region during the fall of 2004.

The Apple Hill Shuttle will significantly reduce congestion and lower emissions related to cold starts and provide a regional mitigation to traffic congestion on the rural roads of Camino and offer some relief to State Highway 50 east of Placerville.

Working in collaboration with the Apple Hill Growers Association, EDCTA will offer a comprehensive shuttle program, which includes five 45-passenger buses, one trolley, advertising, notification via press releases and a web site, transit drivers, support staff, insurance, portable restrooms at parking lots and shuttle signage.

The weekend shuttle will operate during September and October 2004 to provide a convenient, pleasant option to traveling in an automobile in traffic and waiting for available parking in overcrowded lots. The Apple Hill Shuttle offers passengers the convenience of reduced drive time between orchards, ranches and wineries providing more time to enjoy Apple Hill amenities.

Sincerely,

Laurel Brent-Bumb
Chief Executive Officer

**The El Dorado Business Alliance
P.O. Box 121, Shingle Springs, CA 95682**

March 28, 2004

El Dorado County Planning Commission
330 Fair Lane
Placerville, CA 95667

Honorable Planning Commissioners:

The El Dorado Business Alliance (BA), representing more than 6,500 individuals and businesses in El Dorado County, reviewed the draft General Plan (GP) last July, 2003, and offered comment. You have received copies of that document, and it is identified in the records as Letter 261. At that time "...we wholeheartedly and unanimously endorse(d) the adoption of the 1996 General Plan Alternative as expeditiously as possible". We also expressed our firm belief that adopting the 1996 GP Alternative would best serve the community's needs and require the least amount of time, cost and effort to return El Dorado County's land use authority.

The comments we submitted were the result of many, many hours of work by the Business Alliance General Plan Committee, which analyzed all four Equal Weighted Alternatives and the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR). Suffice to say our efforts were significant and we utilized the expertise of our member-organizations in a variety of areas in order to adopt consensus positions and make informed recommendations.

One purpose of this letter is to restate our support for the 1996 GP Alternative. Although a couple of our member-groups endorsed Measure G, the recent voter initiative to adopt a General Plan, the majority of our groups opposed it or took no position, so the Business Alliance as an organization did *not* take a position. However we strongly urge you to reconsider our comments in Letter 261 and during your recent hearings as so many individuals who opposed Measure G did NOT oppose the 1996 GP Alternative. We believe we make very strong arguments in favor of that Alternative and those points should be addressed by your Commission

The second purpose of this letter is to bring to your immediate attention several strong negatives of the Environmentally-Constrained Alternative, as pointed out and agreed upon by numerous representatives at a recent BA Governing Board meeting. Those issues include: 1) Discretionary building permits; 2) Fire safety regulations; 3) The high costs associated with implementation of proposed mitigation measures; 4) Proposed deed restrictions; 5) Wood Stove retrofits and 6) Proposed Inclusionary Zoning.

Discretionary building permits: The only county in the state to have discretionary building permits is Los Angeles and there is no comparison of the needs and communities of rural El Dorado County to LA. This is a massive policy shift that negatively impacts every citizen in the county in one way or another. Prior to adopting such onerous restrictions we suggest there be separate and focused hearings with countywide meeting notices circulated widely, in order for this Commission to fully understand the impacts that would ensue.

Fire Safety Regulations: We commend the General Plan Team and consultants for recommending numerous changes to the goals and policies pertaining to Fire Safety as outlined in the Annotated Draft Environmentally-Constrained Alternative. We support the establishment of fire protection policies as set forth by local fire safety experts and we encourage you to adopt their positions.

Cost of mitigations: The enormous costs associated with numerous mitigation measures as proposed in the Environmentally Constrained Alternative have yet to be quantified. The county and the state are under serious financial constraints and implementing expensive policies that will stifle economic growth and increase costs to local taxpayers is ill-advised at best. We strongly encourage this Commission to consider realistic financial constraints when implementing such policies. According to representatives of the Business Alliance, who are experts in this area, the constraints and mitigation measures, as proposed, will prevent the construction of housing for low- and very-low-income wage earners. We urge you to keep this in mind as you consider the Housing and Land Use Elements.

Proposed deed restrictions: This discussion took place in the Commission's hearing on the Health and Safety Element (Policy HS-10d) to the Environmentally Constrained General Plan predominantly as a result of the recent asbestos issue in El Dorado Hills (although asbestos is an issue throughout the state and in other areas of the county). The Business Alliance urges the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors to reject deed restrictions and instead adopt disclosure to protect public safety. Once deed restrictions are in place there are many problems including how the restrictions be eventually lifted. Must the current property owner trace down the original owners at some later date? Restrictions placed on property-owners deeds serve as a red-flag to both lenders and insurance companies alike. Lenders will be more hesitant to loan on restricted properties and insurance companies will hesitate to insure homeowners for fear of future liability. Deed restrictions are a significant change from current policy and should not be imposed when disclosure can serve the public better.

