November 20, 2020

Final EIR | State Clearinghouse Number: 2019110286 **Volume 1: Final EIR**

TERRA VI LODGE PROJECT

FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

for Tuolumne County

PLACEWORKS

PLACEWORKS

COUNTY OF TUOLUMNE CALIFORNIA

NOVEMBER 20, 2020 | **FINAL EIR**
STATE CLEARINGHOUSE NUMBER: 2019110286

VOLUME 1: FINAL EIR

TERRA VI LODGE PROJECT

FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

for Tuolumne County

Prepared By:

PlaceWorks
1625 Shattuck Avenue, Suite 300
Berkeley, California 94709
510.848.3815

Table of Contents

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY 1-1

2. INTRODUCTION 2-1

3. REVISIONS TO THE DRAFT EIR 3-1

4. LIST OF COMMENTERS 4-1

5. RESPONSE TO COMMENTS 5-1

APPENDICES

Appendix K: Comments Received on the Draft EIR
Appendix L: Supplemental Noise Analysis
Appendix M: Supplemental Hydrogeology Information
Appendix N: Supplemental Trip Generation Information
Appendix O: Supplemental Biological Resources Information
Appendix P: Vehicle Miles Traveled
Appendix Q: Comments on the Project Application
Appendix R: Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

Appendices A through J are located within the Draft EIR

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 5-1 Alternate Helipad Location 5-8
Figure 5-2 Location of Project Site and Nearby Communities, with Rim Fire Overlay 5-15

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures 1-7
Table 4.11-1 Project Consistency with General Plan Goals, Policies, and Implementing Programs Pertaining to Land Use and Planning 3-12
Table 4.12-4 Maximum Allowable Noise Exposure for Aircraft Noise Sources[a] 3-16
Table 4.12-6 Significance of Changes in Cumulative Noise Exposure[a] 3-17
Table 5-1 Maximum Number of On-Site Vehicles 5-12
Table 5-2 Maximum Number of On-Site Vehicles Exiting Cumulative Project Sites 5-13
Table 5-3 Project Wildfire Risk Reduction Features Discussion 5-18
Table 5-4 Responses to Comments Received on the Draft EIR 5-28

1. Executive Summary

This Final Environmental Impact Report (Final EIR) has been prepared to provide an assessment of the potential environmental consequences of approving and implementing the proposed Terra Vi Lodge project (project or proposed project). This executive summary includes the conclusions of the environmental analysis contained in the Draft EIR and presents a summary of impacts and mitigation measures identified. The remainder of this Final EIR contains corrections and clarifications to the text and analysis of the Draft EIR, where warranted, along with a response to comments matrix and a list of commenters. For a complete description of the proposed project, see Chapter 3, Project Description, of the Draft EIR. For a complete discussion of alternatives to the proposed project, see Chapter 6, Alternatives, of the Draft EIR.

The Draft EIR addressed the environmental effects associated with approval and implementation of the proposed project. The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires that local government agencies, prior to taking action on projects over which they have discretionary approval authority, consider the environmental consequences of such projects. An EIR is a public document designed to provide the public, local, and State governmental agency decision-makers with an analysis of potential environmental consequences to support informed decision-making.

The Draft EIR was prepared pursuant to the requirements of CEQA[1] and the State CEQA Guidelines[2] to determine if approval of the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment. The County of Tuolumne, as the Lead Agency, reviewed and revised as necessary all submitted drafts, technical studies, and reports to reflect its own independent judgment, including reliance on applicable County technical personnel and review technical reports. Information for the Draft EIR was obtained from on-site field observations; discussions with public service agencies; analysis of adopted plans and policies; review of available studies, reports, data, and similar literature in the public domain; and specialized environmental assessments (e.g., air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, greenhouse gas emissions, noise, and transportation).

1.1 ENVIRONMENTAL PROCEDURES

The Draft EIR, in conjunction with this Final EIR, have been prepared to assess the environmental effects associated with approval and development of the proposed project. The main purposes of the documents as established by CEQA are:

- To disclose to decision-makers and the public the significant environmental effects of proposed activities.

[1] The CEQA Statute is found at California Public Resources Code, Division 13, Sections 21000 to 21177.
[2] The CEQA Guidelines are found at California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Division 6, Chapter 3, Sections 15000 to 15387.

- To identify ways to avoid or reduce environmental damage.
- To prevent environmental damage by requiring implementation of feasible alternatives or mitigation measures.
- To disclose to the public reasons for agency decision of projects with significant environmental effects.
- To foster interagency coordination in the review of projects.
- To enhance public participation in the planning process.

An EIR is the most comprehensive form of environmental documentation identified in the statute and in the CEQA Guidelines. It provides the information needed to assess the environmental consequences of a proposed project, to the extent feasible. An EIR is intended to provide an objective, factually supported, full-disclosure analysis of the environmental consequences associated with a proposed project that has the potential to result in significant, adverse environmental impacts. An EIR is also one of various decision-making tools used by a lead agency to consider the merits and disadvantages of a project that is subject to its discretionary authority. Prior to approving a proposed project, the lead agency must consider the information contained in the EIR, determine whether the EIR was properly prepared in accordance with CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines, determine that it reflects the independent judgment of the lead agency, adopt findings concerning the project's significant environmental impacts and alternatives, and adopt a Statement of Overriding Considerations if the proposed project would result in significant impacts that cannot be avoided.

1.2 REPORT ORGANIZATION

This Final EIR is organized into the following chapters:

- **Chapter 1: Executive Summary.** Summarizes environmental consequences that would result from implementation of the project, describes recommended mitigation measures, and indicates the level of significance of environmental impacts before and after mitigation. Underline text in Table 1-1 represents language that has been added to the impacts and mitigation measures in the EIR; text in ~~strikethrough~~ has been deleted from the EIR.
- **Chapter 2: Introduction.** Provides an overview describing the use and organization of this Final EIR.
- **Chapter 3: Revisions to the Draft EIR.** Contains corrections to the text and graphics of the Draft EIR. Underline text represents language that has been added to the EIR; text in ~~strikethrough~~ has been deleted from the EIR.
- **Chapter 4: List of Commenters.** Lists the names of agencies and individuals who commented on the Draft EIR.
- **Chapter 5: Comments and Responses.** Presents comments received from agencies and the public on the Draft EIR alongside responses to each comment. Also contains "master responses" that provide comprehensive responses to key issues raised by several comments.

- **Appendix:** The appendix for this Final EIR contains the following:
  - Appendix K: Comments Received on the Draft EIR
  - Appendix L: Supplemental Noise Analysis
  - Appendix M: Supplemental Hydrogeology Information
  - Appendix N: Supplemental Trip Generation Information
  - Appendix O: Supplemental Biological Resources Information
  - Appendix P: Vehicle Miles Traveled
  - Appendix Q: Comments on the Project Application
  - Appendix R: Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program
  - Appendices A through J are located within the Draft EIR

The Draft EIR is available online and incorporated here by reference. It constitutes part of the Final EIR.

1.2.1 TYPE AND PURPOSE OF THE EIR

According to Section 15121(a) of the CEQA Guidelines, the purpose of an EIR is to:

> *Inform public agency decision makers and the public generally of the significant environmental effects of a project, identify possible ways to minimize the significant effects, and describe reasonable alternatives to the project.*

The EIR was prepared as a project EIR, pursuant to Section 15161 of the CEQA Guidelines. As a project EIR, the environmental analysis discussed the changes in the environment that would result from the development of the Terra Vi Lodge project. The Draft EIR examined the specific short-term impacts (project construction) and long-term impacts (project operation) that would occur as a result of project approval by the Tuolumne County Planning Commission, along with cumulative impacts. The conclusions made in the Draft EIR are listed in Table 1-1 of this Final EIR below.

1.3 SUMMARY OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT

The proposed project is designed as a hotel lodge comprised of various single, two-, and three-story elements. The building design accommodates a setback, maximizing the distance between taller structures and adjacent residential properties to minimize visibility from both public and private views. Elements of the project include a public market, general lodge with 100 guestrooms, two manager's suites, and multi-purpose uses, indoor and outdoor areas, and seven guest cabins providing 26 guestrooms, as well as five employee apartments with four rooms in each unit, for a total of 20 employee rooms. A total of 40 jobs would be created once the project is operational. The proposed project would develop 18 percent (11.5 acres) of the project site with buildings, roads, and parking. An additional 1.4 acres would be used for the primary septic system. Refer to Figure 3-4 in Chapter 3, Project Description, of

the Draft EIR for the proposed project's site plan. Additional project plans are provided in Appendix B, Project Site Plans, of the Draft EIR.

1.4 SUMMARY OF PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

The Draft EIR analyzed alternatives to the proposed project that were designed to reduce the significant environmental impacts of the proposed project and feasibly attain some of the proposed project objectives. There is no set methodology for comparing the alternatives or determining the environmentally superior alternative under CEQA. Identification of the environmentally superior alternative involves weighing and balancing all of the environmental resource areas by the County. The following alternatives to the proposed project were considered and analyzed in detail:

- No Project Alternative
- Alternate Location Alternative
- Reduced Footprint Alternative

Chapter 6, Alternatives, of the Draft EIR, includes a complete discussion of these alternatives and of alternatives that were considered, but not carried forward for detailed analysis.

1.5 ISSUES TO BE RESOLVED

Section 15123(b)(3) of the CEQA Guidelines requires that an EIR identify issues to be resolved. With regard to the proposed project, the major issues identified to be resolved in the Draft EIR include decisions by the County of Tuolumne, as Lead Agency, related to:

- whether the Draft EIR adequately described the environmental impacts of the proposed project;
- whether the benefits of the proposed project override those environmental impacts that cannot be feasibly avoided or mitigated to a level of insignificance;
- whether the identified mitigation measures should be adopted or modified; and
- whether there are any alternatives to the proposed project that would substantially lessen any of the significant impacts of the proposed project and achieve most of the basic objectives.

1.6 AREAS OF CONCERN

The County of Tuolumne issued a Notice of Preparation of a Draft EIR on May 2, 2019 and held a scoping meeting on May 13, 2019 to receive scoping comments. Due to a clerical issue, the NOP for the Draft EIR was reissued and submitted to the Office of Planning and Research State Clearinghouse on November 15, 2019 for an additional 30-day review period. During the scoping period for this EIR, responsible agencies and interested members of the public were invited to submit comments as to the scope and content of the EIR. While every environmental concern applicable to the CEQA process is addressed in the Draft EIR,

the list is not necessarily exhaustive; rather, it attempts to capture those concerns that are likely to generate the greatest interest based on the input received during the scoping process. The comments received focused primarily on the following issues and the chapters in which these issues were addressed in the EIR are indicated in parentheses:

- Lighting impacts because of cumulative projects. (Chapter 4.1, Aesthetics)
- Natural beauty of the area will be compromised. (Chapter 4.1, Aesthetics)
- Impacts on scenic vistas and scenic views (Chapter 4.1, Aesthetics)
- Air quality impacts. (Chapter 4.2, Air Quality)
- Odors created by the proposed use. (Chapter 4.2, Air Quality)
- Potential protected species on-site. (Chapter 4.3, Biology)
- Archaeological resources on-site. (Chapter 4.4, Cultural Resources)
- Presence and capacity of solar. (Chapter 4.5, Energy)
- Increase in electricity demand. (Chapter 4.5, Energy)
- Cause evacuation issues. (Chapter 4.9, Hazards)
- Not enough water. (Chapter 4.10, Hydrology and Water Quality)
- Could reduce water supply of adjacent residential wells. (Chapter 4.10, Hydrology and Water Quality)
- Non-compliant with zoning. (Chapter 4.11, Land Use and Planning)
- Potential noise impacts to neighboring properties. (Chapter 4.12, Noise)
- Not enough housing for employees. (Chapter 4.13, Population and Housing)
- Potential traffic impacts to emergency service vehicles. (Chapter 4.14, Public Services and Recreation and Chapter 4.15, Transportation)
- Potential impacts to availability of emergency services. (Chapter 4.14, Public Services and Recreation and Chapter 4.15, Transportation)
- Impacts to schools. (Chapter 4.14, Public Services and Recreation and Chapter 4.15, Transportation)
- Potential traffic impacts associated with the driveway being located off of Sawmill Mountain Road. (Chapter 4.15, Transportation)
- Increase in overall traffic. (Chapter 4.15, Transportation)
- Need transit services to Yosemite. (Chapter 4.15, Transportation)
- Potential traffic impacts with nearby cumulative projects. (Chapter 4.15, Transportation)
- Solid waste generation. (Chapter 4.16, Utilities and Service Systems)
- Sewage and drainage issues, including sewage contaminating water supply. (Chapter 4.16, Utilities and Service Systems)
- Increased risk of wildfire. (Chapter 4.17, Wildfire)

- Cumulative impacts of neighboring development. (All chapters)
- Requests for project alternatives to consider a different location. (Chapter 6, Alternatives)

1.7 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Under CEQA, a significant impact on the environment is defined as a substantial, or potentially substantial, adverse change in any of the physical conditions within the area affected by the proposed project, including land, air, water, minerals, flora, fauna, ambient noise, and objects of historic and aesthetic significance.

As determined in the Draft EIR, the proposed project has the potential to generate significant environmental impacts in a number of areas. Pursuant to Section 15126.2(b) of the CEQA Guidelines, an EIR must describe any significant impacts that cannot be avoided, even with the implementation of feasible mitigation measures. As shown in Table 1-1, all significant impacts would be reduced to a less-than-significant level if the mitigation measures identified in the Draft EIR are adopted and implemented, with the exception of Impacts GHG-1.1, GHG-1.2, and NOI-3.1. As described in detail in Chapter 7, CEQA-Mandated Sections, of the Draft EIR, the proposed project would have no significant impact on agricultural or mineral resources, due to existing conditions in the project area. Accordingly, these topics were not analyzed further in the Draft EIR.

Table 1-1 summarizes the conclusions of the environmental analysis contained in the Draft EIR and presents a summary of impacts and mitigation measures identified. It is organized to correspond with the environmental issues discussed in Chapters 4.1 through 4.17. Table 1-1 is arranged in four columns: 1) environmental impact; 2) significance without mitigation; 3) mitigation measures; and 4) significance with mitigation. For a complete description of potential impacts, please refer to the specific discussions in Chapters 4.1 through 4.17.

TABLE 1-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Significance without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance with Mitigation
AESTHETICS			
AES-1: The project would not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista.	LTS	N/A	N/A
AES-2: The project would not substantially degrade the view from a scenic highway, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings.	NI	N/A	N/A
AES-3: The project would change but would not degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings.	LTS	N/A	N/A
AES-4: The proposed project includes the installation of photovoltaic panels to generate solar energy. Because the location and materials for the panels is not yet known, the panels have the potential to become sources of glare, which would be a *significant* impact.	S	**AES-4:** Proposed photovoltaic panels shall be designed to ensure the following: ▪ The angle at which panels are installed precludes, or minimizes to the maximum extent practicable, glare observed by viewers on the ground. ▪ The reflectivity of materials used shall not be greater than the reflectivity of standard materials used in residential and commercial developments. ▪ Panels shall be sited to minimize their visibility from Highway 120.	LTS
AES-5: The proposed project would not contribute to significant cumulative aesthetics impacts.	LTS	N/A	N/A
AIR QUALITY			
AQ-1: The project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan.	LTS	N/A	N/A
AQ-2: The project would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in non-attainment under applicable federal or State ambient air quality standards.	LTS	N/A	N/A
AQ-3: The project would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.	LTS	N/A	N/A
AQ-4: The project would not result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people.	LTS	N/A	N/A
AQ-5: The project would not, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects, result in significant impacts regarding air quality.	LTS	N/A	N/A

N/A = Not Applicable; NI = No Impact; LTS = Less than Significant; S = Significant; SU = Significant and Unavdoiable

TABLE 1-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Significance without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance with Mitigation
BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES			
BIO-1.1: The project has the potential, through habitat modification, to adversely affect the Crotch bumble bee, a species identified as a candidate for listing as endangered under the CESA.	S	BIO-1.1a: Preconstruction Bee Surveys. Prior to issuance of grading permits for any staging, construction, or ground disturbing activities between February 1 and November 30th of the construction year, a qualified biologist shall survey the project boundaries for active Crotch bumble bee nests. If identified, CDFW shall be consulted for guidance on buffer distances to avoid colony disturbance (e.g., buffer surrounding the nest itself, entry/exits, and avoiding direct disturbance). If full avoidance cannot be achieved through buffers, no construction shall occur until the nest is no longer occupied. No pesticides or herbicides shall be used so long as the species occupies the site. This measure shall be incorporated into the project bid package and contract. The measure is the responsibility of the qualified biologist under contract to either the County or construction contractor. BIO -1.1b: Environmental Awareness Training. All contractors involved in site development, applicable County department staff, and environmental specialists (e.g., biologist) shall attend a mandatory Environmental Awareness Training prior to any site disturbances. The program shall address proper implementation of mitigation measures contained herein. This measure shall be incorporated into the project bid package and contract and implemented throughout project construction. The project biologist shall have the authority to stop work or remove any construction worker on-site that has not completed training. The measure is the responsibility of the qualified biologist under contract to either the County or construction contractor.	LTS
BIO-1.2: The project has the potential, through habitat modification, to adversely affect the Fisher, a species state-listed as threatened under the CESA.	S	BIO-1.2a: Implement Mitigation Measure BIO -1.1b. BIO -1.2b: Avoid Inadvertent Animal Trapping During Construction. To avoid inadvertently trapping special-status or common animal species during construction, all excavated steep-walled holes or trenches more than two feet deep shall be covered at the end of each working day with plywood or	LTS

N/A = Not Applicable; NI = No Impact; LTS = Less than Significant; S = Significant; SU = Significant and Unavdoiable

TABLE 1-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Significance without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance with Mitigation
		similar material, or provided with one or more escape ramps constructed of earth fill or wooden planks, or equivalent, at each end of the trench. Before such holes or trenches are filled, they shall be thoroughly inspected for trapped animals. If at any time a trapped animal is discovered, the contractor shall place an escape ramp or other appropriate structure to allow the animal to escape. Alternatively, the contractor shall contact the project biologist or California Department of Fish and Wildlife for assistance. Similarly, stored pipes or other materials providing potential cover for animals shall be inspected prior to installation or use to ensure that they are unoccupied. BIO -1.2c: Food and Trash Disposal. All food and food-related trash shall be enclosed in sealed trash containers at the end of each workday and removed completely from the construction site every day to avoid attracting wildlife. This measure shall be implemented throughout project construction. The measure is the responsibility of the construction contractor. BIO -1.2d: Construction Hours. Project construction shall be limited to 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. unless an emergency exists.	
BIO-1.3: The project has the potential, through habitat modification, to adversely affect the spotted bat (*Euderma maculatum*).	S	BIO-1.3: Implement Mitigation Measure BIO-1.2d.	LTS
BIO-1.4: The project has the potential, through habitat modification, to adversely affect the Western mastiff bat (*Eumops perotis californicus*).	S	BIO-1.4: Implement Mitigation Measure BIO-1.2d.	LTS
BIO-1-5: The project has the potential, through habitat modification, to adversely affect the Silver-haired bat (*Lasionycteris noctivagans*).	S	BIO-1.5a: Preconstruction Surveys Suitable Bat Roosting (or Nursery) Areas and Provisions for Protection, if Identified. The project sponsor or contractor shall implement the following measures: ▪ 15 days or fewer before commencing ground-disturbing activities between April and September of the construction year, a qualified biologist shall survey snags, trees, rock crevices and other suitable cavities and structures on the site for roosting bats or bat nurseries. ▪ If bats are not found and there is no evidence of bat use, construction may proceed.	LTS

