



Planning Department <planning@amadorgov.org>

Lake Camanche Village 3B subdivision, an additional 281 lots directly south of Goose Creek Rd

1 message

Scott Tippin <tippinlan@volcano.net>
To: planning@amadorgov.org

Mon, Sep 14, 2020 at 6:11 PM

Planning Commission,

I am writing in regards to Lake Camanche Village 3B subdivision. This project is not conducive to the neighborhood. These are my concerns:

- * The project doesn't include any plans for additional fire protection, law enforcement, schools, parks and other currently lacking facilities and utilities.

- * Road adequacy and maintenance. There is only one way in and out. The additional traffic from both the construction and new residence will increase road noise, pollution and wear and tear in the infrastructure. The county cannot even maintain the roads currently out here. The roads will deteriorate at a faster rate, creating safety hazards and extra wear and tear on our personal vehicles.

- * Sewer and water. What will be their sewer plan? Septic or a sewer system? Where will this be built? There was a proposed sewer plant to be built for Unit 6A, the front village, but that was never started. With the money issues with the Amador Water Agency, how can they afford to extend service to an additional 281 homes? At what cost to existing home owners will the quality of our water be degraded?

- * Emergency Egress. Currently there is none. With the additional 281 homes, if there was an emergency evacuation, it would be chaotic and unsafe.

- * How current is the environment impact review? The last one completed in the 1970s. A new one needs to be completed prior to this development being approved.

- * Ryan Voorhees, the developer, what kind of builder is he? In prior developments, he has been reported to not support his homebuyers, the surrounding community, county or environment. He has already, without county approval has used heavy equipment to grade parts of the land in questions. Contact Supervisor Richard Forster.

Please do not approve this development. Ryan Voorhees is not a good builder, neighbor or friend to Amador County. This project is not a good fit for the land, nor the existing neighborhood. There are plenty of vacant lots available in this community that should be built on prior to approving any additional development. The existing services out here are already taxed to their limits and cannot take on an additional 281 homes.

Hopefully, the planning board will take the above points in prior to making a decision on this project.

Thank you,

Scott and Debbie Tippin

September 15, 2020

Dear Amador County Technical Advisory Committee,

I am writing to express my opposition to the request for discretionary permits for the installation of infrastructure (streets, culverts, water lines, sewer lines, and wastewater treatment plant) to serve Lake Camanche Village Subdivision Unit 3B.

I have read through the 214 page document being considered by the committee in the meeting scheduled for Wednesday, September 16, 2020 and am stunned with the breadth of misrepresentation, lack of data and apparent complicity of past County representatives that went into creating and approving the November 2007 PMC Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration for Lake Camanche Village Unit 38.

While I have over a dozen pages of specific excerpts of claims in the document that are questionable at best, but the immediate issues with the request before you boil down to three glaring problems:

1. **The November 2007 PMC Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration for Lake Camanche Village Unit 38 is ONLY focused on the roads, trails and utility infrastructure.**

The County continues to claim the actual development of homes is not subject to any CEQA requirements due to the initial approval of the plan in 1970. This report is based on this assertion and throughout repeats there will be little to no impact to the environment and surrounding community because *"No housing structures are planned as part of this project. Therefore, there is no impact."* (p: 103 as scrolled from the beginning of the document). You are being asked to give approval for an entire development and wholesale change to the landscape, not just a mere road, trail and utility project.

2. **The November 2007 PMC Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration for Lake Camanche Village Unit 38 was incomplete before approval and is out of date.**

The 2007 report refers to a need for surveys to be conducted on everything from biological and water quality to the impact on transportation and other impacts to the existing community, yet the Mitigated Negative Declaration was granted.

The emergency access road that is the central focus of this report no longer appears to be valid, as it appears the developer is using a new road carved over the hills west of the location in the 2007 report map near the new AWA water storage tank that supplies water to Camanche Village.

The report also claims no tiger salamander have been found closer than 0.6 mile to the property, yet here is a picture of what I believe is said tiger salamander that was in one of our water valve control boxes in 2014 – 50 feet from the 3B property line.



What data exists in this report is now over 13 years old – How can anyone claim this report is still valid as a basis for any of this development project to go forward?