Retrofit requirements at point-of-sale: Forcing a retrofit at the time of sale of a property has long been debated in California. Frequent retrofit proposals, such as the one proposed for wood stoves in Policy HS-9d, have been introduced, but most are not implemented because the cost is typically borne by the home buyer, not the seller. Again, such policies do nothing to promote home affordability. Our representatives can elaborate further on such policy issues at your request.

Inclusionary zoning: Inclusionary zoning is a fairly recent concept in California that attempts to produce affordable housing. However, many government jurisdictions that have adopted inclusionary zoning policies in the past have discovered such policies do not produce affordable homes. Several local jurisdictions adjacent to El Dorado County are opposed to inclusionary zoning, as evidenced in their testimony against the recent Assembly Bill 1426 (Steinberg). Folsom, Roseville, Elk Grove and Rocklin all stated that if AB1426 was approved they would be forced to adopt inclusionary zoning in an attempt to meet the mandates of the bill. Yet each stated such this policy would have the opposite affect and would make homes more costly. Again, please refer to our July 2003 comment paper for additional information on inclusionary policy issues.

Planning Commission Letter
March 29, 2004
Page 3 of 3

In closing, please note that this letter should not be interpreted to mean that there are not additional significant issues that should be considered by the Commission, as our representatives are presenting to you at various hearings. The numerous, specific concerns of the ED Business Alliance organizations are contained in our July 2003 comment papers. We urge you to review and individually consider all of those comments.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Kimberly Beal, Chairperson

cc: ED Business Alliance
ED Board of Supervisors
All Distribution Mail Lists

GP Ltr to PC 3-04

March 29, 2004

Mr. Steve Calfee
City of Placerville
487 Main Street
Placerville, CA 95667

Re: Gateway Hotel & Gas Station
Placerville, El Dorado County, CA

Dear Mr. Calfee

The El Dorado County Chamber of Commerce is dedicated to the development and retention of business in our County. I am writing today to address specifically the City of Placerville proposed Gateway Hotel & Gas Station project.

Placerville is in dire need of modern hotel accommodations. Our community also lacks gas station facilities near the freeway with good visibility and easy-on easy-off access, particularly on the westbound side of the Highway 50 corridor.

The proposed project is perfectly located for the Placerville community needs. It also provides the extremely important direct access from the freeway to Apple Hill.

The El Dorado County Chamber of Commerce, representing well over 700 member businesses, strongly supports this project. We would urge you to do whatever you can to expedite this project.

Please feel free to contact me should you have any questions or need further information.

Sincerely,

Laurel Brent-Bumb
Chief Executive Officer

March 29, 2004

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Attn: Ms. Nancy A. Haley, Chief
San Joaquin Valley Office
Sac. Dist. Regulatory Branch (200200319)
1325 "J" Street, Room 1480
Sacramento, California 95814-2922

Re: Gateway Hotel & Gas Station
Placerville, El Dorado County, CA

Dear Ms. Haley,

The El Dorado County Chamber of Commerce is dedicated to the development and retention of business in our County. I am writing today to address specifically the City of Placerville proposed Gateway Hotel & Gas Station project.

Placerville is in dire need of modern hotel accommodations. Our community also lacks gas station facilities near the freeway with good visibility and easy-on easy-off access, particularly on the westbound side of the Highway 50 corridor.

The proposed project is perfectly located for the Placerville community needs. It also provides the extremely important direct access from the freeway to Apple Hill.

The El Dorado County Chamber of Commerce, representing well over 700 member businesses, strongly supports this project. We would urge you to do whatever you can to expedite this project.

Please feel free to contact me should you have any questions or need further information.

Sincerely,

Laurel Brent-Bumb
Chief Executive Officer

The El Dorado Business Alliance
P.O. Box 121, Shingle Springs, CA 95682

March 30, 2004

Commissioner Pat Wood III
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION
888 First Street NE
Washington DC. 20426

Re: SMUD License 2101

Honorable Commissioner Wood:

The Sacramento Municipal Utilities District (SMUD) has been utilizing the alternate licensing process (ALP) to relicense its Upper American River Project (UARP) FERC license No. 2101. As you know, the project is located entirely within, and utilizes the natural resources of, El Dorado County, CA. The project's original license was for a term of 50 years, a period during which the project induced many adverse and uncompensated impacts on El Dorado County. At this time of license renewal, both the FERC and the applicant are obligated to assess, recognize, and mitigate past and future impacts stemming from this project.

In your April 2003 response letter to Congressman Doolittle you stated that section 10(a) of the existing Federal Power Act required a comprehensive review of all impacts a federally granted power license would have on the region where it was sited. We are writing to bring to the Commissioner's attention the refusal of SMUD to address the impacts of the UARP on El Dorado County. We object to the FERC granting a new license in the absence of such required and requested economic impact studies and mitigations.

