

POSITION PAPERS

Highway 50 corridor mobility support.txt
From: "Laurel Brent-Bumb" <chamber@el doradocounty.org>
To: <opinion@sacbee.com>
Subject: Highway 50 corridor
Date: Friday, December 22, 2006 11:29 AM

Dear Editor,

It's clear to the El Dorado County Chamber of Commerce that we need a new approach to transportation planning along the Highway 50 corridor. The public-private planning process described in Tony Bizjak's December 21 story ("Traffic group lauded, faulted") is the type of proactive effort that is needed to effectively address our congestion problems. An improved, well-planned Highway 50 corridor transportation system that provides realistic choices for residents and commuters will help protect area jobs and enable the continued economic development of this vitally important part of the region. Such collaboration also will help ensure that we secure more of our fair share of available funding for much-needed transportation projects.

Laurel Brent-Bumb, CEO

El Dorado County Chamber of Commerce

Laurel Brent-Bumb, ACE
Chief Executive Officer
El Dorado County Chamber
www.neighborhoodeconomics.com
"neighborhood economics it's good for all of us"

The El Dorado Business Alliance

P.O. Box 121, Shingle Springs, CA 95682

December 31, 2006

Position Paper: 2004 General Plan Implementation Process

Issue: A lack of early Board of Supervisor and public participation in development of General Plan (GP) policy interpretations: General Plan policy interpretations are being driven by staff instead of by elected officials.

Background Discussion: One of the El Dorado Business Alliance's (BA) ongoing goals is to stay involved in local governance issues. The BA has access to six business organizations with approximately 6,000 members, many of whom are intimately involved in a variety of businesses and land-use issues in El Dorado County and the state.

Currently GP implementation measures are being developed primarily by the Development Services Department whose staff considers policies included in the 2004 GP and then creates a draft ordinance or interim interpretation standards. These ordinances and interpretations are then scheduled for Planning Commission (PC) review, which is the public's first meaningful input on the topic. The problem with this method is two-fold: First, the public, who has real-world experience, is often instantly at odds with the draft. Second, the Board's input is not known until the end of the process. Yet the Board is the elected body that adopted the GP, presumably with specific goals in mind. The current system often results in a contentious Board hearing where Supervisors must either support a PC-amended draft *or* direct staff to begin anew and include public comments. Importantly, any interim interpretations are not reviewed by the Board at all - while having significant impacts on property owners and residents.

The BA suggests holding publicly-noticed Board scoping meetings first, to cull out areas of controversy and confusion. The BA believes early input by Supervisors and the public is crucial to define specific GP policy goals and identify what was originally intended. Staff would then take all input and develop a draft ordinance, followed by PC hearings and recommendations, and a final decision by the Board.

We also suggest that the public be given a minimum of 14 to 30 days to contact those affected by the ordinance such as contractors, developers, business owners, etc., to improve implementation efficiency and identify impractical regulations early on. This will reduce staff time and pressure that is inherent in "guessing" what the issues are and what the Supervisors intended.

It would also be most helpful if the ongoing hearings on General Plan issues could be scheduled for the same time at each meeting, such as 2:00 pm. Having consistently designated times would assist the public greatly in scheduling their attendance, if at all possible.

Solution: The BA suggests the following process be adopted by the Board of Supervisors in developing all new GP ordinances and implementation measures:

- 1) A series of Board workshops on each of the GP elements identified as problematic.
- 2) A Board workshop on each GP policy prior to staff developing a draft ordinance or implementation guidelines.
- 3) A review of the effectiveness of the former EDC Area Plans as their success was due to early public and community input that generally promoted buy-in by the public.
- 4) Funding should be provided by the Board of Supervisors to hold the workshops and schedule same ASAP.

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

The El Dorado County Joint Chambers Commission opinion regarding the Winery Ordinance is that, as currently written, it is excessively restrictive to agri-tourism businesses throughout El Dorado County. As we understand the Board of Supervisors directed review of all ordinances for compliance with the General Plan. The Board did not direct staff to rewrite each ordinance to be as imposing and restrictive as possible.

We are concerned that in staff's zeal to complete their task of reviewing the ordinances to conform to the General Plan things have gotten off course.

We have heard at public meetings that the ordinance revisions are necessary to mitigate complaints received from the public. It is important to have accurate information regarding such complaints to determine the origin of such problems and to keep revisions to the absolute minimum to protect the economic vitality of the county.

