

Taylor Day

From: JOHN HERMANN ■■■■■■■■
Sent: Tuesday, January 25, 2022 5:07 PM
To: Public Comments
Subject: Voice Mail (1 minute and 51 seconds)
Attachments: audio.mp3

Hello, this is John Herman calling and I own the property at 11274 James Road which you guys want to annex to the city. And I oppose that. And I also oppose the RV park as it is right now. You know, if there's some modifications or fire, and the ability. Also, I don't want to be in the city limits because I burn brush and branches from the 50 big pine trees that I have all the time. And unless you guys want to make accommodations for somebody to bring this, you know on pay for me to bring it to the dump. Then I want to be able to continue burning and so having access to the sewer does me no good at all at and Or unless you wanna give me free hookup to the sewer. Then I would consider it, but at this point my vote is no on annexation, no on the RV park. Again, it's John Herman and it's 11274 Jeans Rd. My phone number 530-913-3816. Thank you very much.

You received a voice mail from [JOHN HERMANN](#).

Thank you for using Transcription! If you don't see a transcript above, it's because the audio quality was not clear enough to transcribe.

[Set Up Voice Mail](#)

From: Robert Long [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, January 25, 2022 5:37 PM
To: Public Comments
Subject: RV Park

I am calling concerning the proposed RV park at the corner of McCourtney and Auburn Rd. While I am not against the RV park and hope it will bring tourism to GV; I am concerned about some of the planning elements.

My major concern is evacuation. There is an excellent discussion of traffic, roads, and intersections in the commission's packet; but no mention is made of the impact additional RVs, exiting over a period of time, will have on traffic merging onto Hwy 20 and 49. This intersection is already rated F. What is the plan to manage this? What is the plan to warn visitors about Code Red warnings, "go bags", keeping ½ tank of fuel at all times, etc.? What is the plan if you do attempt to shelter in place? Who is trained to manage such an emergency? Who will manage spot fires?

Lastly, has this project met all the terms of the Calif Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)? As I read the documents from the Planning Commission; safety relating to critical wildfire evacuation traffic flows was not fully covered. An EIR must consider safety as an environmental impact according to the most current California CEQA law. CEQA, requires analysis of the potential effects of a project on the environment. CEQA defines "environment" to mean "the physical conditions which exist within the area which will be affected by a proposed project..."

- o This includes “any potentially significant impacts of locating development in other areas susceptible to hazardous conditions (e.g., floodplains, coastlines, **wildfire risk areas**) as identified in authoritative hazard maps, risk assessments or in land use plans, addressing such hazards areas.”

Last year in Lake County a judge ruled on the Guenoc Valley Resort and halted construction.

The Lake County judge's ruling should force planners and developers "to see how absolutely crucial it is to consider evacuation challenges when building projects this risky," said Broderick, the environmentalist attorney challenging the resort.

"No developer should be allowed to make it harder for people to escape catastrophic fires" he said.

In addition, no mention was made of how the owners will manage two items they brought up at the public meeting.

1. How will they manage the appearance and functionality of the RVs admitted to the park? They indicated they would have a plan but none was presented
2. They indicated stays would be limited to 30 days. But there is no plan to monitor this and what will constitute re-entry. I.e. What time is to elapse before an RV may reenter?

I would ask that these plans be developed now and be made part of the use permit.

Robert Long
530-913-0287

Taylor Day

From: Andrea Duncan [REDACTED] >
Sent: Tuesday, January 25, 2022 6:00 PM
To: Public Comments
Subject: A No Vote for RV Park

January 25, 2022

Dear City Council Members,

I am writing this letter to express my opposition to the proposed RV Park on McCourtney Road opposite the Nevada County Fairgrounds.

I have numerous concerns including the way in which those people most affected were not informed but I want to express my two primary concerns. My number one concern has to do with evacuation due to fire. In the event of a fire, evacuation of local residents and their animals plus one hundred and fifty (150) thirty (30) foot or larger RV's would be a catastrophe. McCourtney Road would be at a standstill. We are told to plan for the worst and I can't picture anything worse than this.

