

# POSITION PAPERS

March 1, 2006

Assemblyman Tim Leslie  
District Office  
3300 Douglas Blvd., Suite 430  
Roseville, CA 95661

Subject: Holiday Inn Express project, Placerville, CA

Dear Assemblyman Leslie,

The El Dorado County Chamber of Commerce represents over 800 business members and over 4,500 employee/residents in our community. On behalf of our membership I would like to express our concern over the delays and roadblocks presented by Cal-trans for a project that has the support of the vast majority of our County. These supporters include the City of Placerville, DOT, Fire, Police, Schools and the Apple Hill Growers Association as well as the Chamber.

The project developer has worked in good faith with Cal-trans for over 3 years to obtain approval to build a road from the Point View interchange to Jacquier Road. They have hired respected professionals to work with Cal-trans to resolve any possible issues.

The road the developer intends to build has been in the City of Placerville's Master Circulation plan for over 15 years and will provide freeway access to Smith Flat and Apple Hill.

The construction of this roadway is clearly a health and safety issue and the continued delay in resolving the issues is acting to deny the benefits of the new roadway to the community and our many visitors.

We would respectfully request that your office, as appropriate, intervene to assist in resolution of this matter.

Sincerely,

Laurel Brent-Bumb  
Chief Executive Officer

March 1, 2006

Senator Dave Cox  
2140 Professional Dr., Suite 14  
Roseville, CA 95661

Subject: Holiday Inn Express project, Placerville, CA

Dear Senator Cox,

The El Dorado County Chamber of Commerce represents over 800 business members and over 4,500 employee/residents in our community. On behalf of our membership I would like to express our concern over the delays and roadblocks presented by Cal-trans for a project that has the support of the vast majority of our County. These supporters include the City of Placerville, DOT, Fire, Police, Schools and the Apple Hill Growers Association as well as the Chamber.

The project developer has worked in good faith with Cal-trans for over 3 years to obtain approval to build a road from the Point View interchange to Jacquier Road. They have hired respected professionals to work with Cal-trans to resolve any possible issues.

The road the developer intends to build has been in the City of Placerville's Master Circulation Plan for over 15 years and will provide freeway access to Smith Flat and Apple Hill.

The construction of this roadway is clearly a health and safety issue and the continued delay in resolving the issues is acting to deny the benefits of the new roadway to the community and our many visitors.

We would respectfully request that your office, as appropriate, intervene to assist in resolution of this matter.

Sincerely,

Laurel Brent-Bumb  
Chief Executive Officer

# Joint Chambers Commission of El Dorado County

Gregory Chew  
Blueprint Civic Engagement Program Manager  
Sacramento Area Council of Governments  
1415 L Street, Suite 300  
Sacramento, CA 95814



**El Dorado County**  
542 Main Street  
Placerville, CA 95667  
(530) 621-5885 • Fax: (530) 642-1624  
Toll-Free: (800) 457-6279  
[www.eldoradocounty.org](http://www.eldoradocounty.org)



**El Dorado Hills**  
P.O. Box 5605  
981 Governor Dr., Ste. 103  
El Dorado Hills, CA 95762  
(916) 933-1335 • Fax: (916) 933-5908  
[www.eldoradohillschamber.org](http://www.eldoradohillschamber.org)



**Shingle Springs/Cameron Park**  
P.O. Box 341  
3300 Coach Lane, #B8  
Shingle Springs, CA 95682  
(530) 677-8000 • Fax: (530) 676-8313  
[www.sscpchamber.org](http://www.sscpchamber.org)

Dear Mr. Chew,

We are writing in support of the El Dorado County Department of Transportation's grant application entitled: "Enhancement of El Dorado County DOT Web-Based Public Information and Outreach Program" for the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) 2005-07 Blueprint Civic Engagement Program.

El Dorado County DOT is partnering with the 50 Corridor Transportation Management Association to integrate the enhanced public information available on EDCDOT projects with the [www.50Corridor.com](http://www.50Corridor.com) Web site. This Web site was instituted more than four years ago for the purpose of providing transportation-related project information to people who live, work and travel along the U.S. 50 corridor. At the time, more than 30 transportation enhancement projects were taking place along the corridor, from light rail extensions to interchange enhancements.