We would request that the Planning Commission direct staff to study the potential economic effects of the proposed ordinance changes. One ordinance can have disastrous impacts on other segments of the county's economy. We strongly encourage the Planning Commission to direct staff to make only those changes necessary to comply with the General Plan and not over regulate to the detriment of business and the economy.



Still Finding Gold In El Dorado County

February 14, 2007

Mr. Greg Fuz, Director
Development Services Department
2850 Fairlane Court
Placerville, CA 95667

RE: El Dorado County Joint Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan/Habitat
Conservation Plan/Natural Community Conservation Plan

Dear Mr. Fuz,

Although I recognize the reason why this process is being implemented, whereby the County is required to achieve outcomes of GP Policy 7.4.2.8, including the development of a fee program within the Oak Woodlands Management Plan, I have concern that this will add additional restrictions to development though-out the County, particularly in areas that have been planned for future growth. It is only through the revenue generated from this growth that required and requested public services can be met. I have found this policy to be in conflict with many other policies throughout the General Plan and I have great concern that should it be developed and implemented it would inhibit future growth, thereby decreasing future revenue generation. This policy alone could place the County in greater jeopardy by achieving far greater impacts than those this policy is protecting.

In review of the recipient list it appears there are few who can speak to the impact this type of policy may have on the County's economy. I recommend additional members of the business community be included.

Respectfully,

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

Joint Chambers Commission of El Dorado County

To: California Transportation Commission
From: El Dorado County Joint Chambers of Commerce
Re: Support for the El Dorado County US 50 High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) Lane Project



El Dorado County
542 Main Street
Placerville, CA 95667
(530) 621-5885 • Fax: (530) 642-1624
Toll-Free: (800) 457-6279
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



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

Dear Commissioners,

The El Dorado County Joint Chambers of Commerce endorses the request of the El Dorado County Transportation Commission (EDCTC) and Caltrans for \$20 million in Corridor Mobility Improvement Account (CMIA) funding to construct the El Dorado US 50 HOV lane project.

The Joint Chambers represents thousands businesses belonging to the El Dorado County Chamber of Commerce, the Cameron Park/ Shingle Springs Chamber of Commerce and the El Dorado Hills Chamber of Commerce

The requested CMIA funding will assist El Dorado County with improving mobility along the 50 Corridor, both in El Dorado County and Sacramento County,

A key benefit of the project will be the enhancement of the county's commuter bus service which carries El Dorado County residents to work centers in Sacramento. The expansion of the HOV lanes from El Dorado Hills Boulevard to west of Bass Lake Road will potentially save transit users an additional 20 minutes off their morning and evening commute, compared to commuters using the mixed flow lanes.

The proposed project will construct eastbound and westbound HOV lanes in El Dorado County from approximately El Dorado Hills Boulevard to west of Bass Lake Road, which will extend the current HOV lane system and provide 15 continuous miles of eastbound and westbound HOV lanes between Sunrise Boulevard in Sacramento County and Bass Lake Road in El Dorado County. This project is considered the first major phase of the US 50 HOV lane network in El Dorado County, which is ultimately planned to extend east of the Shingle Springs area for a total of 23 miles of continuous HOV lanes.

Scheduled to begin construction in 2008, this project provides regional benefits, as it is estimated to eliminate over 1.2 million annual vehicle hours of delay and alleviate congestion pressure from the increasing travel demands associated with the surging wave of economic and residential growth in this corridor, including the cities of Folsom and Rancho Cordova.

This project is included in the EDCTC Regional Transportation Plan and the Sacramento Area Council of Government's (SACOG) Metropolitan Transportation Plan, and is consistent with SACOG's Blueprint Planning Principles, which include the need for enhanced mobility options such as transit, vanpooling and carpooling.

Laurel Brent-Bumb, CEO
On behalf of;
El Dorado County Chamber of Commerce
Shingle Springs/Cameron Park Chamber - El Dorado Hills Chamber

cc: Katherine Mathews, El Dorado Transportation Commission

Joint Chambers Commission of El Dorado County

March 6, 2007



El Dorado County Board of Supervisors
El Dorado County Planning Commission
330 Fair Lane Dr.
Placerville, CA 95667

Dear Supervisors and Commissioners,

El Dorado County
542 Main Street
Placerville, CA 95667
(530) 621-5885 • Fax: (530) 642-1624
Toll-Free: (800) 457-6279
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



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

The El Dorado County Joint Chambers Commission opinion regarding the Winery Ordinance is that, as currently written, it is excessively restrictive to agri-tourism businesses throughout El Dorado County as is the proposed sign ordinance and the home occupation ordinance. As we understand the Board of Supervisors directed review of all ordinances for compliance with the General Plan. The Board did not direct staff to rewrite each ordinance to be as imposing and restrictive as possible.