My second concern has to do with the cost of installing sewer and NID water to this site and the surrounding neighborhood. My questions is, who pays for this? Will the developers pay or in the end will the cost be passed back to the tax payers like myself. How much revenue over what period of time will it take to recoup this money.

I realize that the developers promise to put money in the City coffers but isn't the safety and well being of your tax paying residents worth more?

Please vote against this project.

Sincerely,

Andrea Duncan

Taylor Day

From: Audrey Hallochak [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, January 25, 2022 6:50 PM
To: Public Comments
Subject: GV RV Park

Ladies and Gentlemen,

Approving the building of this RV Park will be a disservice to our community.

Grass Valley is a small town in the Sierra foothills. Why would you approve such a massive project that doesn't fit the footprint of our town?

I understand the tax revenue benefits and the profits that the landowners will relish, but what about your taxpayer base who cherishes the uniqueness of Grass Valley?

We already have the Fairgrounds RV park with the capability of expanding within its footprint. This is what the Monterey Fairgrounds did several years ago. It's a more aesthetically pleasing option than creating a behemoth RV park. And the city still generates tax revenue!

We have such an enormous need for housing in our local area. This land could be used to create permanent housing for our tax paying citizens who desire to live here, without the commute. I've mentioned the idea of a tiny home community in a Union editorial. Not necessarily a low income community, but a more moderately priced community for middle income families. This is where our need lies.

I implore you, the decision makers of our community to think deeply into what you are voting for here. You're responsibility is to the taxpayers, to ensure that your decisions are conducive to our overall plan for what we want Grass Valley to become, today and into the future.

Putting a Costco in a town that only requires a Target would not be conducive to the community.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Audrey Hallochak
Chemical Engineer, MBA

Taylor Day

From: WIRELESS CALLER [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, January 25, 2022 7:01 PM
To: Public Comments
Subject: Voice Mail (3 minutes and 17 seconds)
Attachments: audio.mp3

This is Matthew Coulter, calling the. They called Grass Valley City Council 25th of January 2022 with comment on the agenda item for the RV Park on McCourtney Road, the corner of Old Auburn Rd. Also referred to as Auburn Rd and that with the lack of sidewalks, accessibility Death defying journey to go one block in Grass Valley. If you can do it. My friend Billy Upton couldn't make it across S Church St in the historic district without being killed on Saturday, but you're going to send children on bicycles heading off into downtown Grass Valley from there. That's a disappointing aspect as well as the fact that fire evacs so many people spoke against fire. Evac on this professionals that spent their lives in the fire. Services spoke against this and on deaf ears, of course. And I guess I'm curious if there is a project that Grass Valley won't approve, but I haven't seen one yet. I'm watching for years now. The rubber stamp mill be powered by this group that works in that building. And this trailer park is a good example of the \$1,000,000 sewage line form which is only going to serve a couple other houses between there and the existing sewer line there already as part of the city. And by the way the sewage is leaking at Loma Rica ranch and the sewage is also leaking into Wolf Creek behind, Uhm, what's it called? The Swiss House Wildlife Pub might want to check out that large sewer main running down the middle of the Creek. Point being, is you're biting off more than you can chew? You can't even maintain what you have. You haven't maintained what you have, and you keep asking more without looking at the crosswalks in town. You can't even see the paint on the ground, they're all worn off. You guys aren't doing your basic responsibilities. Basic responsibilities involving health and safety, you just keep packing more crap in, and it's killing people left and right. It's killing people one way or another. So please consider this project to be a no go until such time as it can be funded on its own money for one thing and not subsidized by the taxpayers and two more legitimate things can be considered for that intersection for one and sidewalks to town and what we have to cross freeway onramps and offramps to. This is going to be difficult. So you guys better put on your thinking hats and get to work. Thanks a lot.

You received a voice mail from [WIRELESS CALLER](#).

Thank you for using Transcription! If you don't see a transcript above, it's because the audio quality was not clear enough to transcribe.

[Set Up Voice Mail](#)