

3.5 FORM LETTERS

Comment Letter 1

Hot Issues – Center For Sierra Nevada Conservation

Protecting the ecological integrity and beauty of the Sierra Nevada and El Dorado County since 1985


About Donate Contact **Hot Issues** Blog Archives Goals Achievements Join Us Volunteer

Press Releases Submit a Comment Letter

We Walk the Talk

Learn more

Home Hot Issues



Urgent! Update on El Dorado County General Plan – Revisions to Biological Resource Policies

August 6, 2016 – El Dorado County is updating its General Plan (GP), and we have an opportunity to comment on it by August 15! [Land use affects everything about our quality of life](#), from how close our neighbors are to how crowded our roads. It also impacts the natural environment, including wildlife, oak woodlands, sensitive plants and water supplies. Planning for growth and how that growth occurs are central to the plan.

Global warming isn't a prediction. It is happening.

1-1

<http://www.sierranevadaconservation.org/hot-issues/>[8/15/2016 10:19:50 AM]

Hot Issues – Center For Sierra Nevada Conservation

~James Hansen

The Center for Sierra Nevada Conservation’s (CSNC) is particularly concerned about our fast-disappearing oak woodlands and the effect on wildlife habitat and movement. The County’s plan is to “mitigate” losses of oak woodland by purchasing development rights on grazing lands far away from where wildlife is threatened. Since those lands are highly unlikely ever to be developed anyway, this so-called mitigation is a net loss for wildlife habitat and does nothing to protect important habitat and corridors actually being used by wildlife.

CSNC is proposing an alternative, asking the County to analyze where wildlife actually lives and provide long-term refuges and corridors for them to move about. If the County does nothing for wildlife, their movement and migration corridors will be eliminated, and any future potential to provide for them will disappear. Preserving some of the Highway 50 corridor habitat for wildlife will also help curb some of the dense growth there, as well as the resulting additional traffic.

You can make a difference for both wildlife and your future, by supporting our Conservation Alternative. CSNC has developed a feasible alternative that will protect oak woodlands and the wildlife that depends on them. Primarily, we are asking the County to analyze an alternative that provides wildlife corridors along Highway 50, where wild animals are most constrained.

CSNC’s Conservation Alternative will:

- › – Analyze “corridors” where wildlife might cross highways if able to do so.
- › – Provide for directing mitigation funds to preserve habitat.
- › – Link public lands to form refuges for wild animals.
- ›

1-1
Cont.

1-2

<http://www.sierranevadaconservation.org/hot-issues/>[8/15/2016 10:19:50 AM]

Hot Issues – Center For Sierra Nevada Conservation

Comments on the El Dorado County General Plan are due by **August 15, 2016**. Please indicate your support for CSNC'S Conservation Alternative, which will provide analysis of the actual impacts to wildlife and oak woodlands.

Send your letter supporting CSNC's Conservation Alternative now!

Your Name (required)

Your Email (required)

Subject
Protect El Dorado County wildlife and oak woodlands

Your Message
Dear Ms. Purvines,
As residents of El Dorado County, my family and I value the beauty and biological diversity of our county. The proposed changes to the General Plan Biological Policies will threaten those values by further development of the Highway 50 corridor, to the detriment of oak woodlands and the wildlife that relies on that habitat. It will also cut off the few remaining places where wildlife are able to cross Highway 50. It is critical that this north/south corridor remain available for safe wildlife movement.

Furthermore, the changes will add to the dense development of the Hwy 50 corridor, increasing traffic on an already congested freeway. We urge you to adopt the Center for Sierra Nevada Conservation's Conservation Alternative, which will protect wildlife corridors and oak woodlands.

Respectfully,

1-2
Cont.

1-3

1-4

1-5

1-6

[http://www.sierranevadaconservation.org/hot-issues/\[8/15/2016 10:19:50 AM\]](http://www.sierranevadaconservation.org/hot-issues/[8/15/2016 10:19:50 AM])

Hot Issues – Center For Sierra Nevada Conservation

El Dorado County Board of Supervisors to hold public workshops on General Plan biological resources policies update.

The County is in the process of updating the biological resources policies and implementation measures in the County's General Plan. On January 13, 2015 the County Board of Supervisors approved the proposed project schedule. The 18 month project schedule includes a series of public workshops with the Board to be held in January 2015 through June 2015. Workshops will be held in the Board Chambers located at 330 Fair Lane, Bldg A, in Placerville. Workshops are scheduled on the following Mondays: Jan. 26, Feb. 23, March 30, and May 18, 2015. See [Press Release](#) and [Fact Sheet](#).