We are concerned that in staff's zeal to complete their task of reviewing the ordinances to conform to the General Plan things have gotten off course.

We have heard at public meetings that the ordinance revisions are necessary to mitigate complaints received from the public. It is important to have accurate information regarding such complaints to determine the origin of such problems and to keep revisions to the absolute minimum to protect the economic vitality of the county.

We would request that the Planning Commission direct staff to study the potential economic effects of the proposed ordinance changes. One ordinance can have disastrous impacts on other segments of the county's economy. We strongly encourage the Planning Commission to direct staff to make only those changes necessary to comply with the General Plan and not over regulate to the detriment of business and the economy.

Respectfully,

Laurel Brent-Bumb
Chief Executive Officer
On behalf of:

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

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

March 12, 2007

Board of Supervisors
360 Fair Lane
Placerville, CA 95667

Honorable Board of Supervisors:

The El Dorado Business Alliance (BA) has been involved in discussions surrounding the SAIC proposal to conduct INRMP/HCP program studies for El Dorado County (EDC). The BA provided public input on some issues last week, however, this letter seeks to clarify this complicated issue and set forth our position concerning the INRMP and HCP/NCCP processes as applicable to El Dorado County.

The priority issue facing the Board of Supervisors currently is simply to implement the General Plan (GP), more specifically Policies 7.4.4.4 and 7.4.2.8. Many projects are not moving forward due to an inability to remediate site-specific oak tree removal. Yet this relatively simple process has been widely complicated and confused by other sections of the GP and state and federal areas of interest. Basically, the policies under current consideration by this Board state the following:

Policy 7.4.4.4 simply requires that if a project has over one acre and more than 1% woodland canopy, then it may mitigate in one of the following two ways:

Option A = retain a percentage of that canopy while replacing the trees cut down, or

Option B = cut down more than the retention allows and contribute to an oak tree preservation fund.

Of significance is GP **Measure CO-P** which requires EDC to address Policy 7.4.4.4 mitigation standards within two years after adoption of the GP. Clearly we are rapidly closing in on that timeframe now.

Policy 7.4.2.8 simply states that EDC shall develop an Integrated Natural Resource Management Plan (INRMP) that will identify important habitat in EDC and establish a program to preserve and manage those areas. This policy appears to give much leeway to the authority of the Board of Supervisors to interpret and apply it.

Regarding the much discussed **HCP**, these plans are used to address endangered species. In EDC there are 12 state and federally listed endangered or threatened species, two of which are proposed for de-listing; five of which are rare/endangered plants already protected in local plant preserves; five of which are primarily found in wetland or riparian habitats which are already protected by policies contained in the 2004 GP. Additionally, any disruption of wetland and/or riparian habitats will be required to go through wetlands permitting processes and will include specific mitigations for impacts to specific listed species.

It is clear that an HCP/NCCP approach is not required to implement GP Policy 7.4.4.4 oak tree/corridor protection policies. In fact, the HCP/NCCP process would be detrimental to EDC's authority over its land-use process and the Board's clear authority to interpret and develop Policy 7.4.2.8, by interjecting state and/or federal land-use authority into El Dorado County. There is no reason that EDC cannot continue to work with state and federal agencies as appropriate or as is currently underway with the Rare and Endangered Plant Preserves. However, we can work with them through other targeted methods where those agencies are not usurping local decision-making powers.

Finally, our own General Plan-imposed timelines (ref: GP Measure CO-P) require that we address oak tree preservation in a much quicker timeframe than is even remotely conceivable if we were to undertake an HCP/NCCP process. We lose nothing by focusing on implementing Policy 7.4.4.4 immediately. We urge the Board to direct staff to resolve this matter in the most timely, effective and cost-efficient manner possible.

Sincerely,

Kimberly Beal, Chairwoman

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

Joint Chambers Commission of El Dorado County

Bureau of Land Management
Folsom Field Office
Attention: RMP Coordinators
63 Natoma Street
Folsom, CA 95630



El Dorado County
542 Main Street
Placerville, CA 95667
(530) 621-5885 • Fax: (530) 642-1624
Toll-Free: (800) 457-6279
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



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

RE: Comments on Draft Sierra Resource Management Plan and Draft Environmental Impact Statement (Sierra Draft RMP/EIS)

Dear Sir or Madam,

The El Dorado County Joint Chambers of Commerce represent over 1,700 Businesses in the County. We have reviewed the proposed impact statement.