Since this site was launched, more than 92,000 visits were made by individuals seeking information on specific transportation projects under construction. Even though most of these projects were completed more than a year ago, the site continues to enjoy robust attention from the 50 Corridor traveling public. In May 2006, there were more than 3,000 visits to the collection of projects; of the top 12 most visited projects, eight were located in El Dorado County. It is clear that [www.50corridor.com](http://www.50corridor.com) is known by 50 Corridor travelers as the resource for transportation construction project information.

This proposal intends to build on that foundation by providing up-to-date and comprehensive information in an easy to use, easy to access on-line format on all EDCDOT projects whether planned, under construction or recently completed. Interactive maps that will clearly show transportation and land development projects will be featured extensively on this site. Incorporating land development projects (e.g., housing, employment and retail centers) will provide interested parties with a broader depth of information to make better choices and informed decisions regarding where to live, work, shop, etc. and transportation alternatives (routes to take and , modes to use (e.g. auto, transit, carpool, bicycling, walking).

We believe that this civic engagement program proposal will promote public involvement in El Dorado County transportation and land development that is Blueprint-friendly, and would be an excellent project to be selected for funding through SACOG's Blueprint Civic Engagement grant program. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Laurel Brent-Bumb  
Chief Executive Officer  
On behalf of; Joint Chambers Commission

**El Dorado County Joint Chambers  
2006 Legislative Positions through September**

- SB 908 – Commonsense Consumption Act of 2005 Move to support
- Joint Chambers Procedures – Approval of revisions
- Bowling Alley – Miniature Golf Course – Support in concept
- Proposition 86 – Cigarette Tax increase of 300% - oppose
- Proposition 87 – Oppose -4 billion oil tax increase
- Proposition 88 – Oppose - \$50.00 levy per individual and business
- SB 655 - Ortiz bill on Naturally Occurring Asbestos - Oppose
- Black Oak Mine School Bond Measure – Support
- Oppose proposed County Agricultural Regulation regarding Winery Ordinance
- Support proposed Highway 50 HOV lane project
- Support Highway 50 Mobility Coalition to move highway project forward.

**NO - Proposition 86:** Tax on Cigarettes. This measure increases the state's excise tax by 300 percent, adding an additional \$2.60 per pack tax to the price of cigarettes sold in California, with the majority of the revenue used to fund health care services.

Learn more about Proposition 86 and the campaign to defeat it <<http://stop86.org/>>

Joint Chambers to oppose via form faxed to the Californians Against Unaccountable Taxes 916-554-3434

Joint Chambers Oppose Prop. 87 via email form.

Prop. 87, is the \$4 billion oil tax increase that would increase transportation and gas costs for all consumers and businesses, result in a new unaccountable bureaucracy run by 50 political appointees and could force a taxpayer bailout. It also allows the new governing authority to spend and spend – whether or not they make any progress with alternative energy, while increasing our dependence on foreign oil. It is opposed by a coalition of more than 230 organizations including the California Chamber of Commerce, the California Black Chamber of Commerce and the California Hispanic Chambers of Commerce.

# Joint Chambers Commission of El Dorado County

July 17, 2006



Californians Against the Statewide Property Tax  
925 University Ave.  
Sacramento, CA 95834

RE: Oppose Proposition 88

**El Dorado County**  
542 Main Street  
Placerville, CA 95667  
(530) 621-5885 • Fax: (530) 642-1624  
Toll-Free: (800) 457-6279  
[www.eldoradocounty.org](http://www.eldoradocounty.org)

The El Dorado County Joint Chambers is opposed to proposition 88 the statewide property tax proposed to levy a fifty-dollar tax on every individual and business, which currently receives a property tax bill. We believe this proposition is not needed. Both Governor Schwarzenegger and legislative leaders acknowledge that the budget that was just passed fully funds Proposition 98 with a 8.1 billion increase in education spending over 2004-2005.