N/A = Not Applicable; NI = No Impact; LTS = Less than Significant; S = Significant; SU = Significant and Unavdoiable

TABLE 1-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Significance without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance with Mitigation
		▪ If bats are found or evidence of use by bats is present, CDFW shall be consulted for guidance on measures to avoid or minimize disturbance to the colony or nursery. Subject to CDFW approval, measures may include excluding bats from roosts before construction begins. If nurseries are discovered, no work shall occur within buffer areas as established by CDFW until all young are self-sufficient and have left the nursery. ▪ This mitigation measure shall be incorporated into the project bid package and contract. Surveys shall occur within 15 days of commencing construction that occurs between April and September. BIO-1.5b: Implement Mitigation Measure BIO-1.2d.	
BIO-1.6: The project has the potential, through habitat modification, to adversely affect the Hoary bat (*Lasiurus cinereus*).	S	BIO-1.6: Implement Mitigation Measures BIO-1.5a and BIO-1.2b.	LTS
BIO-1.7: The project has the potential, through habitat modification, to adversely affect the Long eared myotis (*Myotis evotis*).	S	BIO-1.7: Implement Mitigation Measures BIO-1.2d and BIO-1.5a.	LTS
BIO-1.8: The project has the potential, through habitat modification, to adversely affect the special-status olive-sided flycatcher (*Contopus cooperi*).	S	BIO-1.8: Pre-Construction Bird/Raptor Survey. Prior to issuance of grading permits for construction occurring between February 1st and August 30th (e.g., excavation, ground disturbance, or vegetation removal) a preconstruction survey for nesting birds shall be conducted in accordance with the CDFW guidelines and a no-disturbance buffer shall be established, if necessary. If equipment staging, site preparation, vegetation removal, grading, excavation or other project-related construction activities are scheduled during the avian nesting season (generally February 1 through August 30), a focused survey for active nests would be conducted by a qualified biologist within 15 days prior to the beginning of project-related activities. Following initial pre-construction surveys in year one of project construction, bird surveys shall be repeated annually so long as outside construction continues. Surveys shall be repeated within 15 days prior to resuming outdoor construction activities for the first time between February 1st and	LTS

N/A = Not Applicable; NI = No Impact; LTS = Less than Significant; S = Significant; SU = Significant and Unavdoiable

TABLE 1-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Significance without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance with Mitigation
		August 30th whenever outdoor construction activities have ceased for more than one month (e.g., if outdoor construction shuts down for the season due to winter rains in late November, preconstruction bird surveys would occur again within 15 days prior to recommencing outdoor site work between February 1st and August 30th. If work recommences in January and continues without interruption through August 30th, then no additional preconstruction survey is required). Surveys shall be conducted in all suitable habitat in the BSA. If an active nest is found, the bird shall be identified to species and the approximate distance from the closest work site to the nest estimated. No additional measures need be implemented if active nests are more than the following distances from the nearest work site: (a) 300± feet for raptors unless otherwise specified; (b) 345 feet for spotted owls; or (~~b~~c) 75± feet for other non-special-status bird species. Disturbance of active nests shall be avoided to the extent possible until it is determined that nesting is complete and the young have fledged. For species protected under the California Fish and Game Code (CFGC), if active nests are closer than those distances to the nearest work site and there is the potential for bird disturbance, CDFW shall be contacted for approval to work within 300± feet of raptors, or 75± feet of other non-special-status bird species. This measure shall be incorporated into the project bid package and contract. Surveys shall occur within 15 days of commencing construction that occurs between February 1st and August 30th.	
BIO-1.9: The project has the potential, through habitat modification, to adversely affect the special-status American peregrine falcon (*Falco peregrinus anatum*).	S	**BIO-1.9:** Implement Mitigation Measure BIO-1.8.	LTS
BIO-1.10: The project has the potential, through habitat modification, to adversely affect the special-status California spotted owl (*Strix occidentalis occidentalis*).	S	**BIO-1.10:** Implement Mitigation Measure BIO-1.8.	LTS
BIO-1.11: The project has the potential, through habitat modification, to adversely affect protected bird species.	S	**BIO-1.11:** Implement Mitigation Measure BIO-1.8.	LTS
BIO-1.12: The project has the potential to interfere substantially with the movement of native resident wildlife species.	S	**BIO-1.12:** Implement Mitigation Measures BIO -1.2b, BIO -1.2c, and BIO -1.2d.	LTS

N/A = Not Applicable; NI = No Impact; LTS = Less than Significant; S = Significant; SU = Significant and Unavdoiable

TABLE 1-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Significance without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance with Mitigation
BIO-1.13: The project has the potential, through habitat modification, to adversely affect the special-status Small's southern clarkia (*Clarkia australis*).	S	BIO-1.13: Pre-Construction Botanical Survey. Surveys shall occur during the bloom season prior to issuance of grading permits during the bloom period for *Clarkia australis* (May through August) and *Erythranthe filicaulis* (April through August). If found, the location of special-status plant populations shall be clearly identified in the field by staking, flagging, or fencing prior to the commencement of activities that may cause disturbance. A buffer surrounding the populations shall be established by a qualified botanist based on the plant species, its habitat, and the nature of the proposed project activity. No activity shall occur within the buffer area. If sensitive plant species cannot be avoided, transplanting (perennial species), seed collection and dispersal (annual species) may be undertaken by a qualified botanist. If transplanting or seed collection/dispersal is employed, ongoing monitoring for 5 years shall be conducted to assess the effectiveness of mitigation. The performance standard for mitigation is no net reduction in the size or viability of the local plant population. Prior to salvaging plants, written permission shall be obtained from the landowner and CDFW shall be notified 10 days prior to salvage activities or, for emergency situations, CDFW shall be notified within 14 days following salvage activities consistent with the provisions of the California Native Plant Protection Act (California Fish and Game Code Sections 1912 and 1913) and California Penal Code Section 384a. Salvage shall be in accordance with California Fish and Game Code Sections 1912 and 1913(c) including CDFW notification. The performance standard for this mitigation measure is no net reduction in the size or viability of local sensitive plant populations. This measure shall be incorporated into the project bid package and contract. Surveys shall occur during the bloom season prior to commencing construction during the bloom period for *Clarkia australis* (May through August) and *Erythranthe filicaulis* (April through August).	LTS
BIO-1.14: The project has the potential, through habitat modification, to adversely affect the special-status Slender-stemmed monkeyflower (*Erythranthe filicaulis*).	S	BIO-1.14: Implement Mitigation Measure BIO-1.13.	LTS
BIO-1.15: The project has the potential to interfere substantially with the movement of native resident wildlife species.	S	BIO -1.15: Food and Trash Enclosures. Trash shall be stored in an animal-resistant enclosure, or bear shed throughout the life of the project. Trash enclosure design shall be approved by the project biologist prior to	LTS

N/A = Not Applicable; NI = No Impact; LTS = Less than Significant; S = Significant; SU = Significant and Unavdoiable

TABLE 1-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Significance without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance with Mitigation
		installation. The project proponents are encouraged to visit http://www.waste101.com/bear-aware/ or contact the Tahoe Truckee Sierra Disposal or similar entity, for appropriate designs. This measure shall be implemented prior to issuance of an occupancy permit. The measure is the responsibility of the construction contractor. A Notice of Action shall be filed with the County Clerk on the project parcels including the project conditions specifying that this measure shall be continued throughout the life of the project.	
BIO-2: The project has the potential to spread invasive plant species.	S	BIO-2: Minimize the spread of invasive plant species through the following: ▪ The project landscaping planting palette shall be revised to ensure that all plantings are non-invasive species. ▪ All hay, straw, hay bales, straw bales, seed, mulch or other material used for erosion control on the project site shall be free of noxious weed seeds and propagules (Food and Agriculture Code Sections 6305, 6341 and 6461). ▪ All equipment brought to the project site shall be thoroughly cleaned of all dirt and vegetation prior to entering the site to prevent importing noxious weeds and shall be cleaned of all dirt and vegetation prior to exiting the site to prevent exporting noxious weeds. (Food and Agriculture Code Section 5401). ▪ All material brought to the site, including rock, gravel, road base, sand, and topsoil, shall be free of noxious weeds and propagules. (Food and Agriculture Code Sections 6305, 6341 and 6461).	LTS
BIO-3.1: The project has the potential to degrade waters of the U.S. indirectly by degrading water quality through construction activities.	S	BIO-3.1: Install Temporary Environmentally Sensitive Area (ESA) Fencing to Protect Sensitive Drainages during Construction Activities that Disturb Soils. Prior to issuance of grading permits, the project contractor shall implement the following: ▪ Install high-visibility/ESA fencing (e.g., orange construction safety fencing) a minimum of 50 feet from the centerline of both sides of Ephemeral Channel-1 (Northwest corner of the project site) during any time when disturbing soils within 50 feet of the drainage channel (fencing is not required when soil disturbances are not occurring so long as erosion control from any prior soil disturbances within 50 feet has been installed).	LTS

N/A = Not Applicable; NI = No Impact; LTS = Less than Significant; S = Significant; SU = Significant and Unavdoiable

TABLE 1-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Significance without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance with Mitigation
		Fencing shall be of flexible material that allows for deer passage. Install silt fencing, fiber rolls, or equivalent erosion and sediment control devices on the project side of the ESA fencing to prevent disturbances and erosion into the adjacent drainage. Silt fencing or other materials, as required, shall be installed consistent with the applicable water quality requirements specified in the project's Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) or Water Pollution Control Plan (WPCP). Fencing or other erosion control materials or devices shall be shown on the final construction documents. ▪ No construction-related materials, equipment, trash or other related debris shall be allowed, stored or staged within the fenced area. ESA Fencing shall remain in place until soil disturbances within 50 feet have been completed and erosion control measures have been installed in accordance with approved plans. Fallen fencing shall immediately be repaired as necessary to remain visible during all construction activities. ▪ Fenced areas shall be avoided throughout project construction (i.e., active soil disturbing activities) and shall be monitored by the project manager throughout construction. ▪ This measure shall be incorporated into the project bid package and contract. ▪ All ESA Fencing shall be removed from the site after construction activities are completed.	
BIO-3.2: The project has the potential to fill waters of the U.S. totaling 0.001 acre.	S	BIO-3.2: Comply with Section 404 of the federal Clean Water Act. Within the Caltrans right-of-way, the applicant shall secure an encroachment permit from Caltrans and comply with all conditions of the Caltrans encroachment permit including the following as it applies to Ephemeral Channel-2: ▪ Prior to issuance of grading permits, comply with Section 404 and Section 401 of the Clean Water Act and comply with all current regulations (i.e., at the time of disturbance) pertaining to fill of Ephemeral Channel-2 (0.001 acre). ▪ If regulations in place at the time of site disturbance require permits from the USACE for filling an ephemeral drainage: the acreage, location, and method(s) for compensation for fill shall be determined during the permitting process in accordance with USACE standards. The project shall	LTS

N/A = Not Applicable; NI = No Impact; LTS = Less than Significant; S = Significant; SU = Significant and Unavdoiable

TABLE 1-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Significance without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance with Mitigation
		adhere to a "no net loss" standard for waters of the U.S. and waters of the State. Suitable habitat shall be restored, enhanced, and/or replaced at an acreage and location and by methods approved by the USACE and Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board, as jurisdictionally appropriate. The replacement of waters will be equivalent to the nature of the habitat lost and will be provided at a suitable ratio to ensure that, at a minimum, there is no net loss of habitat acreage or value. The replacement habitat will be set aside in perpetuity for habitat use. ▪ Compensation may also include purchasing credits from a Corps and/or state or federally approved mitigation bank at a ratio prescribed in the applicable Section 404 Permit as necessary to achieve no net loss of waters of the U.S. For waters of the state, compensation may be through the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation Sacramento District California In-Lieu Fee Program. ▪ Alternatively, if final project plans allow for full avoidance and no fill of Ephemeral Channel 2 pursuant to the determination of the project's wetlands biologist; Mitigation Measures BIO-3.1 and BIO-3.2 may be substituted to ensure avoidance. ▪ This measure shall occur prior to issuance of grading permits. All permit provisions shall be implemented and maintained in accordance with the applicable permits.	
BIO-3.3: The project has the potential to adversely impact waters of the U.S. indirectly by degrading water quality through construction activities.	S	BIO-3.4: Best Management Practices (BMPs) to Protect Water Quality (Including NOI/NPDES/SWPPP). Prior to issuance of grading permits, the project contractor shall implement the following: ▪ Prepare an Erosion Control Plan for implementation for any construction to take place between October 15 and May 15 of any year. In the absence of such an approved plan, all construction shall cease on or before October 15, except that necessary to implement erosion control measures. If necessary, the plan shall be submitted to the County Public Works Department for review and approval. ▪ Submit to the State Water Resources Control Board Storm Water Permitting Unit, a Notice of Intent (NOI) to obtain coverage under the General Construction Activity Storm Water Permit - California's National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) general permit for	LTS

N/A = Not Applicable; NI = No Impact; LTS = Less than Significant; S = Significant; SU = Significant and Unavdoiable

TABLE 1-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Significance without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance with Mitigation
		construction related storm water discharges for the disturbance of one acre or more. Disturbances of less than one acre may also require an NOI for coverage under the NPDES General Permit for construction-related storm water discharge and the State Water Resources Control Board Permitting Unit shall be contacted for determination of permit requirements. Commercial and Industrial developments may require an NOI even if less than one acre is to be disturbed. Obtain coverage or an exemption from these requirements. [Federal Water Pollution Control Act, Section 401, California Clean Water Act]. The permit may include preparation of a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). ▪ This measure shall be incorporated into the project bid package and contract.	
BIO-4.1: The project has the potential to indirectly interfere with the movement of native resident mule deer traveling to and from winter range through the introduction of additional people, pets and traffic.	S	BIO-4.1a: Enhance Rim Fire Burned Deer Winter Range and/or Data. Prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy, the project proponents shall contribute $1,100 per acre for approximately 43.4 acres to a non-profit (e.g., Yosemite Stanislaus Solutions) to be used for activities associated with either enhancing deer winter range or providing updated research data to support herd management within the footprint of the Rim Fire. BIO-4.1b: Keep Dogs Leashed. The project sponsor shall implement the following: ▪ Dogs shall be kept on leash or otherwise prohibited from running free outdoors. Signs shall be posted along all project trails stating that dogs shall be kept on leash. ▪ The project website, booking site, and/or brochures shall advise visitors of this requirement. A Notice of Action shall be filed with the County Clerk on the project parcels including the project conditions specifying that this measure shall be continued throughout the life of the project. BIO-4.1c: Stay on Trails/Education. The project sponsor shall implement the following: ▪ Visitors shall be required to stay on designated trails at the project site when hiking within the project boundaries to minimize wintering deer/human interactions. Signs shall be posted along all project trails	LTS

N/A = Not Applicable; NI = No Impact; LTS = Less than Significant; S = Significant; SU = Significant and Unavdoiable

TABLE 1-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Significance without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance with Mitigation
		stating that visitors shall stay on trails and shall not approach deer (in particular between November 30 and April 30 when deer are expected to be migrating to and from their wintering grounds). In consultation with the project biologist, the project proponents shall prepare an interpretive trail sign/plaque or signs/plaques describing the life history of the Yosemite Deer Herd, the area's importance as wintering deer habitat and as a migratory corridor, and the necessity to avoid approaching non-resident deer during their winter migrations. ▪ The project website, booking site, and/or brochures shall advise visitors of the requirement to avoid approaching non-resident deer during winter migrations.	
BIO-4.2: If there is fencing associated with the project, it has the potential to trap, injure, or impede deer movements, resulting in deer injuries or fatalities. This would indirectly interfere with the movement of native resident mule deer traveling to and from winter range.	S	BIO-4.2a: Deer-Friendly Fencing. Prior to issuance of a final certificate of occupancy, the project contractor shall implement the following: ▪ To prevent trapping, injuring, or impeding deer movement; barbed wire fencing is prohibited. Non barb-wired fencing immediately surrounding structures (e.g., storage facilities, swimming pools) where deer are less likely to travel is permitted. Additional Fencing design shall be subject to review and approval by the project biologist following one of the recommended designs found in a Landowner's Guide to Wildlife Friendly Fences: How to Build a Fence with Wildlife in Mind. 2nd edition, 2012 (or as may be updated) by the Montana Dpt. of Fish Wildlife and Parks. Alternative fencing designs shall be approved by CDFW prior to installation. ▪ A Notice of Action shall be filed with the County Clerk on the project parcels including the project conditions specifying that this measure shall be continued throughout the life of the project. BIO-4.2b: Implement Mitigation Measures BIO-4.1b and BIO-4.1c.	LTS
BIO-5.1: The project has the potential to conflict with Public Resources Code 21083.4 related to oak tree protection.	S	BIO-5.1a: Implement Mitigation Measure BIO -1.1b. BIO-5.1b: Native Oak Tree Protection. Throughout project construction, for native oak trees greater than 5 inches diameter at breast height (DBH), to be retained, to the maximum extent feasible:	LTS

N/A = Not Applicable; NI = No Impact; LTS = Less than Significant; S = Significant; SU = Significant and Unavdoiable

TABLE 1-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Significance without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance with Mitigation
		▪ Limit ground-disturbing activities to outside the dripline of native oaks and preferably outside 1-1/2 times the dripline. ▪ No storage equipment, supplies, vehicles, debris, construction wastewater, paint, stucco, concrete or any other clean-up waste, and temporary or permanent structures shall be placed within the driplines. ▪ Avoid cutting oak roots. ▪ Use boring, rather than trenching, within driplines. ▪ Avoid equipment damage to limbs, trunks, and roots of oaks trees. ▪ Do not attach signs, ropes, cables or other items to trees.	
BIO-5.2: Although not planned to do so, construction activities have the potential encroach within open space boundaries intended to protect wildlife habitat.	S	BIO-5.2: Install ESA Fencing along the existing Open Space Zoning District boundaries where active construction will occur within 50 feet of the boundaries. The project contractor shall install ESA fencing along existing open space boundaries where active construction will occur within 50 feet of existing open space boundaries. Fencing shall be shown on the final construction documents. This measure shall be incorporated into the project bid package and contract and implemented prior to issuance of grading permits.	LTS
BIO-6: The project would not conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or State habitat conservation plan.	NI	N/A	N/A
BIO-7: Increased traffic from the proposed project in combination with proposed adjacent projects could increase deer fatalities along Highway 120 within the project vicinity, interfering with migrating native mule deer.	S	BIO-7: Implement Mitigation Measures BIO-4.1a and BIO-4.2a.	LTS

N/A = Not Applicable; NI = No Impact; LTS = Less than Significant; S = Significant; SU = Significant and Unavdoiable