We are opposed to selecting any alternative that designates as "wild and scenic" any portion of the south fork American River and the three forks of the Cosumnes River. Joint Chamber's believe that so designating the rivers will result in a loss of private property rights along the river. Although your analysis suggests that there would be little or no impact due to the land use along the watersheds, you should note that the open space and natural resources designations do allow agricultural uses. Therefore, there could be potential negative impacts to existing horticultural or livestock operations occurring in these areas.

Furthermore, the designation of these rivers as wild and scenic would preclude development of future water projects in the designated areas. In order to protect the county's ability to develop future water storage or power facilities, we must strongly disagree with wild and scenic status. Ensuring future water supply provides continued protections for agricultural water as well as consumptive use.

Finally, the designation of these rivers as wild and scenic does not consider our General Plan policies that state that such a designation is incompatible with the county's water storage objectives. Since this recommendation is not consistent with local planning, it is inappropriate for BLM to override local authority in this matter.

In conclusion, we reiterate that the wild and scenic designation of these rivers and their tributaries is inappropriate and should be deleted prior to the adoption of the management plan.

Sincerely,

Laurel Brent-Bumb, CEO
On behalf of;

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

cc: Helen Baumann, Chairman, El Dorado County Board of Supervisors
Bill Hetland, General Manger, El Dorado County Water Agency
Assemblyman Ted Gaines, District 4
Assemblyman Alan Nakanishi, District 10
Senator Dave Cox, District 1
Senator Dianne Feinstein
Senator Barbara Boxer
Congressman John T. Doolittle



Still Finding Gold In El Dorado County

April 9, 2007

To Whom It May Concern:

RE: Support for Gold Hill Ranch - Wakamatsu Colony Site Acquisition

On March 21, 2007 Alan Ehrgott, Executive Director of the American River Conservancy provided the Board of Directors of the El Dorado County Chamber of Commerce with a presentation on the purchase of the historic 300 acre Veerkamp property at Gold Hill, a rural ranch in El Dorado County. As presented by Mr. Ehrgott, the Gold Hill-Wakamatsu Project would acquire this ranch from a willing seller, the Veerkamp family at a purchase price equal to the appraised, fair market value and establish a new state historical park on this site in commemoration of the first Japanese settlement in North America.

The Gold Hill Wakamatsu Project would feature a management plan that would protect: 208 acres as wildlife habitat and open space with hiking trails and picnic areas; 60 acres of grazing and pastureland; a 10 acre site protecting the historic Charles Graner House (circa 1852), original barn and family dairy; and lastly a 25 acres site for the recreation of the Wakamatsu Tea and Silk Farm Colony established in July, 1869 as a living history, interpretive facility that features the introduction of silkworm farming, paper making, tea, rice and bamboo crops and processing. It is proposed that this site also become integrated into El Dorado County's Farm Trails Program.

Following the review and discussion of this proposal, the Board of Directors of the El Dorado County Chamber of Commerce unanimously agreed to support in concept the Gold Hill Wakamatsu Project as a unique opportunity to acquire this historic site, establish a state historical park and preserve the sites natural habitat and cultural resources for future generations of visitors to El Dorado County.

Should there be any questions regarding the support of the El Dorado County Chamber of Commerce, please do not hesitate to contact my office at (530) 621-5885

Sincerely,

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



Still Finding Gold In El Dorado County

April 23 2007

Mr. Nick Fonseca
Shingle Springs Rancheria
P.O.Box 969
Shingle Springs, CA 95682

Dear Mr. Fonseca,

The El Dorado County Chamber of Commerce has reviewed the memorandum of understanding between the Rancheria and the County of El Dorado. We recognize and appreciate the time and effort required to reach a conclusion that is beneficial to both parties. The Chamber believes you have done just that.

As you move forward to bring your project to fruition, the community will recognize many benefits. The fact that our local vendors and contractors are to be given a preferential advantage will increase opportunity for our businesses and boost our local economy. Additionally, giving our local residents first selection for the many new jobs that will result from opening the casino will add to the stability of our workforce.

