

John R. Munn, Jr.
2811 Almeria St., Davis, CA 95616
530-753-7529 phone & fax

December, 2020

To: Amador County Technical Advisory Committee (ACTAC)
Attn: Members
810 Court Street
Jackson, CA 95642

Re: Hideout – Item #3 on December 16, 2020 Meeting Agenda

Dear ACTAC Members:

I have the following observations about comments available for public review under Agenda Item 3 for the December 16, 2020, meeting of the Amador County Technical Advisory Committee (ACTAC). These are in addition to my earlier comments included in the Staff Referral Packet for this meeting that, among other things, describe how access to the Hideout crosses my property.

Mr. Hoover has been directed by the Amador County Board of Supervisors to make these Planned Development and Use Permit requests because current use of the Hideout does not comply with its R1A zoning. The Amador County Planning Department and Board of Supervisors have been aware of zoning and code violations related to use of the Hideout for several years, but they have chosen not to enforce these violations while the Hideout continues to operate as a commercial venue.

I am not opposed to the proposed use. However, I am opposed to assumptions about use of the easement across my property. As I have mentioned several times, what is done at the Hideout is not my business, it is getting there and back that is creating problems for me.


The comment letter from Caltrans does not address obtaining an encroachment across the Caltrans owned right of way of an access controlled highway, as explained in my earlier letter to the ACTAC. Access control along this segment of Highway 88 has been confirmed in a response from Caltrans.

The letter from the California Department of Fish and Wildlife contained in the Staff Referral Package covers the agency's concerns about the Corral Flat Creek crossing. What is not mentioned is that this unapproved crossing was built over an existing ford without my knowledge or consent and now prevents approval for my use of this non-exclusive easement for timber operations.

I have proposed solutions for these easement problems, but have not received a reply. Also, comments from the Auburn Rancheria are listed in the electronic notice that I received, but they could not be viewed.

I don't know if these comments are "completeness" issues for purposes of the ACTAC review, but they need to be included and considered to provide context for comments by public agencies that might otherwise be cited as a complete list of agency requirements.

Sincerely,



John R. Munn, Jr.