Specifically, SMUD has failed and refuses under an assorted rubric of incomplete studies, delayed modeling, and outright rejections, to study the impacts of the project on El Dorado County as follows:

1. SMUD's utilization of reservoir sites that are thereby denied to El Dorado County for storage of needed domestic, municipal and agricultural water supplies, as well as water storage needed for long-term drought protection.
2. SMUD's historic opposition to development by El Dorado County of any solution to its real and complex water supply and distribution conditions.
3. SMUD's imposition of financial and other barriers (e.g., power forgone tribute) that in effect deny El Dorado County's ability to utilize its county-of-origin reserved water rights as provided by California Water Code.
4. SMUD's persistent failure to acknowledge contractual obligations to El Dorado County arising out of agreements made as part of the original FERC license 2101 application.
5. SMUD's failure to address the need to compensate for past, and mitigate for future, economic opportunities forgone to El Dorado County by reason of the licensure and operation of the project in El Dorado County.

FERC Commissioner Pat Wood III
March 30, 2004
Page 2 of 3

The requirements of Section 10(a) of the Federal Power Act (FPA) obligate SMUD to respond to the above enumerated issues, and also requires that the Commission ensure that these important effects on our region by a FERC license are meaningfully addressed and answered. SMUD's recently released (2/27/04) socioeconomic study is very narrow in scope and fails to address the key points outlined above.

The FERC license 2101 is located in a region whose water entitlement has recently been upheld by California Superior Court Judge Lloyd Connelly as dating back to 1927 and protected by legislation adopted as an expression of California public policy embodying its Public Trust obligations. That court held that even non-consumptive uses of water are subordinate to the 1927 filings and are subject to further reduction because they are secondary to El Dorado County's county-of-origin right for domestic, consumptive and irrigation water. Judge Connelly's decision reaffirmed El Dorado County's special status under State law as a county-of-origin, thereby confirming that SMUD's UARP license is junior in time and subordinate in right to El Dorado County's water requirements.

Our latest response from SMUD states that El Dorado County's requested economic impact studies will not be carried out as part of the ALP. Failure to conduct these studies as requested constitutes a violation of our rights and protections under Section 10(a), and thereby renders the ALP unacceptable. SMUD must not be granted a new license from FERC until El Dorado County's water needs are accommodated. To do otherwise is contrary to California Water Law and will bring great harm to El Dorado County.

Your prompt reply would be most appreciated.

Sincerely,

ORIGINAL SIGNED

Kathye Russell, Communications Liaison
for the El Dorado Business Alliance

The Following Community Groups are Signatory To This Letter:

Agricultural Council of the EDC Chamber of Commerce
Apple Hill Growers Association
El Dorado Builders' Exchange
El Dorado Business Alliance
El Dorado County Association of Realtors
El Dorado County Chamber of Commerce
El Dorado County Citizens for Water
El Dorado County Farm Bureau
El Dorado County Joint Chambers Commission
El Dorado County Wine Grape Growers Association
El Dorado Forum
El Dorado Hills Chamber of Commerce
Friends of El Dorado County

FERC Commissioner Pat Wood III
March 30, 2004
Page 3 of 3

Grizzly Flats Community Services District
SAGE (Surveyors, Architects, Geologists and Engineers)
Shingle Springs/ Cameron Park Chamber of Commerce
Taxpayers Association of El Dorado County
Taxpayers for Responsible Government

CC: Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger
Congressman John T. Doolittle
Assemblyman Tim Leslie
Senator Rico Oller
Senator-Elect Dan Lundgren
Assemblyman Alan Nakanishi
Association of California Water Agencies (ACWA)
El Dorado County Board of Supervisors
El Dorado County Water Agency (EDCWA)
El Dorado Irrigation District (EID)
Georgetown Divide Public Utilities District (GDPUD)
Mountain Counties Water Association
Regional Council of Rural Counties (RCRC)

El Dorado County Chamber urges Businesses to get out and vote

YES on Prop. 55 A statewide bond for kindergarten-university facilities that is a sound, fiscally responsible investment in our economy and future workforce.

Proposition 55 provides funds for colleges and universities to build classrooms and modernize research facilities that help create jobs and grow California's economy. School construction is a direct investment in the economy. The proposition will create hundreds of jobs throughout California. Passing 55 will invest in our kids' future by fixing rundown classrooms and building new schools. Strict accountability requirements ensure funds are spent only on school repairs and construction. California needs to build more than 22,000 classrooms to relieve overcrowding and deal with increasing student enrollment.

Proposition 55 is a general obligation bond that will not raise taxes!

NO on Prop. 56 Makes it easier to raise taxes on every single Californian.