3. The Proposed Wastewater Treatment Plant Plan was not designed to accommodate Lake Camanche Village Unit 38.

Unit 3B is required to have a dedicated wastewater treatment plant even under the original 1970 development agreement. The Stantec report included in the TAC documents clearly state in the 1.3 PROJECT BACKGROUND section: *“Units 3B, 5, and 7 are still undeveloped, and will need a public water supply system and a conventional centralized wastewater system if they are to be developed. There are currently 345 SFDEs located in Unit 6 with 72 remaining vacant residential lots.”*

The report also clearly states in section 2. 1 .2 Expanded Treatment Capacity: *‘The proposed Project is not designed to serve the entire Village service area, but rather meet the needs of the existing and previously approved parcels in the Unit 6 development.’*

Unlike the developer, I am a citizen of Amador County and enjoy the stunning natural landscape, the wildlife and rural nature of our community. I do not want to see further land bulldozed until current developments have been built out and there is a true need for this action. However, when the time comes for further development, it is in all of our interest to insure it occurs based on sound science and current law to protect the natural values that attracts citizens and tourists alike.

I urge the Technical Advisory Committee to decline the request for discretionary permits for the 3B development.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "D. Brian Brown". The signature is written in dark ink and is positioned above a horizontal line.

D. Brian Brown



Planning Department <planning@amadorgov.org>

Proposed development of Lake Camanche Village 3B subdivision (281 LOTS)

1 message

deeders princess <princess_deeders@yahoo.com>
To: planning@amadorgov.org

Tue, Sep 15, 2020 at 7:33 AM

MAJOR CONCERNS/REQUEST FOR REVIEW AND RESEARCH INTO PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

- 1) Lack of additional fire/law enforcement for the excessive increase in residents.
At an average of 3 people/vehicles per lot this would equate to approx. 843 +/- more people/cars
- 2) Road traffic impact would be significant especially in an emergency situation on the existing narrow 2 lane road.
- 3) Sewer and water availability: New water storage tank just completed by Amador Water District was to bring availability and service up to standards and meet current needs. How will this be impacted by this major influx of new residents ?
- 4) There is an EXTREME need for a new environmental impact study. When previous development of the subdivision was attempted it was eventually halted due to the threat to an endangered species. Since then major environmental legislation has been passed (2017) with even stricter protective guidelines. 17 years since the last study would certainly mandate a new study prior to any further advancement of said project.
- 5) Concerns that the owner/developer Ryan Voorhees has a long history of previous multiple violations and unscrupulous conduct in the construction of other local housing developments. (i.e. Valley Springs and Galt)

Thank you for your time and attention to this matter !!!
Denise DiFranco Camanche Village



Planning Department <planning@amadorgov.org>

Comments on Lake Comanche Village Subdivision Unit 3B Neg Dec

1 message

Larry Patterson <larrypatterson601@gmail.com>

Tue, Sep 15, 2020 at 8:54 AM

To: planning@amadorgov.org

Cc: Phyllis Garrett <Bill_PhyllisGarrett@msn.com>

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Project and Mitigated Negative Declaration. Here are my initial comments:

Construction Impacts on existing streets - The mitigation monitoring plan should include a verification of impacts of construction on the condition of Goose Creek and Village Drive. Photo Documentation should be recorded of conditions before and after construction and repairs required where truck traffic has resulted in degradation of the pavement condition. Would it be feasible for some or all of the construction traffic to use the new emergency access road during construction?

Wastewater treatment - The project includes a new wastewater treatment facility but on page 3.0-76 the Neg Dec states that "The proposed project would not include the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities." The Environmental Checklist indicates that water and wastewater utility impacts are not significant **with mitigation** but the mitigation monitoring plan only requires a letter of water availability from AWA. No reference is made to the project's construction of the wastewater treatment facility or mitigation of potential impacts of this part of the project.

Timing of Project Components - Is completion of all project components required prior to the sale of and construction on any of the Unit 3B lots?

--

Larry A. Patterson
1675 Duck Creek Road
Ione, CA 95640
larrypatterson601@gmail.com
650-898-2585 cell

John & Maryanne Pulley
1605 Duck Creek Road
Ione, CA 95640

September 15, 2020

Amador County Board of Supervisors
Attn: Richard Forster, District 2
810 Court Street
Jackson, CA 95642

Subject: Amador County Technical Advisory Committee
Meeting: September 16, 2020 3:00 pm

Dear Mr. Forster,

This letter is to address various issues regarding the proposed subdivision "Lake Camanche Village Unit 3B":

-1 I have a copy of the original Articles, By-Laws and Restrictions for Lake Camanche Village dated December 16, 1970. In Paragraph 13 (c) (3) it states "No annexation of additional property shall be permitted unless the subdivision maps and restrictions applicable shall be recorded within three (3) years from the date of the Final Subdivision Public Report of the California Division of Real Estate applicable to the next preceding unit of the Subdivision. Therefore, this proposed subdivision cannot be merged with the original Lake Camanche Village subdivision and should not carry that name.

