

**From:** [C. E. Elias](#)  
**To:** [Kenneth Strelo](#)  
**Subject:** General Plan Update Comment  
**Date:** Monday, September 20, 2021 4:09:46 PM

---

Elizabeth Elias \* 70 W. Bolton Rd. \* Oakley, CA. \* 94561

September 20, 2021

Ken Strelo and Oakley City Council

Dear Mr. Strelo and Whomever Else It May Concern:

This letter is being written to protest the extreme rush to pass the draft general plan without due consideration or input from the public. To try and classify a couple of surveys (with such low response rates as to be a statistical zero) as “extensive public input” is highly disingenuous. Especially given the covid situation, there has been virtually no effort whatsoever to engage the public in this process. This smacks of Oakley's usual lack of transparency and dictatorship mentality.

A new council majority was just voted in, in the hopes of eliminating this “business as usual” habit, but it seems the new members have just rolled over and fallen in line. That is unfortunate, as it does not bode well for the future of Oakley.

There MUST be additional time for public input, and this process must be postponed for a minimum of 30 (thirty) days! There is no other reasonable and fair way to proceed.

Let me begin with Mr. Pope's “go ahead” vote on the East Cypress (Hotchkiss Tract) proposal. When he was assured that levees would be built, he went ahead and said essentially, “Okay, fine. Do it.” Let's please the developers at all costs, even at the cost of future potential lawsuits when those homes flood due to sea level rise.

And flood they will. Such a vote is the height of irresponsibility and ignorance. Levees can be breached and/or overtopped. (Remember Hurricane Katrina and what happened in New Orleans?) Who will foot the bill for that once the developer is long gone? Shunting the cost onto the residents of that area, or the rest of the population would be grossly unfair, given that such a situation could be avoided in the first place by not building there!

This area is, in fact, part of the ecosystem that filters our drinking water, and should *never* be built upon.

Next are several items requiring EIR reviews. A negative declaration is not a reasonable, ethical, or honest option. Some things, such as the above-mentioned tract, simply cannot be “mitigated.” You cannot reasonably just state that such reports were done at the time of the prior general plan. Things have changed drastically, and are simply not the same as they were 20 years ago when that plan was made. Things change. Things change. Things change. In case I have not made that point clear enough, ***things change***, and a *new* EIR must be done for ***each and every project within the new plan!***

Trying to rush this through is a blatant attempt to circumvent both the legally required public input and CEQA mandates. We the citizens demand a fair and honest public hearing, and we expect to be heard and listened to. We expect our wishes to be acted upon by the people we elected to represent us, and **not** the desires of the former city manager and his cohorts.

Sincerely,

Liz Elias