*By giving legislators an even freer hand to pass unlimited tax increases, opponents say, the Blank Check Initiative would harm California's economy as businesses and consumers carry a heavier tax burden. The state constitution currently requires a 2/3rds legislative vote before Sacramento can increase our income taxes, sales taxes and other state taxes. **Buried in the Blank Check Initiative is a provision [Section 12(f)(1)] that would eliminate the 2/3rds vote requirement.***

Proposition 56 is a deceptive measure that pretends to hold the politicians accountable, when it actually rewards them with an open-ended blank check. It would give them a free hand to increase our sales, income, property taxes, and other state taxes, year after year, without justification or any bi-partisan consensus.

YES on Measure H A non-resident hotel/motel tax on tourist visits

Measure "h" will raise the hotel motel tax in the unincorporated areas of El Dorado County from its current rate of 8% to 10%. This rate would apply to stays of 30 days or less by business travelers, tourists and other visitors in our community. **This tax is imposed on visitors, not on residents of El Dorado County.**

The current rate of 8% is lower than any of the surrounding communities. Placerville is 10%; South Lake Tahoe and Sacramento are 12%. The proposed increase would generate approximately \$200,000 of additional revenue annually.

You should support this measure for the following reasons:

-Residents do not pay this tax yet we get the benefits of the additional revenue to support local needs.

-The funds will pay for veterans' needs, parks and recreation, fire services, road maintenance, cultural arts, sheriffs' deputies, and other services that we use.

-Finally this measure will help promote El Dorado County as a tourist destination location, thus helping local economic development and job creation.

Measure "H" will be a benefit to our community. Many needs that currently are un-funded can be paid for with this additional revenue. It simply makes good economic sense. That is why the Veterans Affairs Commission, Joint Chambers Commission, Friends of Our Community, Whitewater Rafting Association, Farm Trail, Arts Council, Agriculture Council, and the Visitors Authority all stand in support of the measure and urge you to vote in favor of measure "H".

YES on 57 and 58 These measures represent the cornerstone to restore fiscal stability to California

Proposition 57 will keep the state from running out of money and prevent drastic cuts in spending on vital programs like education and health care. It provides for a fund of up to \$5 billion that can be used to pay these bonds off early. It also provides for a reserve of at least \$8 billion, which can be used to prevent future deficits. Without the proposition the State of California may be out of cash by June 204. If so, the only choices will be to drastically increase taxes. These bonds will let us refinance our inherited debt and give the state time to deal with its ongoing structural deficit.

Proposition 58 will require for the first time, that the Governor and Legislature pass a balanced budget. It will also require general funds to be put in a “Rainy Day” fund to build a reserve to protect California from future economic downturns. Proposition 58 will allow the Governor to call a Special Session of the Legislature to deal with future fiscal crises. If the Legislature fails to act within 45 days, then they will not be able to recess and they will not be able to pass any other legislation. This will force them to find a solution to the problem before it is too late. **Propositions 57 and 58 together will give California’s leaders the tools necessary to restore confidence in the fiscal management of the State.**

YES on Measure G To enact a General Plan for El Dorado County.

Measure G proposes to implement a General Plan similar to the 1996 previously adopted version but with inclusion of Measure Y (a voter-passed traffic congestion initiative.) The ongoing General Plan process has cost the County over \$15 million of taxpayer’s money. The county currently has no planning authority due to a court-imposed Writ of Mandate. This means that El Dorado County cannot, in many cases, process plans for mapping a new business. The County’s water rights are in serious jeopardy due to the lack of an approved General Plan. All efforts for additional water sources and/or storage require certification of a valid General Plan. Federal highway funds due El Dorado County are in serious jeopardy as well. We must have a valid state-mandated Housing Element before we can obtain some federal and state grants. By adopting this General Plan by a public vote, State law will not require that a new EIR be developed. This alone will save taxpayers thousand of dollars and months, if not years of time. When voters pass Measure G, county supervisors will regain local land-use authority. The county can proceed with pending water rights and supervisors can redirect county funds to public safety, education, road improvements and vital local services. **Take back local control, vote YES on Measure G.**

Arguments For Proposition 55

Our kids deserve clean, safe classrooms if we expect them to succeed. But many students are asked to learn in classrooms that are rundown and overcrowded.

California needs to invest in education to invest in the future of our children. Fixing rundown classrooms and building new schools to reduce overcrowding is one way to help students improve test scores and meet higher standards.

Passing Proposition 55 will invest in our kids' future and enact strict accountability standards that make sure school bond funds go directly to repair and build new classrooms where they're most needed.

PARENTS SUPPORT Proposition 55 because it FIXES OLD AND OUTDATED CLASSROOMS in need of repair.

Recent surveys show that one million children attend schools with bathrooms that don't work. Our kids deserve better. Prop. 55:

- FIXES LEAKY ROOFS, REPAIRS BROKEN BATHROOMS, and puts heating and air conditioning in classrooms.
- Helps make sure kids go to school in SAFE BUILDINGS that meet earthquake and fire standards.