-2 The reality of adding 240 (+/-) homes would add significant traffic to two-lane country roads and would impact cars, bicycles and pedestrians in a negative way. This proposed subdivision does not require an additional main thoroughfare for these vehicles to exit the new community which would pose extreme safety issues for all traveling Village Drive. (Note: A proposed emergency gravel road does not suffice.)

-3 On page 9 of the original application, number XVI-Recreation. The report states that there will be NO IMPACT tor neighborhood parks. This is totally untrue as our Papoose Park and Pond will be significantly affected by the number of households being proposed.

-4 There is no mention of additional fire or police impact on the current residents as well as the new residents. It is interesting that the County was concerned about the impact the Buena Vista Casino opening would have on the local police and fire protection but not for this community.

The County has been very active in fighting the relinquishment of Highway 16 and the impact it would have on Amador County residents. You should be just as concerned on the impact of current residents of Lake Camanche Village. By adding the number of homes proposed and the associated number of vehicles and trips these vehicles will make on neighborhood county roads, you are putting the lives of all who live there in jeopardy.

Please consider carefully the full impact before going forward with any more approvals on this proposed subdivision.

Sincerely,

John & Maryanne Pulley

Cc: AMADOR COUNTY TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE



Planning Department <planning@amadorgov.org>

Lake Camanche Village Unit 3B Staff Referral Packet - TAC Sept 16, 2020

1 message

Tam, Joe <joe.tam@ebmud.com>

Tue, Sep 15, 2020 at 3:31 PM

To: "planning@amadorgov.org" <planning@amadorgov.org>

Chuck,

East Bay Municipal Utility District (EBMUD) became aware that the Amador County Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) will review the discretionary permits for Item 1 - Lake Camanche Village Unit 3B tomorrow on 9/16/2020. The Application Referral packet dated September 2, 2020 mentioned various elements of the permit that is of interest to EBMUD because the project includes a proposed emergency access road that traverses through EBMUD-owned lands. However, EBMUD is not listed as a project reference for review and comment on that Application Referral packet (<https://www.amadorgov.org/home/showdocument?id=37503>).

EBMUD would like to be included in the planning process to review potential effects on biological/ wildlife, FERC federal compliance requirements, mitigations, and real estate agreements associated with EBMUD lands. Could you advise on how EBMUD can be included in the process and how our concerns can be addressed? We can follow up this email with written correspondence and are open to attending the TAC as well. I would very much appreciate a response as soon as you could due to the pending timeline for the TAC meeting. I plan to follow up with a phone call for your advice on this matter or if I have any follow up questions that might be more easily conveyed other than by email.

Sincerely,

Joe Tam

Joe G. Tam, P.E.

Associate Civil Engineer

East Bay Municipal Utility District

Water Resources Planning Division

Mailing: P.O. BOX 24055, MS #901, Oakland, CA 94623

Location: 375 11th Street, MS #901, Oakland, CA 94607-4240

Phone: (510) 287-1389

Fax: (510) 287-0541

joe.tam@ebmud.com

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

DISTRICT 10

P.O. BOX 2048, STOCKTON, CA 95201

(1976 E. DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING JR. BLVD. 95205)

PHONE (209) 948-7325

FAX (209) 948-7164

TTY 711

www.dot.ca.gov*Making Conservation
a California Way of Life.*

September 15, 2020

Chuck Beatty, Planning Director
Amador County Planning Department
810 Court St. Jackson, Ca.
9562-2132

**AMA-88-PM 1.335
Lake Camanche
Village Infrastructure
Initial Study**

Dear Mr. Beatty,

The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) appreciates the opportunity to review and comment on the application for an Initial Study (IS) of The Lake Comanche Village Infrastructure project requesting discretionary permits for the installation of streets, culverts, water lines, sewer lines, a wastewater treatment plant and an emergency access road. The new infrastructure will serve Lake Camanche Village Subdivision Unit 3B.

The project location is immediately south of Lake Camanche Village Subdivision Unit 3A, at the termination of the public maintenance area for Village Drive and Goose Creek Road. The subdivision map was recorded in 1973 for 315± acre site zoned Single-Family Residential with 281 parcels. In 2008, the County certified a Mitigated Negative Declaration for project amendments to add an emergency access road from Village Drive to North Camanche Parkway.