It will create a whole new bureaucracy to assess and collect this new tax from Californian's 10 million home and property owners in 58 counties and will place new mandates for data collection on all of the state's more the 1000 school districts – whether they receive funding through the initiative or not.

**El Dorado Hills**  
P.O. Box 5605  
981 Governor Dr., Ste. 103  
El Dorado Hills, CA 95762  
(916) 933-1335 • Fax: (916) 933-5908  
[www.eldoradohillschamber.org](http://www.eldoradohillschamber.org)

The measure will impose the same \$50 property tax, regardless of parcel type, income, or property value resulting in a single-family homeowner paying the same as the owner of a multi-million dollar mansion.



Proposition 88 is particularly bad for California businesses because it sets a new precedent by imposing the first statewide property tax. Once this threshold has been crossed, it is only a matter of time before other interest groups propose statewide property taxes falling more heavily or exclusively on businesses.

**Shingle Springs/Cameron Park**  
P.O. Box 341  
3300 Coach Lane, #B8  
Shingle Springs, CA 95682  
(530) 677-8000 • Fax: (530) 676-8313  
[www.sscpchamber.org](http://www.sscpchamber.org)

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

August 23, 2006

# **ASSEMBLY FLOOR ALERT**

## **OPPOSITION TO SB 655 (Ortiz)**

*Earlier defeated measure removed from inactive file*

File Item # 318

**CALIFORNIA BUILDING INDUSTRY ASSOCIATION  
CALIFORNIA BUSINESS PROPERTIES ASSOCIATION  
CALIFORNIA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE  
CONSULTING ENGINEERS&LAND SURVEYORS CA.  
CALIFORNIA MAJOR BUILDERS COUNCIL  
CA. MANUFACTURERS & TECHNOLOGY ASSOCIATION  
CALIFORNIA BUSINESS ROUNDTABLE  
ASSOCIATED GENERAL CONTRACTORS OF CA.  
CALIFORNIA FORESTRY ASSOCIATION  
AMERICAN FOREST & PAPER ASSOCIATION  
CALIFORNIA FARM BUREAU FEDERATION  
RESOURCE LANDOWNERS COALITION**

**SB 655, a bill that was solidly rejected by the full Assembly last September was recently removed from the inactive file and is back on 3<sup>rd</sup> reading.**

In its current form, SB 655 creates a new, unfunded CalEPA task force whose responsibility would be to develop project control mitigation measures to combat the effects of naturally occurring asbestos (NOA) and oversee an unfunded statewide mapping program to determine where NOA may be present. The state-developed control measures would be applicable to a wide range of land-based activities from farming to homebuilding to forest and timber activities to road building (to name a few). Local governments would be required to adopt some, if not all, of the measures. We strongly object to this approach for the following reasons:

### **No Science To Support Regulatory Program**

SB 655 puts “policy ahead of science.” There is currently no human health risk assessment establishing the concentration of airborne NOA fibers in the outdoor, casual environment that can be scientifically shown to pose a significant health risk to humans. Absent a scientifically-based “risk,” SB 655 opens the door to mitigation without proof of tangible risk and to measures that go far beyond what may actually be needed.

### **Violation of the Administrative Procedures Act (APA) = Underground Regulation**

The “guidelines” for Best Management Practices developed by the Cal EPA task force pursuant to SB 655 meet the criteria of a *rule* that must be adopted pursuant to the APA. According to the APA if the policy is a rule or standard of general application and is adopted by an agency (Cal EPA) to implement a law enforced or administered by the agency then it is a “regulation” and must be adopted pursuant to the APA. SB 655 has no requirement to adhere to the APA and as such violates the Act. The guidelines adopted by the task force become **underground regulations**.

### **Unfunded Mandate**

SB 655 imposes a \$2.5 to \$3 million unfunded mandate upon the Department of Conservation and the State Geologist to conduct a priority mapping of counties of the state known to harbor rocks likely to contain NOA.