TABLE 1-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Significance without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance with Mitigation
CULTURAL AND TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES			
CULT-1: Ground disturbing activities may result in unanticipated discoveries of cultural resources. Construction activities as part of the proposed project could impair or destroy previously undiscovered prehistoric or historical resources extracted during earth disturbing activities.	S	CULT-1a: Prior to the issuance of grading permits, the County shall confirm the applicant has required all construction crews to undergo adequate training for the identification of federal- or State-eligible cultural resources, and that the construction crews are aware of the potential for previously undiscovered archaeological or paleontological resources on-site, of the laws protecting these resources and associated penalties, and of the procedures to follow should they discover cultural resources during project-related work. Examples of prehistoric resources may include: stone tools and manufacturing debris; milling equipment such as bedrock mortars, portable mortars, and pestles; darkened or stained soils (midden) that may contain dietary remains such as shell and bone; as well as human remains. Historic resources may include: burial plots; structural foundations; mining spoils piles and prospecting pits; cabin pads; and trash scatters consisting of cans with soldered seams or tops, bottles, cut (square) nails, and ceramics. CULT-1b: In the event that unanticipated discoveries of potentially sensitive cultural resources are encountered during the construction period, all activity should cease within 100 feet of the find until a qualified archaeologist or paleontologist, who meets federal criteria under 36 CFR 61, can determine the significance of the find and determine the appropriate mitigation. If the deposits are determined to be non-significant by a qualified archaeologist or paleontologist, avoidance is not necessary. If the deposits are determined to be potentially significant by the qualified archaeologist or paleontologist, the resources shall be avoided if feasible. If avoidance is not feasible, project impacts shall be mitigated in accordance with the recommendations of the archaeologist and paleontologist, in coordination with the County, local tribes, and the CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.4 (b)(3)(C), which requires implementation of a data recovery plan. The data recovery plan shall include provisions for adequately recovering all scientifically consequential information from and about any discovered archaeological or paleontological materials and include recommendations for the treatment of these resources. In-place preservation of the archaeological or paleontological resources is the preferred manner of mitigating potential	LTS

N/A = Not Applicable; NI = No Impact; LTS = Less than Significant; S = Significant; SU = Significant and Unavdoiable

TABLE 1-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Significance without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance with Mitigation
		impacts, as it maintains the relationship between the resource and the archaeological or paleontological context. In-place preservation also reduces the potential for conflicts with the religious or cultural values of groups associated with the resource. Other mitigation options include, but are not limited to, the full or partial removal and curation of the resource. The County shall confirm that the project applicant has retained a qualified archeologist and paleontologist for the preparation and implementation of the data recovery plan. The recovery plan shall be submitted to the project applicant, the County, and the Central California Information Center. A data recovery plan shall not be required for resources that have been deemed by the Central California Information Center as adequately recorded and recovered by studies already completed. Once the recovery plan is reviewed and approved by the County and any appropriate resource recovery completed, project construction activity within the area of the find may resume.	
CULT-2: Ground disturbing activities may result in unanticipated discoveries of archaeological resources.	S	**CULT-2:** Implement Mitigation Measures CULT-1a and CULT-1b.	LTS
CULT-3: Construction activities may result in unanticipated discovery of human remains interred outside of dedicated cemeteries.	S	**CULT-3:** If human remains are encountered during ground-disturbing activities within the project site, the project contractor and/or on-site supervisor shall immediately halt all work within 100 feet of the discovery and the project contractor shall immediately notify the Tuolumne County Coroner (Coroner), and the Tuolumne County Community Development Department. In coordination with the County, the project applicant and contractor shall contact a qualified archaeologist meeting federal criteria under 36 CFR 61 to assess the situation and consult with the appropriate agencies. If the human remains are of Native American origin, the Coroner shall notify the NAHC within 24 hours of this identification. The NAHC will identify a Most Likely Descendant (MLD) to inspect the site and provide recommendations for the proper treatment or disposition, with proper dignity, of the remains and any associated grave goods. Upon completion of the assessment, the qualified archaeologist shall prepare a report documenting the background to the finds and provide recommendations for the treatment of the human remains and any associated cultural materials, as appropriate and in coordination with the recommendations of the MLD.	LTS

N/A = Not Applicable; NI = No Impact; LTS = Less than Significant; S = Significant; SU = Significant and Unavdoiable

TABLE 1-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Significance without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance with Mitigation
		The report shall be submitted to the project applicant, the County, and the Central California Information Center. Once the report is reviewed and approved by the County, and any appropriate treatment completed, project construction activity within the area of the find may resume.	
CULT-4: Implementation of the proposed project may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a TCR, as defined in Public Resources Code Section 21074.	S	CULT-4a: Implement Mitigation Measures CULT-1a and CULT-1b. CULT-4b: Prior to the initiation of any construction activities, the project applicant shall provide one-time site access to a Tuolumne Band representative(s) to remove native plants for the purpose of transplanting them to the Four Seasons Native Plant Nursery on the Tuolumne Rancheria. CULT-4c: The project site plan shall be amended to identify a 50-foot buffer around the top of the knoll (see Figure 4.4-1 of the Draft EIR) as a Me-Wuk Open Space area. This area will be available for quiet enjoyment for the following uses: guest/visitor recreational activities, guest/visitor assembly, and guest/visitor programs. The project developer shall not construct or otherwise place any permanent structures or improvements within the 50-foot buffer. CULT-4d: Prior to the initiation of any construction activities, the project applicant shall provide one-time site access to a Tuolumne Band representative(s) to gather firewood on the project site.	LTS
CULT-5: The project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects, would result in less-than-significant cumulative impacts with respect to cultural resources and Tribal Cultural Resources.	LTS	N/A	N/A
ENERGY			
ENE-1: The project would not result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources during project construction or operation.	LTS	N/A	N/A
ENE-2: The project would not conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency.	LTS	N/A	N/A

N/A = Not Applicable; NI = No Impact; LTS = Less than Significant; S = Significant; SU = Significant and Unavdoiable

TABLE 1-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Significance without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance with Mitigation
ENE-3: The project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects, would result in less-than-significant cumulative impacts with respect to energy conservation and renewable energy.	LTS	N/A	N/A
FORESTRY RESOURCES			
FOR-1: The project would not conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forestland (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code Section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code Section 51104(g)).	NI	N/A	N/A
FOR-2: The project would not result in an adverse effect associated with the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest land.	LTS	N/A	N/A
FOR-3: The project would not involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of forest land to non-forest use.	NI	N/A	N/A
FOR-4: The proposed project would result in less-than-significant cumulative impacts with respect to forestry resources.	LTS	N/A	N/A
GEOLOGY AND SOILS			
GEO-1: The project would not directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury or death involving: i) rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault; ii) strong seismic ground shaking; iii) seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction; iv) landslides, mudslides, or other similar hazards.	LTS	N/A	N/A

N/A = Not Applicable; NI = No Impact; LTS = Less than Significant; S = Significant; SU = Significant and Unavdoiable

TABLE 1-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Significance without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance with Mitigation
GEO-2: The project would not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil.	LTS	N/A	N/A
GEO-3: The project would not be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse.	LTS	N/A	N/A
GEO-4: The project site contains small quantities of expansive soil, as defined by Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), but would not create substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property.	LTS	N/A	N/A
GEO-5: The project would not have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater.	LTS	N/A	N/A
GEO-6: The project would not directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature.	LTS	N/A	N/A
GEO-7: Project impacts are not cumulatively significant with other development projects in the vicinity.	LTS	N/A	N/A
GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS			
GHG-1.1: Construction of the proposed project would result in a net increase in GHG emissions.	S	**GHG -1.1a:** The proposed project shall use electrically powered construction equipment, where feasible. **GHG-1.1b:** The net increase in GHG emissions associated with the Terra Vi Lodge Project could be further reduced by the applicant purchasing carbon credits to offset GHG emissions. Carbon credits, however, are market-based. The availability, amount, and price of carbon credits fluctuate over time. As a result, it is unknown if local carbon credit offsets would be available at the time the project is implemented. Additional carbon credit offsets are available on a statewide or national level. However, even though the impact of GHG emissions is considered to be global in scale, the CEQA legal adequacy of applying statewide or national offsets to individual local projects has been questioned. In addition, while the County considered application of carbon credits to offset GHG emissions due to the proposed project, the	SU

N/A = Not Applicable; NI = No Impact; LTS = Less than Significant; S = Significant; SU = Significant and Unavdoiable

TABLE 1-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Significance without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance with Mitigation
		County General Plan places a higher priority on implementing local mitigation measures before application of offsets. As a result of the unknown availability of local carbon credits, mitigation measures needed to eliminate any net increase in GHG emissions are considered to be not available, application of this mitigation measure is not considered to reduce the GHG emissions impacts of the project to a less-than-significant level, and this impact is considered to be significant and unavoidable.	
GHG-1.2: Operation of the proposed project would result in a net increase in GHG emissions.	S	GHG-1.2a: The proposed project shall use electrically powered landscape equipment during outdoor landscaping and maintenance activities. GHG-1.2b: As noted in the description of Mitigation Measure GHG-1.1b, because of the unknown availability of local carbon credits, mitigation measures needed to eliminate any net increase in GHG emissions are considered to be not available, application of this mitigation measure is not considered to reduce the GHG emissions impacts of the project to a less-than-significant level, and this impact is considered to be significant and unavoidable.	SU
GHG-2: The project would not conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases.	LTS	N/A	N/A
HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS			
HAZ-1: The project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials.	LTS	N/A	N/A
HAZ-2: The project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment.	LTS	N/A	N/A
HAZ-3: The project would not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous materials, substances or waste within ¼-mile of an existing or proposed school.	NI	N/A	N/A
HAZ-4: The project would not be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous material sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a	NI	N/A	N/A

N/A = Not Applicable; NI = No Impact; LTS = Less than Significant; S = Significant; SU = Significant and Unavdoiable

TABLE 1-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Significance without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance with Mitigation
result, create a significant hazard to the public or the environment.			
HAZ-5: Operation of an emergency helipad on the proposed project could result in safety hazard impacts to people working or residing within the project area.	S	HAZ-5: Prior to the start of any helipad operations on the project site, the project shall receive airspace determination approvals from the Federal Aviation Administration, a building permit from the Tuolumne County Building Division, and a Letter of Land Use Consistency from the Tuolumne County Airport Land Use Commission.	LTS
HAZ-6: The project would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.	LTS	N/A	N/A
HAZ-7: The project would not expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires.	LTS	N/A	N/A
HAZ-8: The proposed project would result in less-than-significant cumulative impacts with respect to hazards and hazardous materials.	LTS	N/A	N/A
HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY			
HYD-1: The proposed project may increase post-project runoff thus violating water quality standards.	S	HYD-1a: A Drainage Plan for the site shall be prepared prior to issuance of building permits to address the post-construction requirements of the Statewide Construction General Permit. The Drainage Plan shall specify ~~that specifies~~ how runoff on the site will be managed in order to protect water quality. The plans will include detailed runoff calculations to appropriately size culverts, bridges, retention ponds/areas, and roadside ditches to meet the drainage requirements of the project site. The purpose of the plan will be to prevent the creation of localized on- or off-site flooding and to prevent any negative water quality effects off-site. If necessary, the plan shall be submitted to the Engineering Development Division of the Tuolumne County Public Works Department for review and approval. HYD-1b: Detention and/or retention facilities shall be designed to the satisfaction of the Tuolumne County Engineering Development Department staff and shall be included in the drainage report as described in Mitigation Measure HYD-1. These facilities shall capture surface runoff and retain flows such that the rate of surface runoff does not exceed existing flows. Maintenance of retention facilities shall be required by Tuolumne County.	LTS

N/A = Not Applicable; NI = No Impact; LTS = Less than Significant; S = Significant; SU = Significant and Unavdoiable

TABLE 1-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Significance without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance with Mitigation
HYD-2: The proposed project would not substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin.	LTS	N/A	N/A
HYD-3: The proposed project would increase impervious surfaces and post-project stormwater volumes which could exceed pre-project development volumes thus requiring the expansion of existing stormwater facilities or the construction of new facilities.	S	HYD-3: Implement Mitigation Measures HYD-1a and HYD-1b.	LTS
HYD-4: The proposed site is not located in a 100-year floodplain, dam inundation, tsunami, or seiche zone and would not release pollutants due to inundation from a flood hazard.	NI	N/A	N/A
HYD-5: The proposed project would not obstruct or conflict with the implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan.	LTS	N/A	N/A
HYD-6: The proposed project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects, would result in less-than-significant cumulative impacts with respect to hydrology and water quality.	LTS	N/A	N/A
LAND USE AND PLANNING			
LU-1: The project would not physically divide an established community.	LTS	N/A	N/A
LU-2: The project would not cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.	LTS	N/A	N/A
LU-3: The proposed project would not result in significant cumulative impacts with respect to land use and planning.	LTS	N/A	N/A

N/A = Not Applicable; NI = No Impact; LTS = Less than Significant; S = Significant; SU = Significant and Unavdoiable

TABLE 1-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Significance without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance with Mitigation
NOISE			
NOI-1.1: The project would generate a substantial permanent increase in maintenance yard noise in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or in other applicable local, State, or federal standards.	S	NOI-1.1: In order to satisfy applicable Tuolumne County General Plan daytime and nighttime noise level limits at the nearest existing sensitive use to the project, and subsequently result in maintenance yard noise levels at or below ambient noise conditions at that use, the following noise mitigation measures shall be implemented: ▪ Construct a solid noise barrier measuring ~~8~~ 11 feet in height along the north, east and west sides of the maintenance yard boundary, as depicted in Figure 4.12-2. The barrier could be constructed of either masonry or precast concrete panels. A noise barrier constructed of wood (or wood composite) fence material with overlapping slat construction would also be sufficient. The purpose of overlapping slats and using screws rather than nails is to ensure that prolonged exposure to the elements does not result in visible gaps through the slats which would result in reduced noise barrier effectiveness. ▪ Ensure that the generator selected for the maintenance yard have a reference noise level not to exceed 70 dB at a distance of 50 feet. Depending on the power requirements of the equipment, the implementation of a custom engineered generator enclosure may be required in order to achieve an overall equipment noise level of 70 dB at 50 feet.	LTS
NOI-1.2: The project would generate combined on-site operational noise in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the Tuolumne General Plan daytime and nighttime hourly average noise level standards.	S	NOI-1.2a: To satisfy applicable Tuolumne County General Plan noise level increase criteria at the nearest existing sensitive use to the project, the project shall limit on-site truck deliveries to daytime hours only (7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m.) and limit refuse collection activities to daytime hours only (7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m.). NOI-1.2b: Implement Mitigation Measure NOI-1.1.	LTS
NOI-2: The project would not result in generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels.	LTS	N/A	N/A
NOI-3.1: Noise levels associated with use of the proposed emergency helipad could result in substantial temporary	S	NOI-3.1: ~~While mitigation measures related to flight path design and helipad location could potentially be effective in reducing noise levels at the existing residences nearest to the project emergency helipad, it is also possible that~~	SU

N/A = Not Applicable; NI = No Impact; LTS = Less than Significant; S = Significant; SU = Significant and Unavdoiable

TABLE 1-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Significance without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance with Mitigation
increases in ambient daytime and/or nighttime noise levels at nearby existing sensitive uses.		~~noise exposure associated with the selected flight path could impact other sensitive uses along the route. In addition, due to the nature of the operations associated with the proposed helipad (emergency situations), mitigation measures such as limitations on aircraft models and frequency of flights per day (i.e., number per day and time of day) are generally considered to be infeasible in application. Because there are no identified feasible mitigation measures that would ensure noise levels generated by emergency flight operations at the project emergency helipad would not result in substantial increases in ambient noise levels, this impact is considered to be significant and unavoidable.~~ As part of the design and approvals process for the proposed helipad, the project sponsor shall relocate the helipad to a location on the project site farther from residential buildings, if another feasible location can be identified.	
NOI-3.2: Noise levels associated with use of the proposed emergency helipad could exceed the Tuolumne County General Plan 40 dB L_{max} interior noise level standard within the sensitive interior areas of the proposed development.	S	NOI-3.2a: Window and door assemblies of all lodging within the proposed development should be upgraded to a minimum STC rating of 32. NOI-3.2b: Disclosure statements should be provided to inform guests of the potential for elevated interior noise levels during emergency operations at the helipad, especially during nighttime hours.	LTS
NOI-4: The proposed project would result in a less-than-significant cumulative impact with respect to noise.	LTS	N/A	N/A
POPULATION AND HOUSING			
POP-1: The project would not induce substantial unplanned population growth or growth for which inadequate planning has occurred, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure).	LTS	N/A	N/A
POP-2: The project would not displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.	NI	N/A	N/A

N/A = Not Applicable; NI = No Impact; LTS = Less than Significant; S = Significant; SU = Significant and Unavdoiable

TABLE 1-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Significance without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance with Mitigation
POP-3: The project would not contribute to significant cumulative population and housing impacts.	LTS	N/A	N/A
PUBLIC SERVICES AND RECREATION			
PS-1: The proposed project has the potential to increase demand for fire protection services to the project site. The construction or alteration of fire protection facilities to meet the increase in demand could cause significant environmental impacts.	S	**PS-1:** Prior to issuance of the certificate of occupancy, the project sponsor shall provide trained and certified emergency staff. The project shall provide enough staff to ensure that two emergency staff are on premises and available to respond to emergencies at all times. The emergency staff shall be trained to meet Tuolumne County Fire Department volunteer fire service standards. Staffing may be provided by Terra Vi employees who have completed the required training. The Terra Vi project shall provide personal protection equipment (PPE) and positive communication equipment for all emergency staff. PPE and communication equipment shall be stored in a central, secure location. Communication systems shall permit uninterrupted contact between all firefighters at all times and at all locations on or within the property. In addition, there shall be communication at all times between a fire officer and recognized Emergency Command Center (ECC). All equipment required shall be approved by and become property of Tuolumne County and maintained per manufacturer and National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) standards by the Terra Vi project sponsor.	LTS
PS-2: The proposed project, in combination with cumulative projects, has the potential to increase demand for fire protection services in the service area. The construction or alteration of fire protection facilities to meet the increase in demand could cause significant environmental impacts.	S	**PS-2:** Implement Mitigation Measure PS-1.	LTS
PS-3: The proposed project has the potential to increase demand for police services to the project site. The construction or alteration of police facilities to meet the increase in demand could cause significant environmental impacts.	S	**PS-3:** The Terra Vi Lodge shall include private security personnel on staff (Manager on Duty) to provide security, complaint resolution, and interfaces with law enforcement/emergency personnel in case of an incident, emergency, or evacuation. These personnel shall be on-site 24 hours a day, seven days a week. The security personnel shall make regular rounds of the	LTS

N/A = Not Applicable; NI = No Impact; LTS = Less than Significant; S = Significant; SU = Significant and Unavdoiable

TABLE 1-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Significance without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance with Mitigation
		Terra Vi Lodge and employee housing and report internally any incidences, as well as report to local authorities if the situation warrants it.	
PS-4: The proposed project, in combination with cumulative projects, has the potential to increase demand for police services in the service area. The construction or alteration of police facilities to meet the increase in demand could cause significant environmental impacts.	S	**PS-4:** Implement Mitigation Measure PS-3.	LTS
PS-5: The proposed project would not result in the need for new or physically altered school facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, or other performance objectives.	NI	N/A	N/A
PS-6: The proposed project would not result in cumulative impacts with respect to school services.	NI	N/A	N/A
PS-7: The proposed project would not result in the need for new or physically altered public facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, or other performance objectives.	LTS	N/A	N/A
PS-8: The proposed project would result in less-than-significant cumulative impacts with respect to the construction of other public facilities.	LTS	N/A	N/A
PS-9: The project would not result in the need for new or physically altered park facilities or other recreational facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, or other performance objectives.	LTS	N/A	N/A
PS-10: The project would not increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities, such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated.	LTS	N/A	N/A

N/A = Not Applicable; NI = No Impact; LTS = Less than Significant; S = Significant; SU = Significant and Unavdoiable