Caltrans has the following comments regarding the IS:

Caltrans will need to be notified of further progress and development within Lake Camanche Village Subdivision Unit 3B with regards to the future occupation of residential and commercial units.

If any project activities encroach into the Caltrans (ROW), (example: trenching, utility connections, staging of equipment) an application for an Encroachment Permit to the Caltrans Permit Office is required. Appropriate environmental studies must be submitted with the application. These studies will include an analysis of potential impacts to any cultural sites, biological resources, hazardous waste locations, and/or other resources within Caltrans ROW at the project site(s). Please

Chuck Beatty
September 15, 2020
Page 2

include California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) documentation with supporting technical studies when submitting the Encroachment Permit. For more information please visit the Caltrans Website at;
<https://dot.ca.gov/programs/traffic-operations/ep/applications>

Senate Bill (SB) 743 is changing CEQA analysis of transportation impacts. It requires local land use projects to provide safe transportation systems, reduce per capita Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT), increase accessibility by mode share of bicycle, pedestrian, and transit travel, and reduce GHG emissions. VMT reduction is necessary to meet the statewide greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions regulations. Caltrans recommends VMT per capita thresholds are 15% below existing regional VMT per capita. Caltrans also recommends establishment of programs or methods to reduce VMT and support appropriate bicycle, pedestrian, and transit infrastructure.

If you have any questions or would like to discuss these comments, please contact Lloyd Clark at (209) 941-1982 (Email: Lloyd.Clark@dot.ca.gov) or me at (209) 941-1947 (Email: kevin.schroder@dot.ca.gov).

Sincerely,

Kevin Schroder

Kevin Schroder, Acting Office Chief
Office of Rural Planning



Planning Department <planning@amadorgov.org>

281 lots Lake Camanche village 3B

1 message

Elizabeth Davis <ms.bettyjo@yahoo.com>
To: planning@amadorgov.org

Tue, Sep 15, 2020 at 7:18 PM

these appear to very small lots, where nearby are 1acre lots,
This will greatly increase traffic on streets which could bed a great disaster in case of fire, only 1 way out, most people in the back village have animals, horse trailers, tractors, RV's, and boats. this year the homeowners assn. has done a fantastic job of getting all of the vacant lot owners to cut the vegetation. We have lots of seniors living here that enjoy the peace and quietness, along with cows mooing and birds singing. We also have very little crime. If we have another drought like in the past , we would have NO water and would put a strain on the area.

why can't the developer make it shorter to get out of the back village by exiting to Hwy 88?: this would save the wear and tear on our streets in the back village

will the developer have a HOA, what about a park or recreation area. He is not offering the area anything only dollars in his pocket. Why should we have that.

The noise that would be created from trucks tearing up the roads, let alone all the dust. we strongly do not want this in our community. It offers us nothing and the developer wants a free ride.

sincerely
Elizabeth Davis, 1601 goose creek rd., lone, ca 95640
Norma Gazi, 1650 goose creek rd., lone ca 95640



Planning Department <planning@amadorgov.org>

proposed development of Lake Camanche Village 3B subdivision

1 message

deeders princess <princess_deeders@yahoo.com>
To: planning@amadorgov.org

Wed, Sep 16, 2020 at 7:29 AM

this is a follow up to my email of 091520. in regards to owner/developer Ryan Voorhees.. it might be of interest to search his name and review the articles on the following links in regards to his previous development and his blatant dishonesty and unscrupulous conduct :

see..

waterboard.ca.gov certified letter to Mr. Voorhees dated 032217

buildzoom: gold creek homes licensed in New Mexico

Lodinews: Galt area developer violated Clean Water Act

Calaveras enterprise: "Developer will not pay for improvement to Olive Orchard Road"

a lot of these detail the various legal issues he has had in the past with his developments and the associated county agencies

thank you for your time and attention to this important matter

Denise DiFranco camanche village homeowner



Planning Department <planning@amadorgov.org>

Camanche Village 3B subdivision

1 message

Bert Bockover <oldhardtop@live.com>

Wed, Sep 16, 2020 at 8:48 AM

To: "planning@amadorgov.org" <planning@amadorgov.org>

Amador County Technical Advisory Committee,

As you consider and prepare to make decisions regarding the development of 281 residential lots in Camanche Village you need to ask yourself the simple question of whether this developer has a genuine concern for Amador County residents. Ryan Voorhees has failed to uphold his commitments to Amador County and especially the residents of Camanche Village. To allow his company to develop the 3B subdivision without major consideration for and input from the residents and property owners of the previous developments would be a travesty.