### **SB 655 Creates Undue Public Alarm and Opens the Door to Litigation**

SB 655 potentially imposes the dreadful appellation *Asbestos Hazard Zone* upon areas within 44 of California’s 58 counties without specific evidence that NOA is actually present. This will most surely act as a magnet and rallying point to future litigation. The bill makes the assumption that if the rocks likely to contain NOA are present then NOA itself must actually be present. This assumption is **FALSE**. The State Geologist has clearly stated that any mapping program under its authority could only identify the presence of rocks likely to contain NOA. The maps would not determine whether NOA is actually present. Detailed, parcel-by-parcel testing would be necessary.

### **A Possible Solution**

The opponents to SB 655 have suggested the bill be scaled back to a form much more achievable and beneficial: **a mapping program of the state**. The best course this year would be to cease further action, scale the bill back to the version that left the Senate and secure first-phase funding in next year’s budget to begin the mapping process.

Absent this, we remain strongly opposed to SB 655 (Ortiz).

# Joint Chambers Commission of El Dorado County



**El Dorado County**  
542 Main Street  
Placerville, CA 95667  
(530) 621-5885 • Fax: (530) 642-1624  
Toll-Free: (800) 457-6279  
[www.eldoradocounty.org](http://www.eldoradocounty.org)

July 17, 2006

Mr. Rob Schamberg  
Black Oak Mine Unified School District  
P.O.Box 4510  
Georgetown, CA 95634

**RE: Support of General Obligation Bond**

The Joint Chambers Commission of El Dorado County is in full support of the proposed bond measure.



**El Dorado Hills**  
P.O. Box 5605  
981 Governor Dr., Ste. 103  
El Dorado Hills, CA 95762  
(916) 933-1335 • Fax: (916) 933-5908  
[www.eldoradohillschamber.org](http://www.eldoradohillschamber.org)

It is our position that the bond will improve student safety and the quality of education throughout the Black Oak Mine Unified School District. The District will repair, improve, update, replace, construct, furnish and equip school facilities and classrooms with much needed fire safety and septic systems, plumbing, heating and air conditioning systems and science and computer laboratories that will help qualify the District for State matching funds.

We appreciate the built-in accountability provided by a citizens oversight committee as well as independent audits, including the fact that no funds will be used for administrator's salaries.

The Joint Chamber Commission encourages a YES vote on Measure G.

Sincerely,

Laurel Brent-Bumb, CEO  
On behalf of;



**Shingle Springs/Cameron Park**  
P.O. Box 341  
3300 Coach Lane, #B8  
Shingle Springs, CA 95682  
(530) 677-8000 • Fax: (530) 676-8313  
[www.sscpchamber.org](http://www.sscpchamber.org)

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



*Still Finding Gold In El Dorado County*

October 18, 2006

Ms. Genevieve Shiroma  
President  
Sacramento Municipal Utility District Board of Directors  
P.O. Box 15830 – MS B407  
Sacramento, CA 95852-1830

RE: Endorsement of Agency/NGO Alternative in UARP relicensing procedure

Dear President Shiroma:

The El Dorado County Chamber of Commerce represents business and community interests throughout El Dorado County. As such we are vitally aware of the immense effects – both positive and negative – that your Upper American River Project has upon our community. After careful review our Board of Directors has decided to endorse the current Agency/NGO Alternative now before FERC. We believe it represents the most equitable, reasonable and rational approach on the table, and as such meets the diverse needs of the river, our community, our members, and your owner/ratepayers. We strongly encourage your Board to direct a settlement, which will adopt that alternative. Such an action will help preserve and protect your reputation as a good steward of the environment as well as a good neighbor.

Thank you, for your time and consideration. We look forward to a long and fruitful relationship with SMUD and the Upper American River Project.

Regards,

Laurel Brent-Bumb  
Chief Executive Officer

***EL DORADO COUNTY CHAMBER OF COMMERCE***

542 Main Street, Placerville, California 95667  
(530) 621-5885 (800) 457-6279 Fax (530) 642-1624