TABLE 1-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Significance without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance with Mitigation
PS-11: The project would not include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment.	LTS	N/A	N/A
PS-12: The project, in combination with past, present and reasonably foreseeable projects, would result in less than significant cumulative impacts with respect to parks.	LTS	N/A	N/A
TRANSPORTATION			
TRANS-1.1: The project has the potential to generate transit ridership in excess of available capacity on the YARTS line serving the SR 120 corridor, during the peak usage period (May 27 to September 2).	S	TRANS-1.1: The project applicant shall provide an on-site transit coordinator to coordinate guest transit use to help ensure smooth operations at the project site bus stop. The on-site transit coordinator would also serve as a point of contact between Terra Vi Lodge, YARTS, and the County to assist in identifying and responding to issues related to transit services that may arise at the project site.	LTS
TRANS -1.2: The project would result in construction automobile and truck traffic that accesses the site from SR 120 and, in combination with necessary lane closures, this activity would temporarily disrupt background traffic flow. The project's construction truck traffic could result in deterioration of the condition of Sawmill Mountain Road.	S	TRANS-1.2a: The project applicant or contractor shall prepare a Construction Traffic Control Plan as part of the Caltrans encroachment permit application for all work within the state right of way on SR 120. TRANS-1.2b: Prior to the start of any construction activity on-site or in the SR 120/Sawmill Mountain Road intersection, the applicant shall coordinate with the Tuolumne County Public Works Department for an on-site inspection of Sawmill Mountain Road to assess the road surface conditions. Following completion of project construction, but prior to issuance of an occupancy permit, the applicant shall schedule a post-construction inspection to determine if deterioration of the road surface occurred, and if so, the applicant/contractor shall restore the road to pre-construction conditions.	LTS
TRANS-2: The project would not conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, subdivision (b).	LTS	N/A	N/A

N/A = Not Applicable; NI = No Impact; LTS = Less than Significant; S = Significant; SU = Significant and Unavdoiable

TABLE 1-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Significance without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance with Mitigation
TRANS-3: The site distance for project-generated traffic turning right (westerly) from Sawmill Mountain Road onto SR 120 is 400 feet, which does not meet the minimum site distance requirements of 500 feet.	S	TRANS-3: Construction of the proposed left turn lane from SR 120 to Sawmill Mountain to accommodate project-generated traffic will require cutting the hillside and vegetation removal in conformance with Caltrans standards, which will open the line of ~~site~~ sight to an acceptable distance, as determined by Caltrans. The project sponsor shall obtain encroachment permit approval from Caltrans prior to the start of construction on the proposed project site and shall complete improvements to SR 120 prior to operation of the proposed project.	LTS
TRANS-4: The project would not result in inadequate emergency access.	LTS	N/A	N/A
TRANS-5: The project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects, would not in significant cumulative impacts with respect to transportation and traffic, including mass transit, non-motorized transit.	LTS	N/A	N/A

N/A = Not Applicable; NI = No Impact; LTS = Less than Significant; S = Significant; SU = Significant and Unavdoiable

TABLE 1-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Significance without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance with Mitigation
UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS			
UTIL-1: The proposed project would not require or result in the construction of new water facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which would cause significant environmental effects.	LTS	N/A	N/A
UTIL-2: The proposed project would have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry, and multiple dry years.	LTS	N/A	N/A
UTIL-3: The proposed project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects, would result in less-than-significant cumulative impacts with respect to water service.	LTS	N/A	N/A
UTIL-4: The proposed project would result in the construction of new wastewater treatment facilities, the construction of which would not cause significant environmental effects.	LTS	N/A	N/A
UTIL-5: The proposed project would not connect to the public sewer system and would not impact the wastewater treatment provider.	NI	N/A	N/A
UTIL-6: The proposed project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects would result in less-than-significant cumulative impacts with respect to wastewater service.	LTS	N/A	N/A
UTIL-7: The proposed project would be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the proposed project's solid waste disposal needs.	LTS	N/A	N/A
UTIL-8: The proposed project would comply with federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.	LTS	N/A	N/A

N/A = Not Applicable; NI = No Impact; LTS = Less than Significant; S = Significant; SU = Significant and Unavdoiable

TABLE 1-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Significance without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance with Mitigation
UTIL-9: The proposed project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable development, would not result in significant impacts with respect to solid waste.	LTS	N/A	N/A
UTIL-10: The proposed project would increase post-project runoff and may result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects.	S	UTIL-10: Implement Mitigation Measures HYD-1a and HYD-1b.	LTS
UTIL-11: The proposed project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects, would result in less-than-significant cumulative impacts with respect to stormwater infrastructure.	LTS	N/A	N/A
UTIL-12: The proposed project would not result in a substantial increase in electrical service demands and would not require new energy supply facilities and transmission infrastructure or capacity enhancing alterations to existing facilities.	LTS	N/A	N/A
UTIL-13: The proposed project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects, would result in less-than-significant cumulative impacts with respect to energy conservation.	LTS	N/A	N/A
WILDFIRE			
WF-1: The project would be located in a State Responsibility Area, but it would not substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.	LTS	N/A	N/A
WF-2: The project includes several project features that would address and reduce wildfire hazards. However, project landscaping plans are not consistent with these measures. Therefore, the project has the potential to, due to the increase of people and vehicles on the project site, exacerbate wildfire risks and expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or uncontrolled spread of wildfire.	S	WF-2: Prior to issuance of building permits, the applicant shall submit a Wildland Fire Prevention Plan and Vegetation Management Plan to the Tuolumne County Fire Prevention Bureau for review and approval. The project site plan and landscaping documents shall be revised to conform to the Vegetation Management Plan. These revisions shall include, but are not limited to, the following measures:	LTS

N/A = Not Applicable; NI = No Impact; LTS = Less than Significant; S = Significant; SU = Significant and Unavdoiable

TABLE 1-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Significance without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance with Mitigation
		▪ The perimeter of all structures shall be surrounded by a 5-foot non-combustible zone. ▪ Project landscaping shall be fire resistant, with a planting palette consisting of native hardwoods and other fire-resistant native vegetation. ▪ Landscape plantings shall be installed in a way that strategically staggers placement and planting heights to provide effective screening of the proposed project from adjacent roadways. ▪ Areas within 200 feet of all structures shall be managed as defensible space (in compliance with the California Fire Code and Public Resources Code Section 4291, with vegetative fuels that would produce 2-foot or shorter flames. ▪ The entire project site, including open all undeveloped areas, shall be managed as fire-resistant landscaping that adheres to CAL FIRE's firescaping requirements, with widely spaced trees and shrubs. ▪ Any new plantings in the undeveloped areas of the site shall include a greater proportion of oaks. ▪ Undeveloped areas of the project site shall be managed so that they do not grow back in as high a density as existed before the 2013 Rim Fire. Brush and grass in these areas shall be maintained and managed so that continuous groupings do not exceed 120 square feet in area.	
WF-3: The project would be located in a State Responsibility Area and would require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines, or other utilities) but would not exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment.	LTS	N/A	N/A
WF-4: The project would be located in a State Responsibility Area and would not expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes.	LTS	N/A	N/A
WF-5: The project would not contribute to significant cumulative wildfire impacts.	LTS	N/A	N/A

N/A = Not Applicable; NI = No Impact; LTS = Less than Significant; S = Significant; SU = Significant and Unavdoiable

This page intentionally left blank

2. *Introduction*

Pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines, Chapter 14 California Code of Regulations, Section 15378[a], the Terra Vi Lodge Project is considered a "project" subject to environmental review as its implementation is "an action [undertaken by a public agency] which has the potential for resulting in either a direct physical change in the environment or a reasonably foreseeable indirect physical change in the environment." The assessment in this Final Environmental Impact Report (Final EIR) is intended to inform the County's decision-makers, other responsible agencies, and the public-at-large of the nature of the proposed project and its effect on the environment.

2.1 PROPOSED PROJECT

The proposed project is designed as a hotel lodge comprised of various single, two-, and three-story elements. The building design accommodates a setback, maximizing the distance between taller structures and adjacent residential properties to minimize visibility from both public and private views. Elements of the project include a public market, general lodge with 100 guestrooms, two manager's suites, and multi-purpose uses, indoor and outdoor areas, 26 cabin rooms, as well as five employee apartments with four rooms in each unit, for a total of 20 employee rooms. A total of 40 jobs would be created once the project is operational. Refer to Figure 3-4 in Chapter 3, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, for the proposed project's site plan.

2.2 EIR SCOPE

This Final EIR identifies and analyzes site specific potential impacts of the project which were determined in the Draft EIR. The analysis of the Draft EIR discloses the specific short-term impacts (construction) and long-term impacts (operation) that would occur as a result of project approval and implementation.

2.3 ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW PROCESS

2.3.1 DRAFT EIR

Pursuant to CEQA Section 21080(d)[1] and CEQA Guidelines Section 15063,[2] the County determined that the proposed project could result in potentially significant environmental impacts and that an EIR would be required. In compliance with CEQA Section 21080.4, the County circulated the Notice of Preparation

[1] The CEQA Statute is found at California Public Resources Code, Division 13, Sections 21000 to 21177.

[2] The CEQA Guidelines are found at California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Division 6, Chapter 3, Sections 15000 to 15387.

(NOP) of a Draft EIR for the proposed project to interested agencies and persons on May 2, 2019 for a 30-day review period. Due to a clerical issue, the NOP was reissued and submitted to the Office of Planning and Research State Clearinghouse on November 15, 2019 for an additional 30-day review period. A public Scoping Meeting was held on May 13, 2019 at 6:00 p.m. in the Groveland Community Hall located at 18720 Main Street in the Town of Groveland. The NOP and scoping process solicited comments from responsible and trustee agencies, as well as interested parties regarding the scope of the Draft EIR. Appendix A, Notice of Preparation and Comments on the Notice of Preparation, of the Draft EIR contains the NOP, as well as the comments received by the County in response to the NOP.

The scope of the Draft EIR was established by the County of Tuolumne through the EIR scoping process and includes an analysis of both the proposed project's impacts and cumulative impacts in the following issue areas:

- Aesthetics
- Air Quality
- Biological Resources
- Cultural and Tribal Cultural Resources
- Energy
- Forestry Resources
- Geology and Soils
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Hydrology and Water Quality
- Land Use and Planning
- Noise
- Parks and Recreation
- Population and Housing
- Public Services
- Transportation
- Utilities and Service Systems
- Wildfire
- CEQA-Mandated Assessment Conclusions:
  - Significant Unavoidable Impacts
  - Impacts Found Not To Be Significant
  - Significant Irreversible Changes
  - Growth-Inducing Impacts

The Draft EIR was available for review by the public and interested parties, agencies, and organizations for a 45-day comment period starting on June 16, 2020 and ending on July 30, 2020. During the comment period, the public was invited to submit written comments on the Draft EIR via mail or e-mail to the Tuolumne County Community Development Department.

2.3.2 FINAL EIR

Upon completion of the 45-day review period for the Draft EIR, the County reviewed all comments received and prepared written responses for each comment. These letters are included in Appendix K of this Final EIR. This Final EIR includes written responses for each comment received during the public review period. This Final EIR consists of the Draft EIR, the comments received on the Draft EIR, and the responses to those comments, and describes any changes to the Draft EIR that have resulted from the comments received.

If the Tuolumne County Planning Commission determines that the project may be approved, it will certify this Final EIR and adopt and incorporate into the project all feasible mitigation measures identified in the EIR and may also require other feasible mitigation measures as conditions of approval.

However, the Planning Commission may also find that the project does not satisfy the required findings for approval and decide to reject the project on that basis. In that case, the Planning Commission is not required to certify the Draft EIR.

The decisions regarding the Draft EIR and project approval would be appealable to the Tuolumne County Board of Supervisors, an elected body, which would then decide on both the EIR and project.

2.3.3 MITIGATION MONITORING

Public Resources Code Section 21081.6 requires that the lead agency adopt a monitoring or reporting program for any project for which it has made mitigation findings pursuant to Public Resources Code 21081. Such a program is intended to ensure the implementation of all mitigation measures adopted through the preparation of an EIR. The Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program for the proposed project is included in Appendix R of this Final EIR.

This page is intentionally left blank.

3. Revisions to the Draft EIR

This chapter presents changes to the Draft EIR that resulted from preparation of responses to comments, or from staff-directed changes, including corrections and clarifications. In each case, the page and location on the page in the Draft EIR is presented, followed by the text or graphic revision. Underlined text represents language that has been added to the EIR; text with ~~strikethrough~~ has been deleted from the EIR. The revisions in this chapter do not require recirculation of the Draft EIR because they do not constitute "significant new information" under Section 15088.5 of the CEQA Guidelines. All changes to Draft EIR Table 1-1, Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures, are included in Chapter 1 of this Final EIR.

CHAPTER 1 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The first paragraph on page 1-4 of the Draft EIR is hereby amended as follows:

The proposed project is designed as a hotel lodge comprised of various single, two-, and three-story elements. The building design accommodates a setback, maximizing the distance between taller structures and adjacent residential properties to minimize visibility from both public and private views. Elements of the project include a public market, general lodge with 100 guestrooms, two manager's suites, and multi-purpose uses, indoor and outdoor areas, and seven guest cabins providing 26 guestrooms, as well as five employee apartments with four rooms in each unit, for a total of 20 employee rooms. A total of 40 jobs would be created once the project is operational. The proposed project would develop 18 percent (11.5 acres) of the project site with buildings, roads, and parking. Wastewater would be treated on-site, with excess treated effluent disposed in leach fields on the west side of Sawmill Mountain Road. ~~An additional 1.4 acres would be used for the primary septic system.~~ Refer to Figure 3-4 for the proposed project's site plan. Additional project plans are provided in Appendix B of this Draft EIR.

CHAPTER 2 INTRODUCTION

The second paragraph on page 2-1 of the Draft EIR is hereby amended as follows:

The proposed project is designed as a hotel lodge comprised of various single, two-, and three-story elements. The building design accommodates a setback, maximizing the distance between taller structures and adjacent residential properties to minimize visibility from both public and private views. Elements of the project include a public market, general lodge with 100 guestrooms, two manager's suites, and multi-purpose uses, indoor and outdoor areas, 26 cabin rooms, as well as five employee apartments with four rooms in each unit, for a total of 20 employee rooms. A total of 40 jobs would be created once the project is operational. The proposed project would develop 18 percent (11.5 acres) of the project site with buildings, roads, and parking. Wastewater would be treated on-site, with excess treated effluent disposed in leach fields on the west side of Sawmill Mountain Road. ~~An additional 1.4 acres would be used for the primary septic system.~~ Refer to Figure 3-4 for the proposed project's site plan.

CHAPTER 3 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The last paragraph on page 3-7, continuing onto page 3-8, of the Draft EIR is hereby amended as follows:

The proposed project is designed as a hotel lodge comprised of various single, two-, and three-story elements. The building design accommodates a setback, maximizing the distance between taller structures and adjacent residential properties to minimize visibility from both public and private views. Elements of the project include a public market, general lodge with 100 guestrooms and multi-purpose uses, indoor and outdoor areas, and 26 cabin guestrooms in seven buildings, as well as 5 employee apartments with four rooms in each unit, for a total of 20 employee rooms. A total of 40 jobs would be created once the project is operational. The proposed project would develop 18 percent (11.5 acres) of the project site with buildings, roads, and parking. Wastewater would be treated on-site, with excess treated effluent disposed in leach fields on the west side of Sawmill Mountain Road. ~~An additional 1.4 acres would be used for the primary septic system.~~ Refer to Figure 3-4 for the proposed project's site plan. Additional project plans are provided in Appendix B of this Draft EIR.

The third paragraph on page 3-20 of the Draft EIR is hereby amended as follows:

All landscaping proposed as part of the project would consist of low water-use vegetation. Planted areas would be irrigated with a high efficiency irrigation system in compliance with State and County water efficient landscape regulations. Water used for irrigation would originate from stormwater and ~~greywater~~ recycled water systems that capture and store water on-site for the purpose of irrigation. Subsurface groundwater would not be used for landscape irrigation. All proposed plantings would be native California Species that require minimal water.

The last bulleted item at the top of page 3-23 of the Draft EIR is hereby amended as follows:

- ~~Greywater~~ Recycled water systems for landscape irrigation to eliminate the use of fresh water, and rainwater collection and storage.

The second to last bulleted item at the bottom of page 3-23 of the Draft EIR is hereby amended as follows:

- Vegetation Management. A Vegetation Management Plan that integrates the needs for wildland fire safety would be incorporated into the landscaping documents. The landscape would be designed and maintained in compliance with this Vegetation Management Plan, which would be reviewed and approved by the Tuolumne County Fire Prevention Bureau. The landscape would be irrigated using the ~~greywater~~ recycled water system, which is an additional defense against wildland fire.

The last paragraph on page 3-24, continuing onto page 3-25, of the Draft EIR is hereby amended as follows:

- Wildland Fire Response Support. Development in the county must comply with fire safety standards outlined in Title 15 of the Code of Ordinances. The project proposes construction in compliance with the National Fire Protection Association's fire protection system and would include fire sprinkler and standpipe systems. Suppression systems and site hydrants for fire protection would be provided using

a combination of reclaimed, treated wastewater ~~greywater~~, and potable water storage. Water supply would be provided by a storage system and augmented with wildland fire hoses.

Section 3.3.8.1, Water Supply and Water Conservation, on page 3-26 of the Draft EIR is hereby amended as follows:

The project proposes an on-site public water system that would be developed from two on-site wells that are currently in place. Three monitoring wells have also been installed on-site but are not proposed for use for water supply. Well water is proposed to be treated and stored in water tanks located adjacent to the on-site roadway that ends in a cul-de-sac along on the northern boundary. Treatment of well water may include an on-site treatment unit that would be located next to the proposed water tanks. The determination of whether to include the treatment unit would be dependent on the result of future water quality testing, which would be conducted prior to project completion. As mentioned above, fire suppression systems and site hydrants for fire protection would be provided using a combination of reclaimed, treated ~~greywater~~ wastewater and potable water storage. All water conveyance pipes would be routed under proposed roads to minimize impacts to native ground.

The project proposes to minimize water consumption through the use of ~~grey~~ recycled water systems for landscape irrigation, as well as by using high-efficiency appliances and low-flow plumbing features. It is estimated that the project would generate up to 7,000 gallons of ~~grey~~ recycled water per day for secondary uses such as landscape irrigation. Additionally, the project proposes use of recyclable single-service plates and utensils, which require three times less water for washing and sanitation activities.

Section 3.3.8.2, Wastewater, page 3-26, of the Draft EIR is hereby amended as follows:

The on-site wastewater treatment system (OWTS) would consist of a Micro Membrane Reactor that provides disinfected tertiary treated effluent ~~be divided between five separate wastewater systems sized for 10,000 gallons per day of sewage loading each. Enhanced wastewater system reliability would be provided through duplex pumping equipment. An area has been planned for and set aside for a 100 percent replacement future leach system area~~. The process would include influent screening, an anoxic process for nutrient removal, an aeration zone for activated sludge and membrane filtration, sludge return/wasting, and disinfection. The OWTS would be sized to treat up to 130 percent (23,282 gallon per day) of the proposed project's expected full operating water demand (17,832 gallons per day). The proposed OWTS would also be designed and built to incorporate beneficial uses of recycled water. Recycled water would be used for non-potable indoor uses, on-site landscape irrigation, and fire suppression. Excess treated effluent that is not used for dual-plumbed fixtures, irrigation, or fire suppression purposes would be disposed in leach fields on the west side of Sawmill Mountain Road.