It may be a wise decision to go against the grain of the world as we know it today and open this meeting with a prayer asking for guidance from the Creator of the property of concern.

I trust you will not allow selfish greed to be of great concern in your decisions.

Robert Bockover
1912 Village Dr.
lone, CA 95640
oldhardtop@live.com

Sent from Mail for Windows 10



Planning Department <planning@amadorgov.org>

**Comments for Amador Country Technical Advisory Committee Meeting
09/16/2020, 3:00 - 4:00 PM RE: Lake Camanche Village 3B Development**

1 message

JEFFERY STEPHENS <danastephens777@comcast.net>

Wed, Sep 16, 2020 at 11:20
AM

To: "planning@amadorgov.org" <planning@amadorgov.org>
Cc: Dana Stephens <danastephens777@comcast.net>

Please accept my comments and questions regarding the Lake Camanche Village 3B Development

Dear Esteemed Committee Members:

Thank you for the opportunity to put forth comments and questions regarding the Lake Camanche Village 3B Development. Upon review, as a long time resident of Camanche Village, I respectfully submit the following questions/comments:

1) Sewage Treament Plant: The plans for the 3B development call for building a sewage treatment plant to be built in the current Lake Camanche back village. The plans I have seen seem vague - with a development near Newman Hill Drive and on Village Drive. My first question: Exactly what components of the sewage treatment plant is proposed to be built where in the back village? My second question: Were the plans currently being presented for the development of the raw sewage treatment plant for 3B actually plans which were developed for the handling of 3B raw sewage? My third question: Why, when the back village has been thriving, and growing, as a close knit community for decades, would the committee consider authorizing a sewage treatment plant to be built in the middle of our scenic community, literally directly behind residents' backyards and directly across the street from residents' front yards? Each back village home owner has spent literally tens of thousands of dollars for a septic tank to process their own sewage as this preserves the beauty and health of our community. It seems unreasonable to ask back village residents to contend with a different subdivisions' raw sewage waste. A more reasonable plan would be to construct the sewage treatment plant somewhere other than the back village. At a time when letting your dog defecate in someone's front yard, or in the park, and leaving it for someone else to contend with is considered offensive and against ordinances, why would placing a sewage treatment plant next to tennis courts and along current residents' property lines seem reasonable or appropriate-especially when it is not our developments' waste? Lastly, please let us not forget the ongoing nightmare of the Mule Creek State Prison sewage treatment, that has spawned contention, State of California fines, environmental damage and lawsuits.

2) Development Plans: Do the current 3B lot sizes match the lot sizes of the original 1973 development plans, or have the lot sizes been reduced from one acre lots to half acre lots?

3) Traffic and Access: The Camanche Village back village is a community with currently little traffic in the area of the intersection of Village Drive and Goose Creek Drive. Thus, currently, many children play play close to the road. Many families walk together, with children in strollers and dogs on leashes. The school buses drop children off on Village Drive to from the bus stops to their homes. Village Drive currently has no sidewalks. Families and children walk in the street, especially during rattle snake season, as walking off the road can be dangerous.. What part of the development proposal mitigates the threat to the safety of current residents, especially children? Will sidewalks be put in along the entirety of Village Drive in the back village? Would it not be safer and wiser to place a direct access road to 3B from Curran Road or Camanche Road?

4) Meeting Times: Many residents are hardworking persons. Daytime meetings preclude the ability of vested persons to attend discussions of the 3B Development. May I respectfully request that future meetings be held in the evening to enable attendance of community members to participate, ask questions, and have constructive conversations on this proposal?

Some might say, "If you don't like it, move" ...but please remember, we are a close knit community and we have close bonds with our neighbors. And, it is important to remember that many of our neighbors are seniors who have moved to Camanche Village to partake of a quality retirement that they worked their whole lives to attain, and at this point, may not be able to afford to move.

Please be the good neighbors and responsible men and women who have been elected/appointed by we, who live in Camanche Village adn Amador County, to represent us and to preserve our quality of life.

Please do not approve this proposal without first addressing and responsibly resolving the aforementioned detriments. Edmud Burke said, "The only thing necessary for the triumph of evil is for good men to do nothing." Please act on our community's behalf to preserve our quality of life.

Sincerely,

Jeff and Dana Stephens
1929 Village Drive
lone, CA 95640