



**Fwd: Sierra Hot Springs Masterplan**

1 message

Sat, Jan 26, 2019 at 10:51 PM

[Redacted]  
[Redacted]

Cc: Suzi Schoensee <kokopelisuzi@gmail.com>

[Redacted]

Suzi has given her permission for you to post her letter on your website...it is here below...  
Thanks.

[Redacted]

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Suzi Schoensee** <kokopelisuzi@gmail.com>

Date: Fri, Jan 25, 2019 at 12:05 AM




Subject: Fwd: Sierra Hot Springs Masterplan

To: [Redacted]  
[Redacted]

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Suzi Schoensee** <kokopelisuzi@gmail.com>

I just wanted to share with you what I wrote to the supervisors, planning department and the commissioners.

  I know I should have taken some time to have you all edit it for me but, I didn't have time. 

Date: Thu, Jan 24, 2019 at 9:53 PM

Subject: Sierra Hot Springs Masterplan

To: <supervisor1@sierracounty.ca.gov>

Dear Lee,

I have studied the plan and it is impressive at first glance. . It looks pretty fancy. The dragonfly design of the 60 room hotel and conference center is really cool. However, I disagree with the Mitigated Negative Declaration. The project is way too large to NOT have a mandatory (EIR) Environmental Impact Report.

This proposal would be three times the population of Sierraville, or, about half the population of Loyalton!! It was alarming to see in figure 4 of the master plan the diagrams of all the areas of the leach fields! Each building is surrounded by leach fields, and then, the wet meadow is right below all of them!! In looking at the percolation test sights, I found none where the bathrooms are planned at the 50 unit campground; a possible 200 people using that facility!!!

I feel it is irresponsible and perhaps even negligent to declare a Mitigated Negative Declaration. California Environmental Quality Act, (CEQA) makes environmental protection a mandatory part of every California state and local(public) agency's decision making process. "State and local agencies must give major consideration to environmental protection in regulating public and private activities and should not approve projects for which there does not exist feasible and environmentally superior mitigation measures".

In reviewing the CEQA-- Appendix G-- the Environmental Checklist form, I learned that if two items were



checked on the list as "Potentially Significant Impact", an EIR must be done. I am not a planner, but, I think it is just common sense that "POTENTIAL SIGNIFICANT IMPACT" should, at the least, be checked on the following 7 items::

#1. Item VII- Hydrology and water Quality-- b).Would the project substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge? This is an unknown and needs to be examined further. In addition the Sierra County general plan policy prohibits land uses that require major new groundwater withdrawals which may impact meadows and other water influenced habitat. It seems to me that a new 135,000 gallon water tank, plus, a state of California requirement of supplying a supplemental water source in the form of a commercial well most certainly would be a potential significant impact.

#2. item IX-LAND USE AND PLANNING- b) would the project conflict with any applicable land use plan including general plan? It appears that it does conflict. It appears to violate the Sierra County general plan. It fails to include a map showing where the proposed development is in relation to the general plan land use within the property. The main reception, market/deli and day use parking and co-managers residences appear to be in areas designated "Open Space". The general plan states that " Allowed uses in areas zoned open space, "essentially unimproved land", are devoted to preservation of resources and low intensity outdoor recreation. Residences, commercial, and signs are not allowed."

#3. Item XI--.NOISE-d) ;

#4. Item XII.-- POPULATION AND HOUSING-a) would the project induce substantial population growth

#5. Item XIII.-- PUBLIC SERVICE-a) FIRE PROTECTION & POLICE PROTECTION: There is only one exit out of the facility and if a fire were to happen and the resort were at full capacity a possible 600 people would be fleeing for their lives. The meandering unimproved road out to State Highway 89 which the masterplan mentions should be improved so that it would be a viable exit.

#6 Item XV--. TRANSPORTATION/ TRAFFIC a) & b)

The close to 3 million dollar expense for the improvements to the entrance roads which the county must incur should be seriously considered by Sierra County Taxpayers. A STUDY NEEDS TO BE DONE TO DETERMINE IF THE TRANSIENT OCCUPANY TAXES WILL REALLY PAY FOR THE SERVICES THE COUNTY WILL HAVE TO PROVIDE.

#7. Item 1--AESTHETICS--would the project a) have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista? I think where the campground is being proposed would be an eyesore, and would destroy the expansive scenic valley vista which we all enjoy from Highway 49 as we drive toward Loyalton. Tents and RVs-- 60 sites in all-- should not be allowed at that location. The campground should be up on the hill in the trees..

Please reconsider the negative declaration, .and, demand an EIR.

Please allow one quarter, or one third of the size proposed.

Please only approve 5 year plans. It has been my personal experience, that developers, break promises, take short cuts at any turn and take advantage. They are to be trusted as far as one could throw them. If it ends up that there is no stopping this travesty, will you please consider approval on the condition that they put the remaining 300 of the undeveloped acres into a conservation easement so that down the road the rest of the property would not be sprawled with development.

The proposal is inconsistent with the quality of life we enjoy. Sierra Valley and for that matter our entire county is an oasis. We need to protect it with all of our hearts and souls. My family has been enjoying Sierra (Campbell) hot springs for 150 years. My Mother learned to swim in the old pool which used to be next to the lodge. My Grandfather when he was logging the cedar off the Sattley burn of 1925 took baths every Saturday at the springs . My son, his wife and my grandchildren enjoy it to this day. Let us be very careful with this gem of ours.

Sincerely, your 5th generation Sierra Valleyan,

Suzi Schoensee  
150 Main Street  
Sattley, CA 96124