The proposed OWTS would be placed in a building located in the proposed maintenance yard on the west side of Sawmill Mountain Road. The building would consist of a poured-in-place concrete slab, a reinforced concrete block, metal roof trusses, and a galvanized metal roof structure. The building would be fitted with sound-attenuation measures to ensure the operating noise is equal to or less than 65 dB at 3 feet. The power requirements would be served by the proposed emergency generator in the event of a power disruption.

The food service wastewater treatment system would include a technologically advanced ~~aerobic~~ treatment system that would be continuously monitored. Specifically, a microprocessor-controlled treatment system would provide remote telemetry to a qualified service provider for 24-hour wastewater treatment system monitoring.

~~All wastewater would be separated into black water and greywater and treated on-site. The black water would be disposed through the proposed leach system, and the greywater would be treated, stored, and re-used for on-site landscape irrigation.~~ The proposed wastewater treatment and pumping system would be located on the southern border of the project site, between Highway 120 and the proposed fire access road. Surplus ~~greywater~~ treated wastewater would be disposed in the leach field.[13]

CHAPTER 4.1 AESTHETICS

The first full paragraph on page 4.1-26 of the Draft EIR is hereby amended as follows:

The water tanks would be approximately 14 feet at the tallest point and would not block any views. The retaining walls would be 5 feet in height from grade, placed to taper into the landscape, and would be designed to mimic natural materials, thereby not blocking views. All buildings would be located on lower elevations on the western portion of the project site, including the proposed maintenance building in the maintenance yard on the west side of Sawmill Mountain Road. Additionally, the existing coniferous forest surrounding the project site would remain. Mature trees existing on the project site are of heights that currently block the majority of scenic vista views from the project site. Furthermore, the views of the mountains in Stanislaus National Forest from the project site are not recognized by the County or State as scenic viewing locations; that is, a distinct location where people gather with a reasonable expectation of having a view of a scenic resource. Therefore, development of the proposed project would not further block or obstruct public views of scenic vistas from public viewing. Similar views would continue to be visible along the project site.

The first full paragraph on page 4.1-27 of the Draft EIR is hereby amended as follows:

In addition, as discussed in Chapter 4.12, Noise, implementation of Mitigation Measure NOI-1.1 would require construction of a solid noise barrier measuring ~~8~~ 11 feet in height along the north, east, and west sides of the maintenance yard boundary. The barrier could be constructed of either masonry or precast concrete panels. The noise barrier would be located in the area shown on Figure 4.12-2 and would not affect scenic views from roadways. Therefore, Mitigation Measure NOI-1.1 would not result in any secondary impacts to aesthetics or visual resources.

The second paragraph on page 4.1-28, of the Draft EIR is hereby amended as follows:

Development would be situated on 11.5 acres, approximately 18 percent of the project site, for buildings, roads, and parking~~, and an additional 1.4 acres for the primary septic system, totaling 12.9 acres or approximately 20 percent of the project site~~. Excess treated effluent that is not used for dual-plumbed fixtures, irrigation, or fire suppression purposes would be disposed in leach fields on the west side of Sawmill Mountain Road. The remainder of the project site would be in the Open Space Zoning District and be left undeveloped with Sierra mixed-conifer vegetation. While the addition of buildings and associated

roadways and landscaping could represent a change to existing visual character of the project site and its immediate vicinity, the scale of proposed buildings would be consistent with applicable zoning requirements, the placement of buildings would be sited to orient the more intense uses along Highway 120 and away from adjacent residential properties, and landscaping would be designed to enhance and preserve the natural environment and to screen the proposed project.

CHAPTER 4.2 AIR QUALITY

Impact discussion AQ-4 on page 4.2-11, continuing onto page 4.2-12, of the Draft EIR is hereby amended as follows:

Types of facilities typically considered to have objectionable odors include large wastewater treatment plants, compost facilities, landfills, solid waste transfer stations, manufacturing facilities, paint/coating operations (e.g. auto body shops), dairy farms, petroleum refineries, asphalt batch plants, and food manufacturing facilities. Hotels and lodges, like the proposed project, are not associated with foul odors that constitute a public nuisance.

During project-related construction activities, construction equipment exhaust and application of asphalt and architectural coatings would temporarily generate odors. Any construction-related odor emissions would be temporary and intermittent. Winds in the area vary depending on the regional climate and topography and may carry emissions or odors to nearby areas where people are, such as nearby residential areas. Noxious odors would be primarily confined to the immediate vicinity of the construction equipment and would be diluted when carried further away.

The potential for long-term operational project-related odor effects would be primarily related to on-site wastewater facilities. The proposed wastewater system has been developed to serve the entire project buildout~~ with a 100 percent redundancy area being preserved. System reliability would be enhanced by additional redundant mechanical system components. The food service wastewater treatment system would include a technologically advanced treatment system and be continuously monitored. Waste and water detention materials would be separated into black and greywater segments and treated on-site. The black water would be disposed of through an approved leach field system~~. Wastewater from the proposed OWTS would be conveyed to the on-site wastewater treatment system (OWTS). The OWTS would treat wastewater to tertiary standards. The treated wastewater would be ~~greywater is proposed to be treated,~~ stored and re-used for toilets, fire suppression storage, and landscape irrigation uses. Excess treated effluent that is not used for dual-plumbed fixtures, irrigation, or fire suppression purposes would be disposed in leach fields on the west side of Sawmill Mountain Road.~~ Surplus greywater would be disposed of in the leach field system. The wastewater from the project would be divided between five separate wastewater systems sized for less than 10,000 gallons per day of sewage loading each. Dividing the total wastewater volume into smaller packages improves wastewater handling efficiency. Wastewater system reliability would be provided through redundant mechanical wastewater system components. The 100 percent future replacement leach system area has been planned for, and the area has been set aside.~~

Potential odor issues typically result from a combination of the strength of odors coming from a source, the distance to the nearest receptors, and meteorological conditions. A receptor's ability to detect odors varies among individuals and is subjective. Odors are generally a nuisance rather than a health hazard.

Due to the subjective nature of odor, the wide range of variables that could influence the potential for odors, and the variety of odor sources, quantitative analysis to determine the presence and magnitude of substantial odor sources is not possible.

The proposed wastewater treatment system would be located in the proposed maintenance yard building on the west side of Sawmill Mountain Road, and excess effluent would be disposed in leach fields ~~would be~~ located in the northwestern portion of the project site. The proposed OWTS, is a packaged tertiary treatment system incorporating extended aeration to break down the organics in the wastewater treatment process, and extended aeration systems are generally odor free.[2] There are no sensitive receptors within a 500-foot radius of the proposed wastewater treatment system site. ~~The nearest sensitive receptor to this area would be the cabin to the north of the project site, which is approximately 250 feet from the property site boundary. This distance would provide a buffer area in which any subtle odors would dissipate before reaching the nearest home.~~

Proposed wastewater treatment and pumping equipment would be located on the southern side of the proposed hotel outdoor recreation area. At this location, equipment would be located away from the residential properties to the north of the project site.

The proposed wastewater system for the project would conform to the California Plumbing Code, TCAPCD, and Tuolumne County regulations. These regulations have been developed over time, resulting in reliable design principles. Compliance with the California Plumbing Code would ensure that the wastewater system is built to current standards and inspected by the County prior to operation. Compliance with TCAPCD's Rule 205 would ensure that the project does not discharge quantities of air contaminants or materials that cause detriment, nuisance, or annoyance to any considerable number of persons or to the public. Compliance with Tuolumne County Ordinance Code Section 13.08.310 would ensure that the parts of wastewater facilities are maintained in good repair at all times and operated in a manner so as not to cause odors.

Because the wastewater system would conform to established State of California, TCAPCD, and County of Tuolumne regulations, long-term operational project-related odor impacts would be *less than significant*.

[2] United States Environmental Protection Agency, 2000, *Wastewater Technology Fact Sheet Package Plants,* EPA 832-F-00-016, Washington D.C.: Office of Water, https://www3.epa.gov/npdes/pubs/package_plant.pdf, accessed September 24, 2020.

CHAPTER 4.3 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Mitigation Measure BIO-1.8 on page 4.3-38, continuing onto page 4.3-39, of the Draft EIR is hereby amended as follows:

> Mitigation Measure BIO-1.8: Pre-Construction Bird/Raptor Survey. Prior to issuance of grading permits for construction occurring between February 1st and August 30th (e.g., excavation, ground disturbance, or vegetation removal) a preconstruction survey for nesting birds shall be conducted in accordance with the CDFW guidelines and a no-disturbance buffer shall be established, if necessary.

If equipment staging, site preparation, vegetation removal, grading, excavation or other project-related construction activities are scheduled during the avian nesting season (generally February 1 through August 30), a focused survey for active nests would be conducted by a qualified biologist within 15 days prior to the beginning of project-related activities.

Following initial pre-construction surveys in year one of project construction, bird surveys shall be repeated annually so long as outside construction continues. Surveys shall be repeated within 15 days prior to resuming outdoor construction activities for the first time between February 1st and August 30th whenever outdoor construction activities have ceased for more than one month (e.g., if outdoor construction shuts down for the season due to winter rains in late November, preconstruction bird surveys would occur again within 15 days prior to recommencing outdoor sitework between February 1st and August 30th. If work recommences in January and continues without interruption through August 30th, then no additional preconstruction survey is required).

Surveys shall be conducted in all suitable habitat in the BSA. If an active nest is found, the bird shall be identified to species and the approximate distance from the closest work site to the nest estimated. No additional measures need be implemented if active nests are more than the following distances from the nearest work site: (a) 300± feet for raptors unless otherwise specified; (b) 345 feet for spotted owls; or (~~b~~c) 75± feet for other non-special-status bird species. Disturbance of active nests shall be avoided to the extent possible until it is determined that nesting is complete and the young have fledged. For species protected under the California Fish and Game Code (CFGC), if active nests are closer than those distances to the nearest work site and there is the potential for bird disturbance, CDFW shall be contacted for approval to work within 300± feet of raptors, or 75± feet of other non-special-status bird species.

This measure shall be incorporated into the project bid package and contract. Surveys shall occur within 15 days of commencing construction that occurs between February 1st and August 30th.

Mitigation Measure BIO-1.13 on page 4.3-42, continuing onto page 4.3-43, of the Draft EIR is hereby amended as follows:

Mitigation Measure BIO-1.13: Pre-Construction Botanical Survey. Surveys shall occur during the bloom season prior to issuance of grading permits during the bloom period for *Clarkia australis* (May through August) and *Erythranthe filicaulis* (April through August). If found, the location of special-status plant populations shall be clearly identified in the field by staking, flagging, or fencing prior to the commencement of activities that may cause disturbance. A buffer surrounding the populations shall be established by a qualified botanist based on the plant species, its habitat, and the nature of the proposed project activity. No activity shall occur within the buffer area. If sensitive plant species cannot be avoided, transplanting (perennial species), seed collection and dispersal (annual species) may be undertaken by a qualified botanist. If transplanting or seed collection/dispersal is employed, ongoing monitoring for 5 years shall be conducted to assess the effectiveness of mitigation. The performance standard for mitigation is no net reduction in the size or viability of the local plant population. Prior to salvaging plants, written permission shall be obtained from the landowner and CDFW shall be notified 10 days prior to salvage activities or, for emergency situations, CDFW shall be notified within 14 days following salvage activities consistent with the provisions of the California Native Plant Protection Act (California Fish and Game Code Sections 1912 and 1913) and California

Penal Code Section 384a. Salvage shall be in accordance with California Fish and Game Code Sections 1912 and 1913(c) including CDFW notification. The performance standard for this mitigation measure is no net reduction in the size or viability of local sensitive plant populations.

This measure shall be incorporated into the project bid package and contract. Surveys shall occur during the bloom season prior to commencing construction during the bloom period for *Clarkia australis* (May through August) and *Erythranthe filicaulis* (April through August).

CHAPTER 4.4 CULTURAL RESOURCES

Mitigation Measure CULT-4b on page 4.4-15 of the Draft EIR is hereby amended as follows:

Mitigation Measure CULT-4b: Prior to the initiation of any construction activities, the project applicant shall provide one-time site access to a Tuolumne Band representative(s) to remove native plants for the purpose of transplanting them to the Four Seasons Native Plant Nursery on the Tuolumne Rancheria.

The first sentence on page 4.4-17 of the Draft EIR is hereby amended as follows:

Mitigation Measures CULT-1a and CULT-1b would ~~allow for tribal monitoring of ground-disturbing activities~~ require training of construction crews for the identification of cultural resources and would ensure that, in the event that unknown cultural resources are discovered, work is stopped and proper procedures are followed.

CHAPTER 4.5 ENERGY

The last paragraph on page 4.5-8 of the Draft EIR is hereby amended as follows:

The proposed project would involve construction of a hotel and public market as well as associated parking lots, maintenance facilities, utilities, and employee apartments on the project site. Electrical service to the proposed project would be provided by PG&E through connections to existing offsite electrical lines and new on-site infrastructure. The proposed electricity consumption for the project site is shown in Table 4.5-2.

CHAPTER 4.6 FORESTRY RESOURCES

The last paragraph on page 4.6-5 of the Draft EIR is hereby amended as follows:

The owner of the project site entered into a CFIP contract with CAL FIRE in 2015 that preserves the site for forest and timber land uses. The CFIP requires a property owner supply protection, maintenance, and enhancement of a productive and stable forest resource system for the benefit of present and future generations in exchange for providing funds to help complete such improvements and preservation. The proposed project would result in non-compliance with this CFIP contract. ~~However, the agreement expired~~

~~on December 31, 2019, and the~~ The project applicant would be required to refund State funds awarded for the project site, consistent with the request of CAL FIRE. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in the loss or conversion of forest land and impacts would be *less than significant*.

CHAPTER 4.7 GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Impact discussion GEO-5 on page 4.7-11, continuing onto page 4.7-12, of the Draft EIR is hereby amended as follows:

Wastewater generated by the proposed project would be conveyed to an on-site wastewater treatment system (OWTS) located in the proposed maintenance yard building. The proposed OWTS would be designed and built to incorporate beneficial uses of recycled water. Recycled water would be used for non-potable indoor uses, on-site landscape irrigation, and fire suppression. Excess treated wastewater not used for these purposes would be disposed in leach fields on the west side of Sawmill Mountain Road soil. Based on the Soil and Site Evaluation conducted by Tuolumne County Environmental Health, the soils encountered in the proposed leach fields in the northwest corner of the project site are capable of adequately supporting the use of ~~septic tanks or~~ alternative wastewater disposal systems. During the field investigation, a total of eighteen trenches were excavated for obtaining soil descriptions in the area of the proposed leach fields. Soils were described as mostly loam and silt loam, with minor occurrences of sandy loam and silty clay loam also observed. The on-site soils were classified in the Soils Report prepared by Don Myers as good to very good for supporting septic systems. According to Myers, the proposed leach fields for the on-site wastewater system would provide a "more than adequate" area for the system to work as designed. Therefore, the impact would be *less than significant*.

CHAPTER 4.8 GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

The fourth bulleted item on page 4.8-10 of the Draft EIR is hereby amended as follows:

- Use of ~~greywater~~ recycled water for outdoor water uses including landscape irrigation, reducing energy consumption from the treatment and transport of potable water.

CHAPTER 4.10 HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

The first paragraph of impact discussion HYD-1 on page 4.10-8 of the Draft EIR is hereby amended as follows:

Due to the 2013 Rim Fire, the existing site has no mature trees which typically help reduce runoff from a site. The existing site also has no structures and is rural in nature. Of the 64 acres that make up the project site approximately 11.5 acres ~~acers~~, or 18 percent, would be mass graded for the buildings, roads, and parking. Wastewater would be treated on-site, with excess treated effluent disposed in leach fields on the west side of Sawmill Mountain Road. ~~An additional 1.4 acres would be developed for the septic system.~~ The proposed project would affect drainage patterns and increase the overall amount of impervious surfaces, thus creating changes to stormwater flows and water quality.

Mitigation Measure HYD-1a on page 4.10-10 of the Draft EIR is hereby amended as follows:

> **Mitigation Measure HYD-1a:** A Drainage Plan for the site shall be prepared prior to issuance of building permits to address the post-construction requirements of the Statewide Construction General Permit. The Drainage Plan shall specify ~~that specifies~~ how runoff on the site will be managed in order to protect water quality. The plans will include detailed runoff calculations to appropriately size culverts, bridges, retention ponds/areas, and roadside ditches to meet the drainage requirements of the project site. The purpose of the plan will be to prevent the creation of localized on- or off-site flooding and to prevent any negative water quality effects off-site. If necessary, the plan shall be submitted to the Engineering Development Division of the Tuolumne County Public Works Department for review and approval.

The section titled "Wastewater Treatment Plant" in impact discussion HYD-1 on page 4.10-10, continuing onto page 4.10-11, of the Draft EIR is hereby amended as follows:

Wastewater from the proposed project would flow to an OWTS. ~~The wastewater system would be divided between five separate wastewater systems sized for less than 10,000 gallons per day of sewage loading each. An area has been planned for and set aside for a 100 percent replacement future leach system area.~~ The OWTS would consist of a Micro Membrane Reactor that provides disinfected tertiary treated effluent. The process would typically include influent screening, an anoxic process for nutrient removal, an aeration zone for activated sludge and membrane filtration, sludge return/wasting, and disinfection. The system would be sized to treat up to 130 percent (23,282 gallon per day) of the proposed project's expected full operating water demand (17,832 gallons per day). The proposed system would also be designed and built to incorporate beneficial uses of recycled water. Recycled water would be used for non-potable indoor uses, on-site landscape irrigation, and fire suppression. Wastewater would be treated on-site, with excess treated effluent disposed in leach fields on the west side of Sawmill Mountain Road. The proposed OWTS would be located in the proposed maintenance yard building on the west side of Sawmill Mountain Road. The power requirements would be served by the proposed emergency generator in the event of a power disruption.

The food service wastewater treatment system would include a technologically advanced ~~aerobic~~ treatment system that would be continuously monitored. Specifically, a microprocessor-controlled treatment system would provide remote telemetry to a qualified service provider for 24-hour wastewater treatment system monitoring. ~~All wastewater would be separated into black water and greywater and treated on-site. The black water would be disposed through the proposed leach system, and the greywater would be treated, stored, and re-used for on-site landscape irrigation. The proposed wastewater treatment and pumping system would be located on the southern border of the project site, between Highway 120 and the proposed fire access road. Surplus greywater would be disposed in the leach field.~~

The OWTS and leach field would be regulated by the RWQCB pursuant to the SWRQB's General Waste Discharge Requirements for Small Domestic Wastewater Treatment Systems (Order WQ 2014-0153-DWQ). Under these regulations, the project applicant would file a Report of Waste Discharge (ROWD) with the Central Valley RWQCB to obtain coverage under the Waste Discharge Requirements (WDRs). The ROWD would include a technical report that describes the wastewater generation, treatment, storage, and disposal. Upon review of the ROWD, the Central Valley Regional Water Board's Executive Officer

would issue a Notice of Applicability (NOA) when coverage under the General Order has been authorized. The NOA will contain the necessary site-specific monitoring and reporting requirements. Furthermore, the proposed project would comply with the requirements of the Basin Plan including any prohibitions and/or water quality objectives, governing the discharge from the OWTS and leach field. Furthermore, the ~~greywater~~ recycled water system will comply with the WDR and the applicable requirements described in Title 22 of the California Code of Regulations. Compliance with the WDR, the NOA, the Basin Plan, and Title 22 of the California Code of Regulations would reduce impacts to a *less-than-significant* level.