*The Biological Policies include the **Oak Woodlands Management Plan**, an earlier version of which was successfully challenged by CSNC in court. It is important that the public let their representatives know we want policies that offer the utmost protection to our county's wildlife habitat and scenic beauty.*

<http://www.sierranevadaconservation.org/hot-issues/>[8/15/2016 10:19:50 AM]

Hot Issues – Center For Sierra Nevada Conservation

Update: On August 17, CSNC and El Dorado Chapter of CNPS submitted a letter to the El Dorado County Planning Department urging better protection of Oak Woodlands than that being proposed in the Amended Biological Resources Policies. [Read the letter.](#)

OSV (Over Snow Vehicle) Plans are coming! Let's make sure the Forest Service gets it Right!

Tahoe National Forest proposed action:

"The Tahoe is only the second national forest to undergo winter travel management planning under the new OSV rule. To ensure rule implementation is off to the right start and avoid the specter of litigation that has plagued summer-time travel management planning, it is critical that the Tahoe's OSV plan satisfies the Forest Service's substantive legal duty

[http://www.sierranevadaconservation.org/hot-issues/\[8/15/2016 10:19:50 AM\]](http://www.sierranevadaconservation.org/hot-issues/[8/15/2016 10:19:50 AM])

Hot Issues – Center For Sierra Nevada Conservation

to locate areas and trails designated as open to OSV use to minimize resource damage and conflicts with the majority of winter visitors enjoying non-motorized, quiet forms of recreation.⁴ Unfortunately, as detailed below, the Tahoe’s proposed action and OSV planning process to-date fall terribly short of what is required to comply with that duty and with the plain language of the final OSV rule.”

The campaign to establish sensible and environmentally ethical management plans for over-snow travel is just beginning. What happens on the Tahoe Forest will have a big impact on plans for the Eldorado Forest.

Read CSNC’s [Scoping Comments on Tahoe National Forest Over-Snow Vehicle Use Designation Proposed Action](#) and the companion [Proposed Preferred Alternative for Tahoe National Forest Over-Snow Vehicle Use Designation](#)

Eldorado National Forest Action Alert:

Winter Travel Management Planning on Eldorado National Forest

The Forest Service extended the deadline until **April 20** for accepting comments on the future of non-motorized winter recreation on Eldorado National Forest.

<http://www.sierranevadaconservation.org/hot-issues/>[8/15/2016 10:19:50 AM]

Hot Issues – Center For Sierra Nevada Conservation

Eldorado National Forest is one of the most popular destinations in California for backcountry skiers, snowshoers and snowboarders. Highway 88 is particularly popular because of the normally excellent snow depths, terrain and scenery in the Carson Pass area. Unfortunately, the Forest Service's Proposed Action for the Carson Pass area designates nearly all the lands adjacent to the highway open to snowmobile use. This includes the route to Meiss Meadow, toward Winnamucca Lake and to Woods Lake.

Please tell the Forest Service that this is unacceptable!

Update on Eldorado National Forest Meadow Roads

The Eldorado NF has begun the process of evaluating repairs for the 18 roads it determined were having a negative impact on sensitive meadows. You can read Forest Supervisor Crabtree's letter here: [FS_correspondence](#)

View photos and descriptions of proposed repairs here: [Project Coordination for Nine Routes](#)

<http://www.sierranevadaconservation.org/hot-issues>[8/15/2016 10:19:50 AM]

Hot Issues – Center For Sierra Nevada Conservation



Hot Issues

Three Sierra Nevada Amphibians Get Federal Protection



Foothill yellow-legged frog

[Read More >>](#)

<http://www.sierranevadaconservation.org/hot-issues>[8/15/2016 10:19:50 AM]

Hot Issues – Center For Sierra Nevada Conservation



<http://www.sierranevadaconservation.org/hot-issues/>[8/15/2016 10:19:50 AM]

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Response to Comment Letter 1

Center for Sierra Nevada Conservation Website August 15, 2016

1-1 This comment introduces the Center for Sierra Nevada Conservation's (CSNC's) form letter. It states that El Dorado County's plan for mitigation of losses of oak woodland entails purchasing development rights on grazing lands far away from where wildlife is threatened and claims that there would be a net loss for wildlife habitat and corridors.

Refer to Master Response 2 in Chapter 2 (Master Responses) of this Final EIR regarding habitat fragmentation and the Priority Conservation Areas (PCAs). The PCAs were identified during preparation of the Oak Woodlands Management Plan (OWMP) between October 2006 and May 2008, and as part of the Updated Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan (INRMP) Initial Inventory and Mapping adopted by the Board of Supervisors in 2010. No changes to the PCAs as approved by the Board of Supervisors in 2010 are proposed as part of the General Plan Biological Resources Policy Update or the draft Oak Resources Management Plan (ORMP). As described in Appendix C, the Draft ORMP, agricultural use is not necessarily a feature of all PCA land. Agricultural use (i.e., grazing) shall be allowed in conserved oak woodlands as long as the activity occurred at the time the conservation easement was established, the spatial extent of the agricultural use is not expanded on conserved lands, and the agricultural use does not involve active tree harvest or removal (e.g., fuelwood operations, land clearing for crop planting). The ORMP also allows for conservation of oak woodlands outside of PCAs and identifies criteria to be considered in selecting such conservation areas. These criteria encourage preservation of natural wildlife movement corridors such as crossings under major roadways (e.g., U.S. Highway 50 and across canyons) and require that oak woodland conservation areas be minimum contiguous habitat blocks of five acres.