LOCAL TEACHERS SUPPORT Proposition 55 because it PROVIDES COMMUNITIES MATCHING STATE FUNDS TO BUILD NEW LOCAL SCHOOLS.

California needs to build more than 22,000 classrooms to relieve overcrowding and deal with increasing student enrollment. Proposition 55 provides matching state funds for local school projects and will:

- BUILD NEW LOCAL SCHOOLS up and down the state.
- BUILD NEW CLASSROOMS to relieve overcrowding and reduce class sizes.

The CALIFORNIA TAXPAYERS' ASSOCIATION supports Proposition 55's STRICT ACCOUNTABILITY PROVISIONS.

- INDEPENDENT AUDITS, COST CONTROLS and other accountability requirements guard against waste and mismanagement and provide oversight of ALL school projects.
- Funds can only be spent to repair or build schools, NOT on bureaucracy or waste.

The CALIFORNIA STATE PTA supports Proposition 55 because it TARGETS FUNDS WHERE THEY'RE NEEDED MOST.

- Prop. 55 provides specific funding to build new schools in areas where classrooms are severely overcrowded.
- New and growing communities also receive their fair share to build the schools and classrooms they need.

The CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, California COMMUNITY COLLEGES and UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA support Proposition 55.

- Proposition 55 provides funds for colleges and universities to build classrooms and modernize research facilities that help create jobs and grow California's economy.

The CALIFORNIA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE supports Proposition 55 because it INVESTS IN OUR ECONOMY AND OUR FUTURE WORKFORCE.

- School construction is a direct investment in the economy. Proposition 55 projects will CREATE HUNDREDS OF THOUSANDS OF NEW JOBS throughout California.
- Prop. 55 provides money to wire classrooms and give students the tools they need to become tomorrow's leaders.

Passing Proposition 55 will invest in our kids' future by fixing rundown classrooms and building new schools. Strict accountability requirements ensure funds are spent only on school repair and construction.

And Prop. 55 is a general obligation bond that WILL NOT RAISE TAXES.

Join Republicans, Democrats and Independents, local teachers, taxpayer organizations, community groups, local businesses, the California Chamber of Commerce, California State PTA and millions of Californians who support our schools.

ARGUMENTS FOR PROPOSITION 56

It's time for real budget reform that holds legislators accountable.

Year after year, under Democratic and Republican governors alike, we have experienced late budgets and huge deficits.

Year after year, the Legislature bickers and postures over the state budget.

Why do they get away with it? Because LEGISLATORS FACE NO CONSEQUENCES FOR LATE BUDGETS AND IRRESPONSIBLE DEFICITS:

- Despite having almost six months to pass a budget, the Legislature has missed the Constitutional deadline every year since 1986.
- California's credit rating has been lowered to near junk bond status--the lowest of any state.
- Huge deficits threaten drastic cuts in education, health care and public safety--and they also have been responsible for the state's biggest tax increases.

PROPOSITION 56--THE BUDGET ACCOUNTABILITY ACT--MAKES LEGISLATORS RESPONSIBLE FOR THEIR BUDGET ACTIONS.

56 is real budget reform that gives voters the tools they need to hold their legislators accountable.

PROPOSITION 56 ENDS LATE BUDGETS.

56 says legislators will face real consequences when the budget is late:

- It requires the Legislature to stay in session and not go on vacation until they pass the budget.
- It says legislators will forfeit their pay and expenses for each day the budget is late. No budget...no pay.

PROPOSITION 56 REDUCES PARTISAN GRIDLOCK.

- 56 reduces the vote requirement on the budget and related taxes from two-thirds to 55% so small groups of partisan legislators can't hold the budget hostage and block compromise.
- 56 allows lawmakers to vote their conscience, rather than be forced to vote the party line. It eases the political parties' stranglehold on the budget process by empowering the Legislature to censure members who threaten or punish other legislators for their budget vote.

PROPOSITION 56 MAKES LEGISLATORS ACCOUNTABLE TO VOTERS.

- 56 requires future Official Voter Information Guides to contain a two-page summary of the budget including an Internet site so voters can see EVERY VOTE cast by legislators on the budget and related taxes.
- LEGISLATORS WILL FACE THE CONSEQUENCES AT ELECTION TIME if they fail to act responsibly on the budget and taxes.

PROPOSITION 56 HELPS PREVENT OVERSPENDING IN GOOD TIMES AND BUDGET DEFICITS WHEN TIMES ARE BAD.

- 56 helps avoid future deficits by creating a "rainy day fund." For the first time, it would require funds to be set aside when the economy is strong to help prevent deficits when the economy is weak.

- In good times, at least 25% of surplus revenues must be deposited in the reserve. This money can only be spent to help maintain existing services in deficit years or for emergencies such as major fires or earthquakes.
- The reserve cannot be used to increase spending.