Impact discussion HYD-2 on page 4.10-12, continuing onto page 4.10-13, of the Draft EIR is hereby amended as follows:

The project proposes an on-site water system that would be developed from two on-site wells that are currently in place. The wells are drilled into weathered bedrock and produce water from fractures. The wells would supply the proposed project with ~~16,636~~ 17,832 gallons per day (gpd) that the project is estimated to demand.[13] Well water is proposed to be treated and stored in water tanks located on the northern boundary of the project site, east of the employee housing. Fire suppression systems and site hydrants for fire protection would be provided using a combination of rainwater, treated ~~greywater~~ recycled water, and potable water storage.

To assess groundwater capacity, the two on-site wells were pumped concurrently at a combined constant rate of 53 gallons per minute (76,320 gpd) for 10 days. Water level responses in the wells indicate they produce from the same fracture set. During pumping, water levels were measured in the on-site wells, three monitoring wells along the northern boundary of the project site, and three nearby domestic wells. The Yosemite Under Canvas camping project is proposed on the south side of Highway 120. Two water supply wells and a monitoring well were constructed for the Yosemite Under Canvas project. Pump testing on the project site was conducted during the period when the Yosemite Under Canvas wells were also being tested to ensure that the source capacity assessment would include the potential long-term influences of nearby off-site wells operating at the same time. Furthermore, testing was completed during October at the end of the dry period to maximize stress on the aquifer and provide conservative estimates of available production capacity.[~~13~~14]

The SWRCB requires that water levels recover to within 2 feet of the static water measurement within a time not exceeding the duration of the well pumping test.[~~14~~15] Water levels in the pumping wells on-site recovered in less than eight days after the pumping was shut off. Water levels in all the monitoring wells recovered when the on-site and the nearby wells were not pumping. The SWRCB also stipulates that wells shall be assigned a capacity of no more than 50 percent of the pumping rate established during the 10-day test. Therefore, the well pumping capacity for the site would be 26.5 gallons per minute (gpm), or 38,160 gpd. The proposed project intends to operate the wells in an alternating pattern, with one well idle and the other well pumping. Since the proposed project would require ~~16,636~~ 17,832 gpd, the wells can individually and safely supply the proposed project's water demand.

The project site and Tuolumne County are not within a designated groundwater basin or recharge area. Groundwater withdrawal in the project area is limited and serves the water demand of scattered resort facilities, vacation homes, and some full-time residents. A detailed discussion of groundwater availability for the project, existing development in the area, and future foreseeable development is provided in Chapter 4.16, Utilities and Service Systems.

The project proposes to minimize water consumption through the use of ~~grey~~ recycled water systems for landscape irrigation and the use of low-flow plumbing fixtures, as per the CALGreen building code. Captured rainwater will also be used for other non-potable uses. In addition, return flow from the ~~grey water~~ irrigation system ~~and from the on-site septic system~~ will provide additional recharge to the groundwater aquifer beneath the site.

Therefore, the proposed project would not substantially decrease groundwater or interfere with groundwater recharge, and impacts would be *less than significant*.

[13] Shamim Engineering Consultants, 2020, Water Demand Calculations for Terra Vi Lodge. Dated September 4, 2020.

The first paragraph of impact discussion HYD-3 on page 4.10-13, continuing onto page 4.10-14, of the Draft EIR is hereby amended as follows:

Of the 64 acres that make up the project site approximately 11.5 acres, or 18 percent, would be mass graded for the buildings, roads, and parking. Wastewater would be treated on-site, with excess treated effluent disposed in leach fields on the west side of Sawmill Mountain Road. ~~An additional 1.4 acres would be used for the primary septic system.~~ The increase in impervious surfaces on-site would increase stormwater runoff. The drainage design would detain stormwater on-site during storm events and meter the outflow in order not to exceed the capacity of the existing culvert under Highway 120. Roof drainage and landscape area drains be captured in surface drainage swales which would also be directed to detention areas. Drainage swales and detention areas would be landscaped. Furthermore, the proposed project would implement rainwater collection and storage which further reduces runoff and would not alter the course of a stream or river. In addition, the site is not in a 100-year floodplain or near any surface water bodies that could result in flood flows.

CHAPTER 4.11 LAND USE AND PLANNING

The fourth paragraph on page 4.11-1 of the Draft EIR is hereby amended as follows:

The owner of the project site entered into a CFIP contract with CAL FIRE in 2015. ~~The agreement expired on December 31, 2019, and~~ Because the project would result in non-compliance with the contract, the project applicant would be required to refund State funds awarded for the project site, consistent with the request of CAL FIRE.

Table 4.11-1 on pages 4.11-2 and 4.11-3 of the Draft EIR is hereby amended as follows:

TABLE 4.11-1 PROJECT CONSISTENCY WITH GENERAL PLAN GOALS, POLICIES, AND IMPLEMENTING PROGRAMS PERTAINING TO LAND USE AND PLANNING

Number	Goal/Policy/Implementing Program Text	Consistency Discussion
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AND DESIGN		
Goal 1B	*Minimize conflicts between incompatible land uses.*	

TABLE 4.11-1 PROJECT CONSISTENCY WITH GENERAL PLAN GOALS, POLICIES, AND IMPLEMENTING PROGRAMS PERTAINING TO LAND USE AND PLANNING

Number	Goal/Policy/Implementing Program Text	Consistency Discussion
Policy 1.B.3	Require new commercial development to be designed to minimize the visual impact of parking areas on public roads and on public viewsheds. **Implementing Program 1.B.g:** Require proponents of new commercial development to locate parking areas behind buildings or sufficiently screen them from public roads and public viewsheds, or if locating behind buildings and screening are determined to be infeasible, provide other landscaping or design features to visually enhance the parking areas.	**Consistent.** Project locates parking areas distributed throughout the site which minimizes views of parking areas from Highway 120. All roadways are designed to be screened where possible by berms and landscaping.
Policy 1.B.5	Preserve the existing nighttime environment by limiting the illumination of areas surrounding new development. New lighting that is part of residential, commercial, industrial, or recreational development shall be oriented away from off-site sensitive uses, and shall be hooded, shielded, and located to direct light downward and prevent glare.	**Consistent.** Project would include outdoor lighting for safety and security purposes which would be designed to minimize light spillage by following Dark-Sky influenced design programs. Lighting would be downward positioned, and fully shielded.
Goal 1C	*Promote a jobs-housing balance in the County and encourage new communities to be designed to provide a jobs-housing balance.*	
Policy 1.C.2	Encourage a Countywide jobs-housing balance as some communities in the County are not suited for extensive job-related or residential-related development. **Implementing Program 1.C.a:** Designate adequate land for commercial, recreational, industrial, business park and mixed-use development within and near identified communities that have adequate infrastructure and services.	**Consistent.** Project is consistent with County's zoning and General Plan Land Use designations and would not exceed regional growth projections or necessitate additional housing elsewhere, as discussed in Chapter 4.13, Population and Housing.
Goal 1D	*Encourage development to build facilities that promote the use of alternative transportation systems.*	
Policy 1.D.1	Encourage pedestrian oriented development to reduce the use of motor vehicles. **Implementing Program 1.D.c:** Encourage building site designs that cater to transit riders, pedestrians and cyclists, as well as those arriving by car. Examples of transit, pedestrian and bicycle friendly building site design features include, but are not limited to, segregated entrances, pavement markings and warning and directional signage.	**Consistent.** Project is designed in a way that amenities on-site, and design of walking trails between these amenities, would greatly reduce the use of automobiles on-site. Project would include a proposed Yosemite Area Regional Transit bus stop and would provide day-use parking spots for the public to use transit and travel to Yosemite National Park.

TABLE 4.11-1 PROJECT CONSISTENCY WITH GENERAL PLAN GOALS, POLICIES, AND IMPLEMENTING PROGRAMS PERTAINING TO LAND USE AND PLANNING

Number	Goal/Policy/Implementing Program Text	Consistency Discussion
UTILITIES ELEMENT		
Goal 3E	*Maintain a healthy environment for the citizenry by setting standards for the types and methods of sewage disposal to be used by new development.*	
Policy 3.E.2	Require that proposed development in areas of known or suspected geological limitations to underground sewage disposal either be served by a public sewer system, or successfully demonstrate that on-site underground sewage disposal can be accomplished with no lessening of quality to ground or surface waters.	**Consistent.** As discussed in Chapter 4.7, Geology and Soils, based on the Soil and Site Evaluation conducted by Tuolumne County Environmental Health, the soils encountered in the proposed leach fields in the northwest corner of the project site are capable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems. The soils testing and evaluation demonstrate that on-site sewage disposal can be accomplished with no lessening of quality to ground or surface waters. The proposed OWTS would not change the incorporation of leach fields or location from where soil testing was conducted, but would include a OWTS built to incorporate recycled water, and located in an enclosed building.
Policy 3.E.3	Encourage new industrial and commercial development in areas where a public sewer system is available or require evidence that there is a capability of functioning on a private system without any adverse public health impact.	**Consistent.** As described above, soil testing and evaluation was conducted to conclude that the project site could support on-site wastewater treatment.
Policy 3.E.4	Require development to connect to a public sewer system if it is reasonably available. **Implementing Program 3.E.d:** Continue to allow development to be served by private water and sewage disposal systems provided that they are first approved by the agency having jurisdiction by law.	**Consistent.** Connection to public sewer is not reasonably available at the project site. The proposed project would be required to comply with all applicable regulations pertaining to wastewater treatment and would require approval from Tuolumne County Environmental Health.
WATER SUPPLY ELEMENT		
Goal 14B	*Maximize the efficient use and reuse of water supplies through water conservation, water recycling, and public education.*	
Policy 14.B.2	Increase water conservation efforts to maximize water use efficiency within Tuolumne County through conservation, recycling and education. **Implementing Program 14.B.d:** Encourage water reuse/recycling through the treatment and distribution of treated wastewater by working with new development to identify ways to incorporate reuse/recycling into projects	**Consistent.** The proposed project would incorporate water recycling for non-potable indoor uses, on-site landscape irrigation, and fire suppression.

TABLE 4.11-1 PROJECT CONSISTENCY WITH GENERAL PLAN GOALS, POLICIES, AND IMPLEMENTING PROGRAMS PERTAINING TO LAND USE AND PLANNING

Number	Goal/Policy/Implementing Program Text	Consistency Discussion
NATURAL RESOURCES ELEMENT		
Goal 16A	*Balance property rights with the conservation of the environment and rural character of the County, which contributes to the quality of life of residents, encourages tourism and supports economic development.*	
Policy 16.A.5	Conserve scenic resources, landmarks and the natural landscape. Implementing Program 16.A.i: Provide flexibility in development standards to facilitate the clustering of new development in order to encourage the retention of scenic resources, landmarks and the natural landscape.	Consistent. As discussed in Chapter 4.1, Aesthetics, of this Draft EIR, the project would not conflict with designated landmarks or scenic resources and would include sustainability measures and landscaping to reduce impacts on the natural landscape. Project is consistent with zoning and General Plan Land Use designations and would be required to comply with all development standards.
Policy 16.A.6	Encourage the protection of clusters of native trees and vegetation and outstanding individual native and non-native trees which help define the character of Tuolumne County.	Consistent. Project would include a tree preservation which would preserve the majority of trees on-site and include additional planting of native forest plant species.
Policy 16.B.5	Evaluate and mitigate impacts to biological resources in accordance with the requirements of State and Federal law.	Consistent. Chapter 4-3, Biological Resources, of this Draft EIR includes evaluation of and proposed mitigation measures for biological resources in accordance with applicable regulations.
Policy 16.B.8	Balance the conservation of biological resources with the need to reduce wildland fire hazards. Implementing Program 16.B.p: Encourage vegetation removal for fire protection purposes or as otherwise required by the Tuolumne County Fire Department in the Open Space zoning district or other areas conserved through zoning, provided such vegetation removal is addressed in a management plan and approved following review under the California Environmental Quality Act.	Consistent. Project would maintain much of the existing forested area and native trees, as well as include landscaping of native plant species in developed areas of the site, while following a Vegetation Management Plan which would be reviewed and approved by the Tuolumne County Fire Prevention Bureau to reduce wildland fire hazards.
Policy 16.B.10	Encourage planting of native species or other drought tolerant species. Implementing Program 16.B.10: Encourage the use of native species and other drought tolerant species listed on the Tuolumne County Landscape Guidelines to promote water efficiency and reduce impacts associated with the introduction of exotic species.	Consistent. Project would include replanting of native forest plant species.
Policy 16.C.4	Support educational programs that describe methods of habitat conservation, encourage voluntary efforts to protect and enhance biological resources, provide opportunities for ongoing study by local students, and provide opportunities for recreation and enjoyment by the community.	Consistent. Project would include educational programs to educate staff and guests about sustainability, and methods to increase sustainability on-site. Project would provide recreational amenities on-site such as grass-landscaped fields, a pool and spa, outdoor dining areas, among others, as well as maintenance of existing trails.

Source: County of Tuolumne, 2018, 2018 Tuolumne County General Plan.

CHAPTER 4.12 NOISE

A supplemental noise analysis is hereby added to the EIR and is contained in Appendix L of this Final EIR. The supplemental analysis considers the potential noise effects of the proposed on-site wastewater treatment system.

Table 4.12-4 on page 4.12-5 and Table 4.12-6 on page 4.12-6 of the Draft EIR are hereby amended as shown on the following pages.

The fifth paragraph on page 4.12-8 of the Draft EIR is hereby amended as follows:

Noise-sensitive land uses are generally defined as locations where people reside or where the presence of unwanted sound could adversely affect the primary intended use of the land. Places where people live, sleep, ~~recreate,~~ worship, and study are generally considered to be sensitive to noise because intrusive noise can be disruptive to these activities.

TABLE 4.12-4 MAXIMUM ALLOWABLE NOISE EXPOSURE FOR AIRCRAFT NOISE SOURCES[a]

	Outdoor Activity Areas[b]	Interior Spaces[c]		
			L_{max}, dB[d]	
Land Uses	L_{dn}/CNEL, dB	L_{dn}/CNEL, dB	Day	Night
Residential – Living Areas	55	45	45	45
Residential – Sleeping Areas	55	40	45	40
Transient Lodging[~~d~~e]	60	45	--	40
Hospitals, Nursing Homes[~~e~~f]	60	45	--	40
Churches, Meeting Halls, Office Buildings, Mortuaries	60	45	45	45
Schools, Libraries, Museums	60	45	55	55

Notes: L_{dn} = day-night sound level; CNEL = community noise equivalent level; dB = decibel
a. This table applies to noise exposure levels that result from aircraft. For existing receiving land uses, consideration shall be given to the noise exposure from new aviation-related sources during the design and approval of the new aviation-related project. In the case of existing aviation-related noise sources, projects or consideration of land use changes that lie within the jurisdictional area of the Tuolumne County Airport Land Use Commission which involve noise-sensitive land uses shall address the noise exposure environment and use these standards as thresholds.
b. An outdoor activity area is a location outside of the immediate structure where formal or informal activities are likely to happen. For example, anywhere on an urban residential property could be an outdoor activity area, while the outdoor activity area for a school would be the playground or sporting fields, and for a hospital would be an exterior patio or exercise area. Where the location of the outdoor activity area is unknown, the exterior noise level standard shall be applied to the property line of the receiving land uses.
c. For typical construction methods, the reduction in the noise level from the outside of the structure to the inside is approximately 15 dB. In a high noise environment, special construction techniques may be necessary to reduce the interior noise level to the standard.
d. Lmax refers to the maximum interior noise level. The design Lmax value shall be established as the maximum aircraft noise level which is exceeded by 10 percent of the aircraft noise events occurring during a typical 24- hour day of aircraft operations. In other words, the Lmax value used in the evaluation shall be determined by eliminating the loudest 10 percent of the aircraft events measured during the sample period, which should be a typical 24-hour day.
~~d~~e. Transient lodging are overnight accommodations usually intended for occupancy by tourists or other short-term paying customers, examples include hotels, motels, or homeless shelters. Transient lodging, as used in this case, does not include bed and breakfast establishments which are located in rural areas, campgrounds, or guest ranches.
~~e~~f. These standards only apply to nursing homes or schools that have more than 6 beds or students, respectively.
Source: Tuolumne County, 2018 Tuolumne County General Plan, Noise Element, Table 5.B.

TABLE 4.12-6 SIGNIFICANCE OF CHANGES IN CUMULATIVE NOISE EXPOSURE[a]

Ambient Noise Levels Without Project, L_{dn} or CNEL[b]	Significant Impact if Cumulative Level Increases By:
<60 dB[b]	+5.0 dB or more
60 – 65 dB[c]	+3.0 dB or more
>65 dB	+1.5 dB or more

Notes: L_{dn} = day-night sound level; CNEL = community noise equivalent level; dB = decibel
~~a. This table applies to noise exposure levels as a result of stationary noise sources. For a development project or land use change involving a noise-sensitive land use, the noise from nearby noise sources will be considered during design and approval of the project, or in determining whether the land use change is appropriate. For development projects which may produce noise, land use changes and project review will consider the effects of noise on possible noise-sensitive uses. When considering modification or expansion at a site that already produces noise levels which exceed these standards at noise-sensitive land uses, the modification or expansion shall be reviewed to consider if the proposed action will further raise the existing noise levels received at the noise-sensitive land use(s).~~
~~Noise-sensitive land uses include urban residential land uses, libraries, churches, and hospitals, in addition to nursing homes or schools which have over 6 beds or students, respectively. Transient lodging establishments which are considered noise-sensitive land uses include hotels, motels, or homeless shelters, but not bed and breakfast establishments located in rural areas, campgrounds, or guest ranches.~~
~~b. The sound equivalent level as measured or modeled for a one-hour sample period. The daytime or nighttime value should not be exceeded as determined at the property line of the noise-sensitive land use. When determining the effectiveness of noise mitigation measures, the standards may be applied on the receptor side of noise barriers or other property line noise mitigation measures.~~
~~c. Similar to the hourly Leq, except this level should not be exceeded for any length of time.~~
a. These standards shall be applied when considering the noise impacts from projects that could cause a significant increase in the cumulative noise exposure of existing noise-sensitive land uses. If it is likely that existing noise-sensitive land uses could experience these increases in cumulative noise exposure, as measured in CNEL or Ldn, then an acoustical analysis that meets the requirements of Table 5.A shall be accomplished and the results considered in project design.
b. Ambient noise is defined as the composite of noise from all sources near and far. In this context, the ambient noise level constitutes the normal or existing level of environmental noise at a given location.
Source: Tuolumne County, 2018 Tuolumne County General Plan, Noise Element, Table 5.D.

The last section on page 4.12-15, continuing onto 4.12-16, of the Draft EIR is hereby amended as follows:

Maintenance Landscaping/Yard

The development will contain a maintenance building in a yard that will be located adjacent to an existing Caltrans sand storage building west of Sawmill Mountain Road. The proposed maintenance building would house the on-site wastewater treatment system (OWTS) for the proposed project. Appendix L, Supplemental Noise Analysis, of this EIR contains a detailed analysis of potential noise impacts associated with the OWTS and finds the OWTS would not create any new noise impacts and that therefore no additional mitigation measures would be warranted. As described in more detail in Appendix L, the nearest receivers to the proposed OWTS are receivers 1 and 2, which are located approximately 840 and 680 feet away, respectively, from the maintenance building in which the OWTS would be housed. Based on a reference noise level of 65 dBA at 3 feet (the cited reference noise level including the sound attenuation provided by the proposed maintenance building construction), and assuming standard spherical spreading loss of sound (6 dB decrease per each doubling of distance from a stationary source), OWTS noise levels are predicted to be 16 and 18 dB L_{eq} at receivers 1 and 2, respectively. The predicted equipment noise levels of 16 and 18 dB could be comparable to the sound of a soft whisper at a distance of 5 feet. The day-night average noise level associated with 24-hour operations of WWTP equipment is calculated to be 22 and 24 dB L_{dn} at receivers 1 and 2, respectively. System equipment noise levels would be even less at receivers located farther away (receivers 3-15). The predicted OWTS equipment noise levels of 16-18 dB L_{eq} at the nearest existing noise-sensitive uses (receivers 1 and 2) would satisfy the applicable General Plan daytime and nighttime hourly average noise level standards by a wide margin.