The commenter is correct that there would be significant and unavoidable impacts relating to wildlife habitat and corridors under the proposed project. However, as with the previous General Plan policies and proposed INRMP, the General Plan EIR found that implementation of the General Plan would also result in significant and unavoidable impacts to biological resources due to habitat loss and fragmentation.

This comment does not address the accuracy or adequacy of the EIR and, thus, no further response is required. This comment, along with all comments on the Draft

EIR, will be considered by the Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the proposed project.

- 1-2** This comment states that CSNC is proposing a Conservation Alternative that preserves some of the Highway 50 corridor for wildlife refuges and migration corridors for wildlife habitat and movement.

Refer to Master Response 7 regarding the alternative proposed by CSNC and Master Response 2 regarding the PCAs and habitat fragmentation in Chapter 2 (Master Responses) of this Final EIR.

- 1-3** This comment serves as the beginning of the form letter. It states that the proposed changes to the General Plan Biological Policies will threaten the beauty and biological diversity of the Highway 50 corridor in El Dorado County.

This comment does not address the accuracy or adequacy of the EIR and, thus, no response is required. This comment, along with all comments on the Draft EIR, will be considered by the Board of Supervisors in their deliberations on the proposed project.

- 1-4** This comment states that the proposed project will cut off the few remaining places where wildlife are able to cross Highway 50, and that the north/south corridor should remain available for safe wildlife movement.

Refer to Master Response 7 in Chapter 2 (Master Responses) in this Final EIR regarding the alternative proposed by CSNC.

- 1-5** This comment states that the changes resulting from the proposed project will add to the dense development of the Highway 50 corridor and increase traffic on the freeway.

As described in the Initial Study, the proposed project does not include new construction, nor would the project generate growth that could result in increased vehicle trips throughout the County. While ongoing implementation of the General Plan would result in development that increases vehicle trips, the proposed General Plan amendments and ORMP would not increase the amount or intensity of land use development allowed within the County and therefore would not result in greater trip generation than is currently anticipated. The proposed project would have no impact on traffic. Refer to Master Response 1 in Chapter 2 (Master Responses) in this Final EIR regarding balancing competing interests in formulating General Plan policy.

- 1-6** The commenter urges the County to adopt the CSNC's Conservation Alternative.

Refer to Master Response 7 in Chapter 2 (Master Responses) in this Final EIR regarding the alternative proposed by the CSNC.

Comment Letter 1.1

8/9/2016

Edc.gov.us Mail - Comments on Proposed General Plan Biological Resources Revisions



Shawna Purvines <shawna.purvines@edc.gov.us>

Comments on Proposed General Plan Biological Resources Revisions

sierran7@box884.bluehost.com <sierran7@box884.bluehost.com>
Reply-To: cheryls_j@hotmail.com
To: Shawna.purvines@edc.gov.us

Sat, Aug 6, 2016 at 7:38 PM

Dear Ms. Purvines,
As residents of El Dorado County, my family and I value the beauty and biological diversity of our county. The proposed changes to the General Plan Biological Policies will threaten those values by further development of the Highway 50 corridor, to the detriment of oak woodlands and the wildlife that relies on that habitat. It will also cut off the few remaining places where wildlife are able to cross Highway 50. It is critical that this north/south corridor remain available for safe wildlife movement.
Furthermore, the changes will add to the dense development of the Hwy 50 corridor, increasing traffic on an already congested freeway. We urge you to adopt the Center for Sierra Nevada Conservation's Conservation Alternative, which will protect wildlife corridors and oak woodlands.

Respectfully,

Cheryl Adler

1.1-1
1.1-2
1.1-3
1.1-4

<https://mail.google.com/mail/u/216007u/=22ll=1503325ee&view=ptical=Bio%20Policy%20Update%2FBIO%20EIR%2FPublic-Agency%20Comments%20...> 1/1

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Response to Comment Letters 1.1–1.81

Individual Commenters August 2016

- 1.1-1** Please note that all 81 letters are identical to the form letter provided in Comment Letter 1 in this section (Section 3.5, Form Letters). Refer to Response to Comment 1-3 in this section (Section 3.5, Form Letters).
- 1.1-2** Refer to Response to Comment 1-4 in this section (Section 3.5, Form Letters).
- 1.1-3** Refer to Response to Comment 1-5 in this section (Section 3.5, Form Letters).
- 1.1-4** Refer to Response to Comment 1-6 in this section (Section 3.5, Form Letters).

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK