

Marie Pritchard
17600 Morgan Valley Road
Lower Lake, CA 95457
Ph/Fax 994-4709

September 18, 2005

From: Marie Pritchard

Subject: An open letter to the Clearlake City Council, Planning Commissioners and
Community Development Department regarding The Provinsalia
Development

I appreciate your efforts, and the efforts of those who have gone before you, towards revitalizing Clearlake. It is clearly a town that followed the path of many other towns and experienced a decline, probably in the 1950's. It has been struggling ever since.

Now though, the results of these revitalization efforts are beginning to unfold. The introduction of quality low income housing, street widening, new sidewalks on Lakeshore Drive and elsewhere, new in-fill housing, park improvements, commercial building being restored and filled with new businesses and street clean-ups are all signs of a bright future for Clearlake.

Clearly, an up-scale development like Provinsalia, 720 high-priced homes and a nine-hole golf course, would add prestige to the community and go a long way to change Clearlake's image. However, its a fact that residential property taxes, most of which go to the state, do not cover the costs of city services (fire, police, public works, parks...). The remote location, size, city related costs, environmental concerns and other impacts to the community and beyond associated with this development simply make it a project the city cannot afford. Provinsalia will be an economic drain and take funds away from other needed improvements.

Projects like Provinsalia are called "bedroom communities" and for good reason. Provinsalia will be where homeowners come to sleep while they spend their working hours and most of their money in Santa Rosa. Additionally, time constraints placed on people forced to spend much of their time driving and arriving home exhausted, do not allow them time to get involved and become full fledged members of the community.

In order to understand this project better, I have now spent over eight hours evaluating just the Lake Street/Dam Road portion of the traffic study. I would like to evaluate the entire thing but I simply don't have the time. I found this study overly burdened with difficult language, references to documents that were not included, such as the Highway Capacity Manual that would explain the LOS and

loaded with way to many charts that should have been combined into fewer easy to read pages. This document is not lay person, or probably even professional person, friendly. I commend you for the time you spend trying to comprehend all that is placed before you but I seriously doubt that you will find this study easy to digest or be able to find the time required to carefully scrutinize each and every aspect of it.

Attached are extractions I took from the Traffic Study as they relate to Dam Rd/ Lake Street and my questions. As you will see, I found the traffic study evaluations presented and conclusions reached for these streets woefully lacking.

In reviewing this study many questions arose about other portions of this report that I have not addressed here due to lack of time. One example is, if in the year 2016 to 2020 the Walmart intersection is to have nine lanes at Hwy 53, how will the needed property be acquired? Right now a sign at that intersection indicates that a gas station is going to be built there, wouldn't now be the time to purchase the needed land, before that happens? Is the developer going to pay for it? The Traffic Study alone is loaded with significant areas of serious concern and unanswered questions. I have found this true also for the Specific Plan and all other reports that have thus far been presented.

I understand that a Mello-Roos Formation is being proposed. This is a method used by developers to get *public funding* to put in roads, utilities and other facilities. I am confident that city taxpayers will be very upset if a new project gets public funding for such things while most of the community drives home on dirt roads. Even if the Mello-Roos proposal is only for the infrastructure of the project itself I find this problematic. It appears that the developer, as the sole property owner at this time, can vote this levy in all by himself and then pass it on to the future property owners as they buy his lots. If the developer wants this project to go forward shouldn't he foot the bill for needed improvements? This method allows him to make even more money per parcel while putting the responsibility of a vote, selling municipal bonds and collecting liens on the city and county. How much will this cost?

Other areas of obvious concern are the removal of 1500 Oak trees, purchasing or possibly condemning property along Dam Road to widen the road, drawing *all* project water from Cache Creek, including water for the nine-hole golf course, serious impacts to the environment, wildlife and on and on.

As everyone interested in this project becomes bogged down with piecemeal studies and reports it becomes incredibly cumbersome to keep track of the big picture. There is a traffic study that tell you car noise and light impacts will be presented elsewhere, cost information that is vague and a specific plan that will present missing elements later. Speaking for myself, it feels reminiscent of dealing with a used-car salesman. We all know this guy, he's the one who keeps

coming back at you with new information, changes and offers. This goes on until you reach the point where you are thoroughly confused but have invested so much time you feel you can't walk away so you finally end up saying, "What the hell, lets go for it".

Suffices to say, given the financial constraints placed on Clearlake, there is a real possibility that the City will inadvertently get in way over its head simply because the complexity of building a project of this scale is so overwhelming that details required to protect the city can slip by.

So what I am suggesting here is that you "back the truck up". I believe its time to go back to square one. Ask yourself some really basic questions. Does approving a development of this scale, in a remote portion of the city, far removed from necessary public services make sense? Does it disrupt the lives of its neighbors and take away funds from citizens already living in this community? How much will it cost and who will pay for it?

I hope you will address these basic questions at your September 22nd meeting. This is a public meeting at 6:00 at Clearlake City Hall and I encourage all the citizens of this community and beyond to turn out and hear your answers.

CC: Ed Robey, Lake County Supervisor
Cynthia Parkhill, Clearlake American Observer