~~IT~~ It is anticipated that the primary noise source associated with maintenance yards include equipment such as circular saws, hammers and nail guns. According to the site plans, the maintenance yard will also include a generator. The project proposes to house the generator within the maintenance/storage building in the proposed maintenance yard; however, this noise analysis provides a conservative analysis by assuming that the generator is unhoused.

The proposed maintenance yard is approximately 700 feet from the nearest existing sensitive use (receiver 1). Table 4.12-10 shows typical noise levels for maintenance equipment. Based on the reference noise levels indicated above, and assuming standard spherical spreading of sound (6 dB decrease per each doubling of distance from source), maintenance yard operations noise exposure at receiver 1 located 700 feet away would be up to 57 dB Leq and 57 dB Lmax. This could exceed ambient daytime and nighttime noise levels at the nearest sensitive receptor, resulting in a *significant* impact.

Mitigation Measure NOI-1.1: In order to satisfy applicable Tuolumne County General Plan daytime and nighttime noise level limits at the nearest existing sensitive use to the project, and subsequently result in maintenance yard noise levels at or below ambient noise conditions at that use, the following noise mitigation measures shall be implemented:

- Construct a solid noise barrier measuring ~~8~~ 11 feet in height along the north, east and west sides of the maintenance yard boundary, as depicted in Figure 4.12-2. The barrier could be constructed of either masonry or precast concrete panels. A noise barrier constructed of wood (or wood composite) fence material with overlapping slat construction would also be sufficient. The purpose of overlapping slats and using screws rather than nails is to ensure that prolonged exposure to the elements does not result in visible gaps through the slats which would result in reduced noise barrier effectiveness.
- Ensure that the generator selected for the maintenance yard have a reference noise level not to exceed 70 dB at a distance of 50 feet. Depending on the power requirements of the equipment, the implementation of a custom engineered generator enclosure may be required in order to achieve an overall equipment noise level of 70 dB at 50 feet.

Significance with Mitigation: Less than significant. Table ~~4.12-11~~ 11 in Appendix L, Supplemental Noise Analysis, of this EIR, shows the predicted mitigated noise levels.

The highest predicted equipment noise levels of ~~38~~ 35 dB L_{eq} and ~~41~~ 38 dB L_{max} are below mean measured daytime ambient noise levels within the vicinity of the nearest sensitive use (site LT-2). In addition, the highest predicted mitigated equipment noise level of ~~41~~ 38 dB L_{max} is below the mean measured nighttime maximum noise level at site LT-2. Lastly, the highest predicted mitigated equipment noise level of ~~38~~ 35 dB L_{eq} would ~~exceed~~ equal the mean measured nighttime ambient noise level at site LT-2 ~~by 3 dB~~ of 35 dB – which would ~~be below~~ therefore not exceed the applicable Tuolumne County General Plan cumulative noise level increase criterion of 5 dB.

Mitigation Measure NOI-1.2 on page 4.12-19 of the Draft EIR is hereby amended as follows:

Impact NOI-1.2: The project would generate combined on-site operational noise in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the Tuolumne General Plan daytime and nighttime hourly average noise level standards.

Mitigation Measure NOI-1.2a: To satisfy applicable Tuolumne County General Plan noise level increase criteria at the nearest existing sensitive use to the project, the project shall limit on-site truck deliveries to daytime hours only (7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m.) and limit refuse collection activities to daytime hours only (7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m.).

Mitigation Measure NOI-1.2b: Implement Mitigation Measure NOI-1.1.

Significance with Mitigation: Less than significant. ~~Table 4.12-13~~ Tables 17 to 20 in Appendix L, Supplemental Noise Analysis, of this EIR, show~~s~~ the predicted mitigated noise levels from implementation of Mitigation Measures NOI-1.2a and NOI-1.2b ~~NOI-1.1. Combined project noise levels from normal on-site operations after implementation of this mitigation measure are predicted to be 38 dB Leq and 49 dB Lmax at the nearest sensitive receiver, for which the cumulative increase in ambient noise levels would be less than the General Plan cumulative noise level increase criterion of 5 dB~~. The data in Tables 17-20 indicate that after implementation of these mitigation measures, combined project noise levels from normal on-site operations are predicted to result in an increase of no more than 4 dB relative to ambient conditions, which is below the applicable General Plan cumulative noise level increase criterion of 5 dB.

Mitigation Measure NOI-3.1 on page 4.12-23, continuing onto page 4.12-24, of the Draft EIR is hereby amended as follows:

Mitigation Measure NOI-3.1: ~~While mitigation measures related to flight path design and helipad location could potentially be effective in reducing noise levels at the existing residences nearest to the project emergency helipad, it is also possible that noise exposure associated with the selected flight path could impact other sensitive uses along the route. In addition, due to the nature of the operations associated with the proposed helipad (emergency situations), mitigation measures such as limitations on aircraft models and frequency of flights per day (i.e., number per day and time of day) are generally considered to be infeasible in application. Because there are no identified feasible mitigation measures that would ensure noise levels generated by emergency flight operations at the project emergency helipad would not result in substantial increases in ambient noise levels, this impact is considered to be significant and unavoidable.~~ As part of the design and approvals process for the proposed helipad, the project sponsor shall relocate the helipad to a location on the project site farther from residential buildings, if another feasible location can be identified.

Significance with Mitigation: Significant and unavoidable. The project applicant has identified a potential alternate helipad location west of Sawmill Mountain Road, but closer to the intersection of Sawmill Mountain Road with Highway 120 (see Figure 5-1 of this Final EIR), in order to locate the helipad further from residential properties. The feasibility of this alternate location would be determined through the design and approvals process for the helipad, including input from permitting agencies. While mitigation measures related to flight path design and helipad location could

potentially be effective in reducing noise levels at the existing residences nearest to the project emergency helipad, it is also possible that noise exposure associated with the selected flight path could impact other sensitive uses along the route. In addition, due to the nature of the operations associated with the proposed helipad (emergency situations), mitigation measures such as limitations on aircraft models and frequency of flights per day (i.e., number per day and time of day) are generally considered to be infeasible in application. Because there are no identified feasible mitigation measures that would ensure noise levels generated by emergency flight operations at the project emergency helipad would not result in substantial increases in ambient noise levels, this impact is considered to be significant and unavoidable.

CHAPTER 4.14 PUBLIC SERVICES, PARKS, AND RECREATION

The last paragraph on page 4.14-3, continuing onto page 4.14-4, of the Draft EIR is hereby amended as follows:

Fire protection services are provided through a multi-jurisdiction effort by the Groveland Community Services District (GCSD), Tuolumne County Fire Department (TCFD), CAL FIRE, and the United States Forest Service (USFS). The closest staffed fire station to the proposed project site is the Groveland Community Services District (CSD) station, located at 18930 Main Street, in Groveland. This station is approximately 17

miles from the proposed project site, which translates to an approximately 22-minute drive time with no traffic. The project site is technically located within the primary response area of the Tuolumne County Fire Department, whose closest station that is staffed full-time is Station 76 at 18249 4th Street in Jamestown, a 40-mile drive to the northeast, which takes approximately 57 minutes. The closest Tuolumne County volunteer fire station is located at 13785 Highway 120 in Chinese Camp, a 34-mile drive to the east, which would take about 47 minutes. The closest CAL FIRE station is located at ~~11300~~ 11700 Merrell Road in Groveland, which primarily responds to fire suppression calls in the SRA. This station is further from the project site than the GCSD, and therefore it is assumed that it would not be the first-in station for most incidents at the project site. The Merrell Road station is an Amador station. An Amador station is a CALFIRE fire station, with CALFIRE staff and equipment. The cost of running the station is borne by the State during fire season. During the winter months, GCSD is charged for providing the service.

CHAPTER 4.15 TRANSPORTATION

Mitigation Measure TRANS-3 on page 4.15-21 of the Draft EIR is hereby amended as follows:

Mitigation Measure TRANS-3: Construction of the proposed left turn lane from SR 120 to Sawmill Mountain to accommodate project-generated traffic will require cutting the hillside and vegetation removal in conformance with Caltrans standards, which will open the line of ~~site~~ sight to an acceptable distance, as determined by Caltrans. The project sponsor shall obtain encroachment permit approval from Caltrans prior to the start of construction on the proposed project site and shall complete improvements to SR 120 prior to operation of the proposed project.

CHAPTER 4.16 UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Impact discussion UTIL-1 on page 4.16-4, continuing onto page 4.16-5, of the Draft EIR is hereby amended as follows:

The project proposes an on-site public water system that would be developed from two on-site wells that are currently in place. One well at a time would be pumped at a rate of 26.5 gallons/minute (gpm) to meet the estimated daily water demand of approximately ~~16,636~~ 17,832 gallons per day (gpd). The pumped groundwater would be treated and stored in two 60,000-gallon water tanks located along the northern boundary of the project site, just east of the employee housing. Non-potable water needs would be met by using captured rainwater and recycled water ~~treated grey water~~, which will be stored in a 60,000-gallon tank next to the potable water tanks. Fire suppression systems and site hydrants for fire protection would be provided using a combination of reclaimed~~, treated greywater,~~ and potable water storage.

The project proposes to minimize water consumption through the following measures:

- Low low-flow plumbing fixtures, high efficiency equipment such as washers, dryers, and dishwashers.
- Education programs to educate hotel staff and guests about sustainability. Staff would be trained on how to reduce solid waste disposal, food waste generation, and water consumption. Guests would also be encouraged to reduce their water consumption and waste generation. Below are examples of the conservation programs the hotel would implement:
  - Reduced frequency of housekeeping: the hotel would educate the guests on the impacts of servicing the rooms less often and the importance of reusing towels and linens.
  - Guest room water usage monitoring: the hotel will incorporate water flow technology to provide guests real time information on water usage per room. Guests will be educated on water usage and impacts on the environment.
  - On-site water treatment and storage to reduce the use of potable water consumption.
  - ~~Grey water~~ Recycled systems for landscape irrigation.
  - Rainwater collection and storage.

As indicated under impact discussion HYD-2 in Chapter 4.10, Hydrology and Water Quality, a groundwater capacity assessment was conducted in October 2019. The two on-site wells were pumped concurrently at a combined constant rate of 53 gpm for 10 days and water level responses were measured in the two on-site pumping wells, three monitoring wells on the northern edge of the project site, and three nearby domestic wells. (See Figure 4.16-1.) The assessment found that the wells met the requirements of the SWRCB for capacity testing of a new water source, and that each well can be pumped safely at a rate of 26.5 gpm, or 38,160 gpd. The proposed project intends to operate the wells in an alternating pattern, with one well pumping and the other well on standby. Since the water demand for the proposed project would be ~~16,636~~ 17,832 gpd, each well can individually supply the proposed project's demand.

Therefore, the proposed project would not result in the construction of new water treatment or distribution facilities and the impact would be *less than significant*.

The first paragraph of impact discussion UTIL-2 on page 4.16-5 of the Draft EIR is hereby amended as follows:

The potable water demand for the proposed project was calculated at ~~16,636~~ 17,832 gpd (approximately ~~11.4~~ 12.4 gpm), with the installation of water efficient plumbing fixtures as per the CALGreen building standards code.[4] A 10-day pumping test was conducted by GeoScience using the two on-site groundwater wells to determine if there would be sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and the surrounding community during normal, dry, and multiple dry years.

[4] Shamim Engineering Consultants, 2020, Water Demand Calculations for Terra Vi Lodge. Dated ~~February 11~~ September 4, 2020.

The first full paragraph on page 4.16-8 of the Draft EIR is hereby amended as follows:

Furthermore, non-potable water needs would be met using captured rainwater and treated ~~grey~~ recycled water to irrigate a landscaped area of approximately 98,440 square feet.6 Irrigated areas would be located around vehicle entry and drop-off, the active-use outdoor amenity areas, and the areas immediately surrounding the buildings. The California DWR's Water Budget Workbook was used to calculate the maximum allowed irrigation water allowance for compliance with MWELO and CalGreen standards. The landscaped area for the proposed project is specified as being a special landscape area in the workbook since it would be irrigated by reclaimed water. The effective precipitation is specified as being 36.5 inches per year. The maximum allowable outdoor water demand for the proposed project is approximately 5,396 gpd. Outdoor water demand would be supplied by the ~~grey~~ recycled water system on-site. This system has a capacity of 7,000 gpd and can therefore accommodate the irrigation water demand for the proposed project. In addition, return flow from the ~~grey~~ recycled water irrigation system and from the on-site ~~septic system~~ leach fields will provide additional recharge to the groundwater aquifer beneath the site.

Impact UTIL-4 on page 4.16-11 of the Draft EIR is hereby amended as follows:

Wastewater generated by the proposed project would be conveyed to an on-site wastewater treatment system (OWTS) located in the proposed maintenance yard building. The OWTS would treat wastewater to tertiary standards and would be designed and built to incorporate beneficial uses of recycled water. Recycled water would be used for non-potable indoor, on-site landscape irrigation, and fire suppression. Wastewater would be treated on-site, with excess treated effluent disposed in leach fields on the west side of Sawmill Mountain Road. ~~Wastewater from the proposed project would flow to an on-site wastewater treatment system. The wastewater system would be divided between five separate wastewater systems sized for less than 10,000 gpd of sewage loading each. An area has been planned for and set aside for a 100 percent replacement future leach system area.~~ The food service wastewater treatment system would include a technologically advanced ~~aerobic~~ treatment system that would be continuously monitored. Specifically, a microprocessor controlled treatment system would provide remote telemetry to a qualified service provider for 24-hour wastewater treatment system monitoring. ~~All wastewater would be separated into black water and greywater and treated on-site. The black water would be disposed through the proposed leach system, and the greywater would be treated, stored, and re-used for on-site landscape irrigation. The proposed wastewater treatment and pumping system would be located on the southern border of the project site, between Highway 120 and the proposed fire access road. Surplus greywater would be disposed in the leach field.~~

The construction-related impacts associated with these improvements are analyzed throughout this Draft EIR ~~DEIR~~. Impacts to water quality from the leach fields ~~is~~ are addressed in Chapter 4.10, Hydrology and Water Quality. Furthermore, plumbing on-site would be installed in accordance with the California Plumbing Code and construction of the ~~on-site wastewater treatment system (~~OWTS~~)~~ and leach field would be regulated by the Central Valley RWQCB pursuant to the SWRQB's General Waste Discharge Requirements for Small Domestic Wastewater Treatment Systems (Order WQ 2014-0153-DWQ). The project applicant shall file a Report of Waste Discharge (ROWD) with the Central Valley RWQCB to obtain coverage under the Waste Discharge Requirements (WDRs). The ROWD shall include a technical report that describes the wastewater generation, treatment, storage, and disposal. Upon review of the ROWD, the Central Valley Regional Water Board's Executive Officer will issue a Notice of Applicability (NOA) when coverage under the General Order has been authorized. The NOA will contain the necessary site-specific monitoring and reporting requirements. Furthermore, the proposed project would comply with the requirements of the Basin Plan including any prohibitions and/or water quality objectives, governing the discharge from the OWTS and leach field. Upon implementation of these regulatory requirements the impact would be less than significant.

Impact UTIL-10 on page 4.16-22 of the Draft EIR is hereby amended as follows:

Of the 64 acres that make up the project site approximately 11.5 acres, or 18 percent, would be mass graded for the buildings, roads, and parking. Wastewater would be treated on-site, with excess treated effluent disposed in leach fields on the west side of Sawmill Mountain Road. ~~The area affected by the installation of the primary septic system is an additional 1.4 acres.~~ The increase in impervious surfaces on-site would increase stormwater runoff. The drainage design would detain stormwater on-site during storm events and meter the outflow in order not to exceed the capacity of the existing culvert under Highway 120. Roof drainage and landscape area drains would direct stormwater underground to detention areas. Sheet flow from roads and parking areas would be captured in surface drainage swales which would also be directed to detention areas. Drainage swales and detention areas would be landscaped. Furthermore, the proposed project would implement rainwater collection and storage which further reduces runoff.

CHAPTER 4.17 WILDFIRE

The third paragraph on page 4.17-28 of the Draft EIR is hereby amended as follows:

Although the project site is largely composed of conifer forests, the proposed project would introduce management activities on the project site that would reduce wildfire hazards from on-site vegetation characteristics. As discussed in Chapter 3, Project Description, of this Draft EIR, the proposed project would develop a Vegetation Management Plan that would, in part, address irrigated landscaping, a ~~greywater~~ recycled water system, and additional defenses against wildland fires. The undeveloped areas of the project site and defensible space zone would be designed and maintained in compliance with the Vegetation Management Plan.

The third paragraph on page 4.17-31 of the Draft EIR is hereby amended as follows:

The undeveloped and landscaped areas of the project site would be designed and maintained in compliance with County-reviewed and-approved Vegetation Management Plan. The proposed project

would integrate the needs for wildland fire safety, and the landscape would be irrigated using a ~~greywater~~ recycled water system, which would provide an additional defense against wildland fires. Additionally, the proposed project would be required to comply with Tuolumne County General Plan Policy 17.E.8 and Implementation Program 17.E.t, which require property owners to maintain wildlands in a fire resistant manner and remove dead or diseased trees pursuant to California PRC Section 4291. As shown in Figure 3-13, the Landscape Zone will include areas that will be irrigated using the ~~greywater~~ recycled water system, which is an additional defense against wildland fire. The potential environmental impacts associated with future construction on the project site, including roadway and trail construction, are evaluated in Chapter 4.3, Air Quality, Chapter 4.8, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Chapter 4.12, Noise, and Chapter 4.16, Transportation and Traffic, of this Draft EIR.

CHAPTER 6 ALTERNATIVES

The last paragraph on page 6-17 of the Draft EIR is hereby amended as follows:

Site-specific study of the alternate site would need to be conducted to ensure adequate water supply and pressure, and adequate capacity for wastewater treatment, however these issues could be addressed through payment of service impact fees in addition to the ongoing property tax assessments. Unlike the proposed project, this alternative would utilize water provided by GCSD, instead of water pumped from on-site wells. The GCSD obtains all of its water from the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission's Hetch Hetchy Reservoir, which originates from snowmelt in the High Sierra.2 It is assumed that this alternative would include rainwater collection and ~~grey~~ recycled water systems for irrigation, like the proposed project.

The first paragraph on page 6-18 of the Draft EIR is hereby amended as follows:

This alternative would utilize sewer utilities provided by GCSD, instead of an on-site ~~septic~~ wastewater treatment system. The GCSD's wastewater treatment system provides collection for approximately 1,500 residents of Groveland and Big Oak Flat communities, and includes 16 sewage lift stations, 35 miles of gravity mains, seven miles of force mains, a recycled water treatment plant, two surface storage reservoirs, and approximately 15 acres of spray fields.

