



# COMMUNITY RESOURCES AGENCY

David Gonzalves, CBO  
Director

Administration - Building - County Surveyor - Engineering - Environmental Health - Fleet Services - GIS - Housing - Planning - Roads - Solid Waste

## Terra Vi Lodge Project Environmental Impact Report Scoping Meeting Summary - May 13, 2019

48 W. Yaney Avenue, Sonora  
Mailing: 2 S. Green Street  
Sonora, CA 95370  
(209) 533-5633  
(209) 536-1622 (Fleet)  
(209) 533-5616 (fax)  
(209) 533-5909 (fax - EHD)  
(209) 588-9064 (fax - Fleet)  
(209) 533-5698 (fax - Roads)  
[www.tuolumnecounty.ca.gov](http://www.tuolumnecounty.ca.gov)

On May 13, 2019, Tuolumne County held a scoping meeting in Groveland on the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Terra Vi Lodge project. The purpose of the meeting was to receive comments from community members on environmental issues to be addressed in the EIR. The meeting began with an open house during which community members could view site plans, elevations, and other information about the proposed project, as well as view the CEQA thresholds by which the project will be evaluated in the EIR. Following the open house, participants provided verbal and written comments addressing the scope of the issues that the EIR should address.

The input received at the scoping meeting is summarized below and organized by topic area.

### **Aesthetics**

Consider how the proposed project could change the character of the project vicinity.  
Consider how the proposed project will affect the views from neighboring properties.  
Consider effects of lighting on neighboring properties.  
All of the thresholds under this topic should be evaluated in the EIR.

### **Agriculture & Forestry Resources**

Consider potential impacts on forestry resources.  
A commenter noted that the site had been under contract with the State for reforestation.

### **Air Quality**

Consider air quality impacts, including from vehicle trips.

### **Biological Resources**

Consider impacts on mule deer migration.  
A commenter stated that mule deer use the project area as a winter grazing area, requesting that the wildlife evaluation consider wildlife use year-round.

### **Hydrology & Water Quality**

Many commenters expressed concern over potential impacts of the project groundwater drawdown and corresponding impacts to the wells of neighboring properties, including both water supply and water quality. One commenter noted that the test wells dug last summer lowered water levels in their well. A commenter stated that the wells that are shown as existing in the project materials were recently dug by the project applicant, prior to the application. Consider a multiple dry year scenario and a long-term timeframe in water supply analysis (a commenter specifically noted the *Pacific Decadal Oscillation* in support of the need for a long-term analysis). Consider how the proposed leach field will affect water quality, including for the wells in the area. Commenters stated that the proposed leach field location is in a wet area they considered a wetland. A commenter noted that the project applicants don't have rights to surface water. All of the thresholds under this topic, with the exception of threshold e (regarding flood hazard, tsunami, and seiche zones), should be evaluated in the EIR.

### **Land Use & Planning**

Several commenters stated that the proposed use is not appropriate for the site. One commenter stated that the Commercial Recreation zoning district is not intended for the proposed use.

A commenter stated that the proposed project site is the result of an unlawful land division.

### **Noise**

Several commenters noted the need to consider noise impacts on neighboring properties, including from the proposed helipad.

### **Population & Housing**

Consider population and housing impacts, including the availability of housing and potential impacts to housing supply.

### **Public Services**

Consider the limitations of fire protection services for area.

The Groveland Community Services District (GCSD) is currently studying fire and emergency medical services along the Highway 120 corridor, including for the proposed project.

Consider whether GCSD water and wastewater service would be needed for the proposed project.

A commenter requested that the County ensure that the community/GCSD is fairly compensated for providing fire and emergency medical services to the proposed project.

### **Recreation**

Consider impacts of the proposed project on Tuolumne River recreation areas and on the Groveland park (i.e., from lodge guests).

### **Transportation**

When evaluating transit service, consider whether YARTS will be reliable; a commenter suggested that YARTS buses would be full by the time they reach the proposed project.

Consider traffic entering Yosemite National Park on Highway 120, which can be very heavy on holiday weekends.

Evaluate line-of-site and other safety concerns from vehicles entering and exiting the project from Highway 120. Also consider safety related to vehicles traveling to and from the project site along the whole Highway 120 corridor.

Consider impacts on the Forest Service access road. A commenter asked whether the project's main access could be provided directly from Highway 120.

Consider effects of the proposed project on bicycle safety on Highway 120. A commenter suggested that the Highway 120 shoulder be widened in the project area.

### **Utilities & Service Systems**

A commenter stated that a public wastewater system is needed to serve the proposed project, and that the EIR should consider back-up options if the septic system fails.

Several commenters expressed concern over whether there is adequate infrastructure generally to serve the proposed project.

### **Wildland Fire**

Consider the potential for project occupants to start a fire (e.g., from a cigarette butt, firepits, etc.).

Consider on-site wildfire risks.

Evaluate consistency with new CalFire regulations regarding development in high fire risk areas.

Many commenters expressed concern about emergency evacuation for the proposed project, and its impacts on evacuation of the surrounding area in an emergency. A commenter stated that there is only one evacuation route from the project site.

### **Cumulative**

Cumulative analysis should include the Under Canvas project, Berkeley Tuolumne Camp rebuild, and Yosemite Lakes Thousand Trails RV park expansion.

**Alternatives**

Consider alternative locations (e.g., “the scar” in Big Oak Flat).

**Other Issues/Comments**

A commenter suggested that the project be slowed down so that it can conform to future CalFire regulations regarding development in high fire risk areas.

A commenter questioned how the proposed project will obtain fire insurance.

Several commenters expressed concerns about impacts of the proposed project on its neighbors.

Several commenters expressed concern about the lack of seasonal employees available to serve the project, noting that they would need to be imported/housed.

Questions were raised as to the economic viability of the proposed project.

A commenter expressed concern about this project attracting more hotels to the area.

A commenter supported the project because of the need for jobs and for more children in the local schools.

Several commenters expressed concerns about County communication with residents regarding other projects.