We recognize the benefits of additional jobs, a new large employer and a business that will attract additional tourism. The Chamber looks forward to the opening of the Casino and to continuing a strong relationship with the people of the Rancheria.

Wishing you much success.

Sincerely,

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

The INRMP as outlined in the General Plan is more than adequate to provide a framework for conservation planning in El Dorado County.

- We are not faced with endangered species permitting issues which justify expanding the local program into an HCP/NCCP.
- We want to maintain local control over the INRMP, rather than having state and federal agencies dictate how what we can and can't do.
- The additional investment (time and money) to develop an HCP/NCCP simply isn't warranted based on the information we have today.

With apologies to SAIC, the RFQ/RFP process should be started over the original RFQ/RFP asked for an HCP/NCCP, which requires highly specialized experience. We believe this led to a number of firms which are otherwise qualified to prepare an INRMP to decline to respond to the County's request.

- The new RFQ/RFP should outline all of the data which is available, and specify what needs to be updated (i.e. special status species locations identified since last map update) so that firms responding don't assume they have to reinvent the wheel.
- SAIC seems to have underestimated the cost to develop the HCP/NCCP and overstated the costs for the other alternatives.
- It is imperative that the INRMP process involve the input of the public and stakeholders early and often in the process in order to avoid a repeat of the problems with the Oak Woodland Management Plan. General Plan Policy 7.4.1.6 provides for the public and stakeholders to be involved and consulted in defining the Important Habitats in the county. This step cannot be avoided!

invite to Board of Sups.txt
From: "Laurel Brent-Bumb" <chamber@el-doradocounty.org>
To: <bosone@co.el-dorado.ca.us>
Subject: Fw: Joint Chambers Commission
Date: Tuesday, June 19, 2007 11:27 AM

The Joint Chambers Commission would like to extend an invitation to the Board of Supervisors to participate with us at our monthly meeting. The meetings are held the first Thursday of each month at 7:30am at the Office of Education, Conference Room B.

We are sending this email to you as the appointed Chamber Liaisons for the Board of Supervisors. We would welcome your participation or a representative for the Board of Supervisors.

Please contact me for any questions or further information.

Sincerely,

Laurel Brent-Bumb, ACE
Chief Executive Officer
El Dorado County Chamber
www.neighborhoodeconomics.com
"neighborhood economics it's good for all of us"

Trade Agreement support.txt
From: "Laurel Brent-Bumb" <chamber@el doradocounty.org>
To: "Castner, Dick" <DCastner@USChamber.com>
Subject: Trade Agreement
Date: Tuesday, June 19, 2007 11:35 AM

Hi Dick,

Hope all's well with you.

Our El Dorado County Joint Chambers Commission voted to support the US Chambers Trade for America campaign.
Do you need a signature or letter?

Laurel Brent-Bumb, ACE
Chief Executive Officer
El Dorado County Chamber
www.neighborhoodeconomics.com
"neighborhood economics it's good for all of us"



Still Finding Gold In El Dorado County

October 8, 2007

El Dorado County Planning Commission
2850 Fairlane Court
Placerville, CA 95667

Re: Community Regions/Rural Centers and Agricultural Buffers

The Joint Chambers Commission of El Dorado County would like to express our concern regarding Agriculture Buffers.

It is our understanding that the intent of the General Plan Land Use Element encourages Community Regions and Rural Centers and we would like to reiterate our support for those purposes.

We would recommend that there be a reconsideration of any provisions that inhibit the ability of the Community Regions and Rural Centers to achieve their purpose, such as the 10-acre minimum parcel size when created adjacent to agriculturally zoned lands. It does appear that Policy 8.1.3.1 conflicts with the intent of various sections of that Plan that seeks to encourage development in appropriate areas such as Community Regions and Rural Centers.

Thank you, for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Laurel Brent-Bumb, CEO
On behalf of;

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

EL DORADO COUNTY CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

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

El Dorado County Joint Chambers 2007 Positions through September

- Joint Chambers Procedures – Approval of revisions
- Bowling Alley – Miniature Golf Course – Support in concept
- Support El Dorado County and Casino MOU
- Oppose Habit Conservation Plan as part of the Natural Resource Management Plan
- Oppose Wild and Scenic River designation for the American River
- Support International Trade Agreement
- Support Business Alliance General Plan implementation program
- 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.
- Support American River Conservancy's proposed Wakamatsu plan
- Oppose over review of County ordinances in the General Plan process
- Support Board of Supervisors participation in the Joint Chambers Commission