

Shirlee Herrington

From: hollyjesq@aol.com
Sent: Monday, January 14, 2019 11:09 AM
To: Placer County Environmental Coordination Services
Cc: Christopher Schmidt
Subject: Re: Whitehawk I and II - Draft EIR - ADDITIONALLY Placer Retirement Residence Draft EIR and Cumulative Projects

Thank you.

It should also be noted that there are several draft EIRs that have been released recently by Placer County, whereby individually and cumulatively they are exceeding the page limitation and the burden placed on the public to adequately respond, which is not reasonable. Request is hereby made for the extension of time to respond to these projects and proposed revisions. My understanding is that the documents and projects proposed include, but are not limited to, Whitehawk I and II; Sunset Area Plan; Placer Retirement Residence draft EIR; Tiny Houses proposed amendments to the Placer County Code; Placer Ranch; Sunset Industrial Area/Placer Ranch draft EIR; and proposed Zoning Text Amendments to the Placer County Code.

Further, the Placer Retirement Residence draft EIR exceeds the page limitation set forth in regulation under CEQA. The offices associated with licensing and the facilities are closed due to the shutdown. Impacts for the Sunset Industrial Area/Placer Ranch project are far reaching and of significant impact on the entire county. The project will destroy thousands of acres of farmlands, wetlands, endangered species and add to traffic corridors with 10,000 additional homes without providing adequate affordable housing. Information from departments involved in affordable housing and destruction of endangered species are closed due to the federal government shutdown and, as a result, the public is denied access at this time to critical information that would allow pertinent statements.

It is respectfully submitted that there be an extension of time to respond to these projects. Please allow the public to adequately respond to the numerous projects and voluminous documents set forth by Placer County, and for the County to comply with federal and state mandates.

Thank you,

Holly Johnson

-----Original Message-----

From: Placer County Environmental Coordination Services <CDRAECS@placer.ca.gov>
To: Holly <hollyjesq@aol.com>
Cc: Christopher Schmidt <CRSchmid@placer.ca.gov>
Sent: Mon, Jan 14, 2019 10:24 am
Subject: RE: Whitehawk I and II - Draft EIR

Thank you for your interest in the subject project and for taking the time to provide comments. This is to confirm that your comments have been received. Also, you are on our master email and/or USPS distribution list for the subject project and, as such, you will receive updates and notifications of future opportunities to for public participation and input.

Thanks.

.....
Shirlee Herrington
Community Development Technician
Environmental Coordination Services
Placer County Community Development Resource Agency
3091 County Center Drive, Suite 190, Auburn, CA 95603

-----Original Message-----

From: Holly [mailto:hollyjesq@aol.com]
Sent: Saturday, January 12, 2019 8:20 PM
To: Placer County Environmental Coordination Services
Cc: Christopher Schmidt
Subject: Re: Whitehawk I and II - Draft EIR

Correction: Title 14 CCR reference should be to section 15141.

> On Jan 12, 2019, at 8:17 PM, Holly <hollyjesq@aol.com> wrote:

>

> To Whom It May Concern:

>

> Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations section 151410 provides that the draft EIR should be only 150 pages, with those of unusual scope to be less than 300 pages. The draft EIR for the Whitehawk proposals is 747 pages, plus the 1,638 pages in the appendices for a total of 2,385 pages. Placer County further released this EIR for public comment over the holidays, with no extension in the time period to respond.

>

> Placer County is in violation of the page requirements for the draft EIR pursuant to the California Code of Regulations. Request is hereby made to (1) ensure the Draft EIR complies with the page limitations; and (2) provide for further extension of time for the public to adequately respond.

>

> Furthermore, there is no adequate justification to approve the increase in density for these projects or to allow zoning modifications to authorize same. There is no adequate mitigation to the increase in traffic and congestion, and to already high level of services, or that which would adequately address the destruction in the nature and beauty of that area on Douglas Boulevard.

>

> Thank you in advance for your consideration.

>

> Holly Johnson

>