After 17 years of late budgets, papered-over deficits and a sinking bond rating, we need to end the gridlock, create a budget reserve and give voters information to hold their legislators accountable at election time.

Proposition 56 makes legislators accountable for their actions on the budget.

Arguments For Proposition 57

Proposition 57 will keep the state from running out of money and prevent drastic cuts in spending on vital programs like education and health care.

Proposition 57 provides for a fund of up to \$5 billion that can be used to pay these bonds off early. It also provides for a reserve of at least \$8 billion, which can be used to prevent future deficits.

Without the Proposition 57 bonds, the State of California may be out of cash by June 2004. If so, the only choices will be to drastically increase taxes. These bonds will let us refinance our inherited debt and give the state time to deal with its ongoing structural deficit.

Proposition 57, and the California Balanced Budget Act, Proposition 58, together will give California's leaders the tools necessary to restore confidence in the fiscal management of the State.

Arguments For Proposition 58

Proposition 58, the California Balanced Budget Act, will require for the first time, that the Governor and Legislature pass a balanced budget.

It will also require general funds to be put in a "Rainy Day" fund to build a reserve to protect California from future economic downturns.

As California faced unprecedented budget deficits for the last 3 years, the problem was ignored, spending exceeded revenues, and there was no process in place to address the fiscal crisis. Proposition 58 will allow the Governor to call a Special Session of the Legislature to deal with future fiscal crises. If the Legislature fails to act within 45 days, then they will not be able to recess and they will not be able to pass any other legislation. This will force the Governor and the Legislature to work together to find a solution to the problem before it is too late.

April 22, 2004

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

Re: Proposal to acquire 40 acres of the Cronin Ranch for development of an equestrian facility

Dear Supervisor Dupray,

The El Dorado County Chamber of Commerce has reviewed the proposal for the expenditure by El Dorado County of \$280,000 of park and recreation funding, provided by Prop. 40, for the purchase of 40 acres on the northern boundary of the Cronin Ranch and the development of an equestrian event and staging facility.

The El Dorado County Chamber Board of Directors has voted to support this proposal. We believe the acquisition of the land and development of an equestrian facility will have a positive economic impact on the local business community by increasing the number of visitors using equestrian, mountain bike and other recreational trail users along the proposed South Fork American River trail corridor in the Coloma, Lotus, Pilot Hill and Cool area.

With the County investment of \$280,000 and the State, Federal and private funds the match would exceed 13 million dollars to complete the development of the facility. The County Chamber believes this project is the perfect development for the economic growth in this rural area.

We urge the Board of Supervisors to approve this acquisition and site development proposal.

Sincerely,

Laurel Brent-Bumb
Chief Executive Officer

Cc: Coloma-Lotus Chamber
Supervisor Charlie Paine

The Honorable Arnold Schwarzenegger
Governor, State of California
State Capitol, First Floor
Sacramento, CA 95814

May 25, 2004

Dear Governor Schwarzenegger,

The El Dorado County Joint Chambers Commission represents over 1,600 business members in El Dorado County. We are contacting you on behalf of these businesses in regard to the proposed Sierra Nevada Conservancy.

Any proposed conservancy gives us cause for serious concern. State employees have created countless problems in our region with no accountability to the people and little connection to the areas their decisions impact. It is our desire to see government become more responsive and connected to the people, not less.

If there is to be a Sierra Nevada Conservancy, it must be built upon respect for and collaboration with the people whose lives will be directly affected, the residents of the Sierras.

Should a conservancy be established it must provide local communities with true influence in the decision making process. The Conservancy board must contain strong representation from the Sierra region, and, more importantly, any major board action must be based upon general consensus with local elected officials.

Local governments are responsible for local land use planning and decisions, and are held accountable by their constituents for such decisions. The conservancy must not be given the power to acquire land in a manner that is unacceptable to the community most impacted by that acquisition.

We would urge you to recognize that the people that live, work and play in the Sierras do so because of the quality of life and beauty that surrounds them. These people are excellent stewards of the land and committed to maintaining everything that makes the Sierras the very special place it is. Should you feel compelled to establish this conservancy please consider our concerns and the very important need for true influence in the decision making process by the people directly affected, the people of the Sierra region.

Sincerely,

Laurel Brent-Bumb
Chief Executive Officer
On behalf of:

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

cc: Assemblyman Tim Leslie
Assemblyman John Laird
Mike Chrisman, Secretary California Resources Agency

July 13, 2004

The Honorable Judy Chu, Chairperson
Assembly Appropriations Committee
State Capitol, Room 2148
Sacramento, CA 95814

RE: SB 754 (Perata), Heritage Trees--OPPOSE

Dear Chairperson Chu,

The El Dorado County Joint Chambers Commission, representing more than 1700 member businesses, is opposed to SB 754 (Perata). We oppose this legislation for the following specific reasons:

- ***Old growth forests in California are NOT almost gone.***

Most of the National Forests in California are composed of uncut, old growth forests. Unfortunately, because these forests have been placed off-limits to timber management for the same well-intentioned reasons expressed in this bill, these forests are in serious jeopardy due to the strong likelihood that they will be destroyed by catastrophic wildfire. Forest thinning to prevent catastrophic fires has been marginalized due to over-regulation both by state and federal agencies.

- ***There are still substantial inventories of old-growth timber on private land.***

The term "old growth" as defined in this proposed legislation is 154 years old (born before 1850 when California became a state) in combination with a stump height measurement of 42" for Redwood, 40" for Douglas fir, or 28" for hardwood. Since these trees are in private ownership, the state should not impose restrictions that would cause them to die in place rather than to remain harvestable and be used as intended by the private landowner.

- ***The arbitrary buffer zones result in a "taking" of trees and land.***

The buffer zones around each of two species heritage trees will tie up vast areas of productive timberland and make it almost impossible to manage the remaining property. The restrictions are so onerous that they will render the land unusable because it will no longer be economically feasible to harvest the otherwise merchantable timber. This is a "taking" of private property and will result in a devaluation of land values. Furthermore, the buffer zones actually create a situation that is more susceptible to wildfire, creating crown fires and hot spots that will decimate the trees they were intended to protect.

- ***The bill will destroy the incentive for private landowners to grow large trees.***

Why would a prudent landowner allow a tree to get larger than 40" if he knows that he will lose the right to harvest it when it gets to be 42"? If the goal here is to protect old growth trees, these arbitrary thresholds will actually cause the savvy landowner to cut down trees when they are small thus doing exactly what this bill purports to prevent ... the eventual loss of old growth forests.

- ***This bill imposes criminal penalties on timber owners.***

This bill imposes a penalty that is criminal instead of civil in nature. This far exceeds penalties assigned to other industries that are also heavily regulated by federal and state agencies. Why is the timber industry being singled out in such an obvious way? The industry is already struggling to comply with increased regulations that are causing it to become less economically viable.

In El Dorado County over 50% of our land is already owned and controlled by federal and state agencies. This legislation would serve to tie up the remaining forestland that exists on private property by making it impossible to profitably harvest timber. For those who have banked on their timber's marketability to plan for their family's financial future, they have just lost the ability to do so with these new restrictions. Their land will be de-valued and certainly their timber that was managed for growth for many years will have no market value.

Again, with this legislation it seems clear that this is less about heritage tree protection than it is about further restricting land use by regulating an already struggling timber industry. It is not based on sound science and seeks to decrease the amount of merchantable timber by the "taking" of land and trees within the arbitrary "buffer zones". The onerous restrictions proposed will be one more nail in the coffin for the timber industry and especially for the small businessmen like our independent loggers. Therefore, we urge you to vote "NO" when this bill is heard in the Assembly Appropriations Committee.

Sincerely,

Laurel Brent Bumb, CEO
On behalf of;

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

cc: The Honorable Arnold Schwarzenegger, Governor
 Secretary Mike Chrisman, Resources Agency
 Members, Assembly Appropriations Committee
 The Honorable Sheila Kuehl
 The Honorable Tim Leslie
 The Honorable Alan Nakanishi
 Rusty Dupray, Chair, El Dorado County Board of Supervisors

**Agricultural Council of California
Agricultural Council El Dorado County Chamber
Alliance for Habitat Conservation
Associated General Contractors
Association of California Water Agencies
California Association of REALTORS®
California Association of Winegrape Growers
California Building Industry Association
California Business Properties Association
California Cattlemen's Association
California Chamber of Commerce
California Farm Bureau Federation
California Grain and Feed Association
California Manufacturers and Technology Association
California State Association of Counties
California Thoroughbred Breeders Association
California Wool Growers Association
Consulting Engineers and Land Surveyors of California
Contra Costa Water District
El Dorado County Joint Chambers Commission
Family Winemakers of California
Forest Landowners of California
Harris Farms, Inc
Kern County Water Agency
Lumber Association of California and Nevada**

Regional Council of Rural Counties
Resource Landowners Coalition
Transportation Corridor Agencies of Orange County

SB 1334 (Kuehl), CEQA Expansion: Oak Woodlands Mitigation--OPPOSE

The above-listed groups including the El Dorado County Joint Chambers Commission urge your “NO” vote on SB 1334 (Kuehl) in the Assembly Agriculture Committee. The bill sets up a state-mandated land use control scheme that threatens affordable housing, state and local infrastructure, agricultural production, and local government authority over land use. It also pushes counties toward an unprecedented statewide mitigation standard, leading to costly litigation that local governments, businesses and property owners can't afford.

Please Vote “NO” on SB 1334.

We OPPOSE SB 1334, because it:

• *Ignores the Science Surrounding Oak Trees in California—There is NOT a Statewide Problem*

Current research and science does not support a statewide approach to oak protection. The state's Integrated Hardwood Rangeland program was formed in 1986 to protect the approximately 10 million acres of hardwood rangelands in California, and the state still HAS roughly 10 million acres of hardwood rangelands today. Further, a 2001 report done by the Fire and Resource Assessment Program (FRAP) within the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection states that 96-98 percent of all hardwood areas had no detectable change within a five-year monitoring period. That same period documented a decrease of less than 3% in cover. SB 1334 places a new regulatory regime onto counties and landowners without justification of need.

- **Fails to Recognize that Most Counties Already Protect Oaks and Increases Litigation Potential**

There are 41 counties in California that already have some type of oak tree protection mechanism in place. Instead of recognizing that fact, and rewarding those who are doing the right thing pursuant to their local circumstances, SB 1334 expands the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) to force counties into a new planning and mitigation scheme. Any oak woodlands management plan would have to contain mitigation alternatives and procedures to minimize impacts to oak woodlands along riparian zones, near wetlands, caves, cliffs, and burrows. The placement of this language into CEQA creates the potential for increased litigation, giving those who oppose county actions a new tool to challenge those actions in court. Effectively, SB 1334 forces ALL counties to abandon their previous oak protection efforts, pushing them toward an unprecedented mitigation standard at a time when they can least afford it.

- **Threatens Needed Affordable Housing, Infrastructure Projects and Agricultural Production**

Although housing and infrastructure are already subject to local government permitting and CEQA review for projects that may impact oak trees and oak woodlands, SB 1334 places a new mitigation standard in CEQA that will adversely impact agricultural activities, housing and infrastructure projects. The mitigation standard set forth in the bill—to conserve IN PERPETUITY, through conservation easements, two oak trees of the same species for each oak tree removed—sets an unprecedented “floor” for mitigation that will be expensive and unworkable for all types of activities. Again, those who oppose such activities will have a new legal tool to challenge the actions of local governments under CEQA.

- **Hurts the New State Incentive Program for Protecting Oaks**

The Oak Woodlands Conservation Act, a voluntary, incentive-driven program created by the Legislature in 2001 (AB 242, Thomson), is just beginning to get off the ground. The Wildlife Conservation Board (WCB) currently has \$10 million to administer this grant program, which rewards local governments that develop oak woodlands management plans pursuant to their local circumstances. Once these locally developed plans are in place, the WCB funding is available to reward landowners who provide long-term protection of oak woodlands. This money can also be used at the local level for oak protection planning and public education. The Legislature should not thwart its own incentive program by effectively making it mandatory. Further, SB 1334 specifies that those who contribute to the Oak Woodlands Conservation Fund are ineligible to receive grants from the fund. If the goal is to protect oak woodlands, funding should be available to anyone who furthers the cause.

- **Coalition Amendments Offered Several Times**

Our coalition has submitted amendments that would create a fair process for agriculture, and enhance the applicability of CEQA to projects involving oak woodlands, without the county mandates and unworkable mitigation standards contained in SB 1334 (attached). Please help us achieve these amendments, to enact a more reasonable approach to protecting oak woodlands. **Until then, we must OPPOSE SB 1334 (Kuehl).**

WE URGE YOU – FIGHT SPRAWL AND TRAFFIC CONGESTION DO NOT SIGN

After years of hard work and community input, our County Board of Supervisors on July 19th, adopted the 2004 Smart Growth & Open Roads General Plan - A Plan for Quality Neighborhoods and Traffic Relief." This General Plan is good for business and good for El Dorado County. Regrettably, a small radical group of is trying to block the general plan by referendum and untruths. The Referendum, if it passes, would overturn the general plan therefore putting the Board of Supervisors back at square one, virtually starting over again costing millions of dollars to the county. Signing the petition will NOT reduce traffic or widen Highway 50. It WILL stop funding for transportation improvements and derail the county's plan for quality neighborhoods and traffic relief. Here's what the 2004 El Dorado County General Plan does. It requires developers, not taxpayers, to pay for new roads. It imposes tough new development restrictions to prevent traffic congestion and applies ALL of Measure Y's traffic control policies adopted by the voters in 1998. The General Plan allows the county to plan for clean and abundant supplies of fresh water while protecting our county's vital agricultural lands. It recognizes the need to preserve our county's historic communities and carefully balances environmental protection and private property rights with the need for jobs and economic development. Scenic corridors, wildlife habitats and ridgelines are protected and protection against exposure to naturally occurring asbestos is strengthened. It protects our rural character by keeping home sites at a one-acre minimum and provides new measures to protect against wildfires. If you unknowingly signed this referendum you can have your signature revoked by contacting the County Elections Department at 530-621-7480.