Section 6.5.3, Reduced Footprint Alternative, on page 6-19 of the Draft EIR is hereby amended as follows:

Under this alternative, the project would be redesigned to reduce the development footprint and overall size of the project. The employee apartments and guest cabins located on the northeast section of the developed area would not be constructed and these areas would be left in their existing condition. Removing these two development areas would reduce the area of development by 5 acres. The size of the main lodge building size would be the same as under the proposed project, but the employee apartments and guest cabins rooms located on the northeast section of the developed area would not be constructed. This would reduce the developed area by 5 acres. The main lodge would include 10 employee suites, resulting in a reduction of 10 guest rooms for a total of 90. This alternative assumes that the project's main lodge would accommodate up to 360 guests, compared to 400 guests, and 35 staff, compared to 40, with 10 staff living on-site, compared to 22. The main lodge would provide the same facilities as under the proposed project, including recreational facilities, a public market, and other guest amenities.

Access to the site would be provided by the same two entrances off of Sawmill Mountain Road as under the proposed project. It is estimated that the Reduced Footprint Alternative would generate approximately 170 fewer net new daily trips than the proposed project, which is an approximately 15 percent reduction in net new trips. The alternative would include the YARTS stop included in the proposed project. This alternative would not include the proposed emergency helipad, but it would include the fire access road off of Highway 120 that is included in the proposed project.

Water storage tanks would be included in the same location as under the proposed project and would be accessed by the internal roadway planned along the northern portion of the project site, including the proposed cul-de-sac. This alternative would include the maintenance yard on the west side of Sawmill Mountain Road. All other areas of the project site would remain undeveloped, with the exception of the ~~septic~~ leach fields, well, and propane facilities included in the proposed project.

The landscaping plan would be the same as under the proposed project, with the exception that the employee housing and cabin areas would be left in their existing, undeveloped state.

Section 6.5.3.16, Utilities and Service Systems, on page 6-24, continuing onto page 6-25, of the Draft EIR is hereby amended as follows:

As described in Sections 6.5.1.16 and 6.5.2.16, the proposed project would result in a significant-but mitigable impact associated with post-project runoff and creation of new stormwater drainage facilities. Under the Reduced Footprint Alternative, the project would require utilities to service a smaller developed area, with reduced employee and guest numbers. Water would still be supplied by two on-site wells, and wastewater would be treated with an on-site ~~septic~~ wastewater treatment system. Construction and operational solid waste would still represent an insignificant amount compared to the daily throughput capacity of the landfill. In addition, the project would utilize the same energy supply facilities and transmission infrastructure without requiring off-site modifications to these utilities. While the Reduced Footprint Alternative would result in less impermeable surfaces than the proposed project, it would still implement the addition of impermeable surfaces on currently undeveloped land. As with the proposed project this would potentially still require further mitigation to ensure post-project stormwater volumes do not exceed pre-project development volumes. Nonetheless, the reduction in the amount of impervious surfaces and in the amount of people and space using utilities would result in slightly lessened impacts regarding utilities and service systems under the Reduced Footprint Alternative.

The third paragraph on page 6-28 of the Draft EIR is hereby amended as follows:

This alternative would meet the project objectives related to building materials, wildfire prevention measures, lighting design, parking supply, and provision of a YARTS stop. It would also involve the same water source and ~~septic~~ wastewater treatment design.

This page intentionally left blank

4. List of Commenters

Comments on the Draft EIR were received from the following agencies, organizations, and individuals. Letters are arranged by category, name, and date received. Each comment letter has been assigned a number, as indicated below. These letters are included in and responded to in Table 5-4 of this Final EIR. Comments are presented in their original format in Appendix K, along with annotations that identify each individual comment number.

4.1 COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT EIR

4.1.1 GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES

GOV1 State of California Office of Planning and Research State Clearinghouse, Meng Heu, June 15, 2020
GOV2 Groveland Community Services District, Peter J. Kampa, General Manager, July 17, 2020
GOV3 Caltrans, Kevin Shroder, Interim Office Chief, July 30, 2020
GOV4 Groveland Community Services District, Peter J. Kampa, General Manager, July 30, 2020
GOV5 Groveland Community Services District, Peter J. Kampa, General Manager, July 30, 2020
GOV6 Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board, Nicholas White, Water Resource Control Engineer, July 31, 2020
GOV7 Caltrans, Alan Roberts, Encroachment Permit Staff, July 31, 2020
GOV8 Caltrans, Kevin Schroder, Acting Branch Office Chief, August 26, 2020

4.1.2 NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS AND PRIVATE COMPANIES

ORG1 Central Sierra Environmental Resource Center, John Buckley, Executive Director, July 10, 2020
ORG2 Tuolumne Group of the Sierra Club, Dr. Kevin Rice, PhD, Conservation Chair, July 13, 2020
ORG3 Central Sierra Environmental Resource Center, John Buckley, Executive Director, July 15, 2020
ORG4 Shute, Mihaly & Weinberger LLP, Ellison Folk, July 20, 2020
ORG5 Tuolumne Group of the Sierra Club, Dr. Kevin Rice, PhD, Conservation Chair, July 26, 2020
ORG6 Shute, Mihaly & Weinberger LLP, Laurel Impett, Urban Planner, July 29, 2020
ORG7 Condor Earth, Dolly Babcock, July 30, 2020
ORG8 Central Sierra Environmental Resource Center, John Buckley, Executive Director, July 30, 2020
ORG9 Evergreen Lodge, Rush Creek Lodge, Yosemite, Lee Zimmerman, July 30, 2020
ORG10 Tuolumne County Alliance for Resources & Environment, Inc., Melinda Fleming, Executive Director, July 30, 2020
ORG11 Shute, Mihaly & Weinberger LLP, Laurel Impett, Urban Planner, September 16, 2020

4.1.3 MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

PUB1 Jenny Pfeiffer, July 3, 2020
PUB2 Joann Pfeiffer, July 7, 2020
PUB3 Joann Pfeiffer, July 7, 2020
PUB4 Kathy Seaton, July 7, 2020
PUB5 Cindy Charles, July 10, 2020
PUB6 Dan Courtney, July 10, 2020
PUB7 Matthew Chapman, July 11, 2020
PUB8 Tim Hutchins, July 11, 2020
PUB9 Nancy Constantino, July 12, 2020
PUB10 Sam and Helen Flanery, July 13, 2020
PUB11 Layne Hackett, July 13, 2020
PUB12 Sam and Helen Flanery, July 14, 2020
PUB13 Matthew R. Moore, July 14, 2020
PUB14 Geoff Dowd, July 15, 2020
PUB15 Ellie Owen, July 15, 2020
PUB16 Jenny Pfeiffer, July 15, 2020
PUB17 Jenny Pfeiffer, July 15, 2020
PUB18 Jill Oringer, July 16, 2020
PUB19 Michael B. Allen, Esq., July 17, 2020
PUB20 Suzanne Ctibor, July 17, 2020
PUB21 Sam Flanery, July 18, 2020
PUB22 Denise Flanery Kraft, July 18, 2020
PUB23 Linda King, July 18, 2020
PUB24 Christina Kraft, July 18, 2020
PUB25 Dennis Kraft, July 18, 2020
PUB26 Beth Martin, July 18, 2020
PUB27 Kathleen M. and Donald P. Brown, July 19, 2020
PUB28 Tim Hutchins, July 19, 2020
PUB29 Charles Kraft, July 19, 2020
PUB30 Samantha Wiedemann, July 19, 2020
PUB31 Zachary Wiedemann, July 19, 2020
PUB32 Dan Courtney, July 20, 2020
PUB33 Dan Courtney, July 20, 2020
PUB34 Brewer Dennis, July 20, 2020
PUB35 Sam Flanery, July 20, 2020
PUB36 Sam Flanery, July 20, 2020
PUB37 Denise Flanery Kraft, July 20, 2020
PUB38 Keith Martin, July 20, 2020
PUB39 Bill McMahon, July 20, 2020
PUB40 Bill McMahon, July 20, 2020
PUB41 Zachary Wiedemann, July 20, 2020
PUB42 Sharon Coolidge, July 20, 2020

PUB43 Tom Coolidge, July 24, 2020
PUB44 Lee Zimmerman, July 24, 2020
PUB45 Angie Norquist, July 26, 2020
PUB46 Jayne Muraki Rasmussen, July 26, 2020
PUB47 Peter Williams, July 26, 2020
PUB48 David A. George, July 27, 2020
PUB49 Ron & Joy Lopez, July 27, 2020
PUB50 Jan Torpy, July 27, 2020
PUB51 Robert Asquith, July 28, 2020
PUB52 Mary Lou Bailey, July 28, 2020
PUB53 Constance C. Brown, July 28, 2020
PUB54 Wendy Francis, July 28, 2020
PUB55 Georgia McKenzie, July 28, 2020
PUB56 Anne Anderson, July 29, 2020
PUB57 Cris Barsanti, July 29, 2020
PUB58 Justin Berton, July 29, 2020
PUB59 Connie Brown and Anne Anderson, July 29, 2020
PUB60 Jerry Cathey, July 29, 2020
PUB61 Matthew Chapman, July 29, 2020
PUB62 Shawn Conlan, July 29, 2020
PUB63 Dan Courtney, July 29, 2020
PUB64 Megan Delaye, July 29, 2020
PUB65 Bill Flanery, July 29, 2020
PUB66 Ben Gardella, July 29, 2020
PUB67 Rosalina George, July 29, 2020
PUB68 Kathleen K. Haff, July 29, 2020
PUB69 John Bissell, July 29, 2020
PUB70 Mary Hollendoner, July 29, 2020
PUB71 Bill Kelly, July 29, 2020
PUB72 Eve Kelly, July 29, 2020
PUB73 Lisa Kelly, July 29, 2020
PUB74 Craig Konklin, July 29, 2020
PUB75 Bill Nickell, July 29, 2020
PUB76 Lauren Nickell, July 29, 2020
PUB77 Thomas E. Parrington, July 29, 2020
PUB78 James Plouffe, July 29, 2020
PUB79 Pat Skeels, July 29, 2020
PUB80 John Stanfield, July 29, 2020
PUB81 Gary Wesley, July 29, 2020
PUB82 Robert Asquith, July 30, 2020
PUB83 Tricia Cline Brown, July 30, 2020
PUB84 Mary Beth Campbell, July 30, 2020
PUB85 Douglas and Alicia Cask, July 30, 2020
PUB86 Pat Cervelli, July 30, 2020

LIST OF COMMENTERS

PUB87 Cindy Charles, July 30, 2020
PUB88 Nancy Constantino, July 30, 2020
PUB89 Priscilla Cornell, July 30, 2020
PUB90 Dan Courtney, July 30, 2020
PUB91 Suzanne Ctibor, July 30, 2020
PUB92 Patricia Elliott, July 30, 2020
PUB93 Elizabeth Erickson, July 30, 2020
PUB94 Erick Erickson, July 30, 2020
PUB95 Ingrid and Jeffrey Carlson, July 30, 2020
PUB96 Lars Erickson, July 30, 2020
PUB97 Sally Erickson, July 30, 2020
PUB98 Ben Gardella, July 30, 2020
PUB99 Laura George, July 30, 2020
PUB100 Robert Hohn, July 30, 2020
PUB101 Bob Kaehms, July 30, 2020
PUB102 Lillian Miotto, July 30, 2020
PUB103 Matthew Moore, July 30, 2020
PUB104 Ronald James Morgan, July 30, 2020
PUB105 Sylvia Nestor, July 30, 2020
PUB106 Andy Nickell, July 30, 2020
PUB107 Nancy Perry, July 30, 2020
PUB108 Gene Pfeiffer, July 30, 2020
PUB109 Patrick Pfeiffer, July 30, 2020
PUB110 Louis Rivara, July 30, 2020
PUB111 Margene Rivara, July 30, 2020
PUB112 Margaret Speed, July 30, 2020
PUB113 Pauline Turski, July 30, 2020
PUB114 Steve Vrionis, July 30, 2020
PUB115 Keigh Zenobia, July 30, 2020
PUB116 Dan Courtney, July 31, 2020
PUB117 Rich Hill, July 31, 2020
PUB118 Sarah Sutton, July 31, 2020

5. Response to Comments

This chapter includes a reproduction of, and responses to, each comment letter received during the public review period on the Draft EIR. Comments are presented in their original format in Appendix K, along with annotations that identify each individual comment number.

Responses to individual comments are provided in this chapter alongside the text of each corresponding comment. Letters are categorized by:

- Governmental Agencies
- Non-Governmental Organizations and Private Companies
- Members of the Public

Letters are arranged by category, date received, and name. Where the same comment has been made more than once, a response may direct the reader to another numbered comment and response. Where a response requires revisions to the Draft EIR, these revisions are shown in Chapter 3 of this Final EIR. Table 5-4 presents comments received on the Draft EIR and responses to each of those comments.

5.1 MASTER RESPONSES

MASTER RESPONSE 1: REQUEST TO EXTEND THE DRAFT EIR PUBLIC REVIEW PERIOD

A number of comments submitted in response to the Draft EIR requested that the County extend the public review period for the Draft EIR. Commenters largely stated that, due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the standard 45-day comment period is not sufficient time for the public to adequately review and provide responses. In response to these requests, County staff consulted with the California Office of Planning and Research State Clearinghouse to determine whether any changes have been made to the minimum required timeframe for Draft EIR due to COVID-19. County staff were told in the consultation that there have been no changes to the minimum required timeframes for review of Draft EIRs in response to COVID-19. Based on that consultation, the County determined that the comment period would not be extended beyond the required 45-day timeframe. However, any comments received after the official review period will still be accepted and considered by County staff and presented to County decision makers.

MASTER RESPONSE 2: WASTEWATER TREATMENT

The Draft EIR evaluated a septic system for wastewater treatment and disposal. However, following the publication of the Draft EIR, the project applicant amended its plans to include an on-site package wastewater treatment system (OWTS). Chapter 3, Revisions to the Draft EIR, includes modifications to the Draft EIR to remove the analysis of the septic system and instead describe the proposed project's OWTS. These revisions are supplemented by the analysis in the subsections below that further analyze the

proposed system. The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires that an EIR be recirculated when "significant new information" is added after the Draft EIR is circulated but before certification. (Pub. Resources Code Section 21092.1; CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5 (a).) New information is not significant unless the "EIR is changed in a way that deprives the public of a meaningful opportunity to comment upon a substantial adverse environmental effect of the project or a feasible way to mitigate or avoid such an effect." The Final EIR, including these responses to comments, does not include any "significant new information," as defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5, and recirculation is therefore not required.

With the revisions proposed, the proposed project would utilize a micro membrane reactor treatment and disposal wastewater system that provides disinfected tertiary treated effluent. The OWTS would be designed and built to incorporate beneficial uses of recycled water using dual plumbed fixtures, on-site landscape irrigation, and fire suppression systems. A typical process for membrane bioreactor treatment includes influent screening, anoxic process for nutrient removal, aeration zone for activated sludge and membrane filtration, sludge/return wasting, and disinfection. Several companies service this industry. The make and model proposed for the Terra Vi project is an Ovivo MicroBLOX. It would be sized to treat up to 130 percent of the proposed project's water demand of 17,833[1] gallons per day (gpd).

The micro membrane reactor equipment would be placed in the maintenance and storage building located in the project maintenance yard on the west side of Sawmill Mountain Road. The building would be approximately 15 feet wide, 40 feet in length, and 15 feet in height. The building would consist of a poured-in-place concrete slab, 8-inch by 8-inch by 16-inch reinforced concrete block, metal roof trusses, and a 12-gauge galvanized metal roof structure. The building would include sound-attenuation design elements to ensure the operating noise is equal to or less than 65 dB at 3'-0". The OWTS would be served by the project's emergency generator in the event of a power disruption.

The project's proposed OWTS, as with any OWTS, would be permitted to comply with the Tuolumne County Ordinance Code, Tuolumne County Environmental Health Division, and the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) requirements that are in place to ensure the safety and quality of the surrounding environment from sewage contamination. The OWTS and leach field would be regulated by the RWQCB pursuant to the California State Water Resources Control Board's (SWRCB) General Waste Discharge Requirements for Small Domestic Wastewater Treatment Systems (Order WQ 2014-0153-DWQ). Under these regulations, the project applicant would file a Report of Waste Discharge with the Central Valley RWQCB to obtain coverage under the Waste Discharge Requirements. The Report of Waste Discharge would include a technical report that describes the wastewater generation, treatment, storage, and disposal. System installation, inspection, and regular compliance with all required permitting would serve to prevent any contamination to the surrounding area, including to surface water or groundwater. The typical effluent characteristics from the type of system proposed as 10 mg/L of BOD, 10 mg/L of TSS, 10 mg/L of total nitrogen, and less than 2.2 mg/L of total coliform.

[1] Shamim Engineering Consultants, To: Hansji Corporation John Bissell Re: Terra Vi Lodge Yosemite, Yosemite, CA 95321, September 4, 2020.

AESTHETICS

The OWTS would be housed within a new maintenance building on the west side of Sawmill Mountain Road. The maintenance building construction would consist of reinforced concrete block walls, metal roof trusses, and a 12-gauge galvanized metal roof. This area of the project site already contains a driveway and existing Caltrans storage building. This area of the site is not highly visible from Highway 120 and a building in this location would not affect scenic views. Therefore, the wastewater treatment system would be located in a building that would be visually unobtrusive.

AIR QUALITY

The proposed OWTS would be required to conform to the Tuolumne County Air Pollution Control District regulations, along with California Plumbing Code and Tuolumne County regulations. Compliance with the California Plumbing Code would ensure that the OWTS is built to current standards and inspected by the County prior to operation. Compliance with the Tuolumne County Air Pollution Control District's Rule 205 would ensure that the project does not discharge quantities of air contaminants or materials that cause detriment, nuisance, or annoyance to any considerable number of persons or to the public. The proposed OWTS, is a packaged tertiary treatment system incorporating extended aeration to break down the organics in the wastewater treatment process, and extended aeration systems are generally odor free.[2] Regardless, compliance with Tuolumne County Ordinance Code Section 13.08.310 would ensure that the parts of wastewater facilities are maintained in good repair at all times and operated in a manner so as not to cause odors. If odors were to occur, there are no sensitive receptors within a 500-foot radius of the proposed OWTS location, and this distance would provide a buffer area in which any odors would dissipate before reaching the nearest sensitive receptor. In addition, the OWTS would be placed in an enclosed utility building that would help to further minimize potential odors.

BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Since the Draft EIR discussed on-site wastewater treatment including the incorporation of the leach fields, and the proposed OWTS would be housed in a building on-site in an area that was already assessed for improvement under the Draft EIR. Therefore, the proposed OWTS would not significantly change the proposed project, and there are no additional impacts to consider for biological resources.

CULTURAL AND TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

The Draft EIR evaluated the proposed project with the incorporation of on-site wastewater treatment. The proposed OWTS would not change on-site conditions with respect to cultural or tribal cultural resources, and there are no additional impacts to consider for cultural or tribal cultural resources.

ENERGY

The OWTS would be electrically powered and would be served by the proposed emergency generator, located within the maintenance yard on the west side of Sawmill Mountain Road, in the event of a power

[2]United States Environmental Protection Agency, 2000, *Wastewater Technology Fact Sheet Package Plants,* EPA 832-F-00-016, Washington D.C.: Office of Water, https://www3.epa.gov/npdes/pubs/package_plant.pdf, accessed September 24, 2020.

disruption. It would not require an unnecessary consumption of energy resources, and installation, and operation would be required to comply with all applicable energy efficiency standards.

FORESTRY RESOURCES

The Draft EIR evaluated impacts of the proposed project on forestry resources, including the use of on-site wastewater treatment with the incorporation of leach fields. The change to the proposed OWTS would not change the conditions of the proposed project where it would impact forestry resources differently. There are no additional impacts to consider for forestry resources.

GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Whereas the Draft EIR evaluated impacts of the proposed project with the incorporation of a septic system, the proposed OWTS would be a package treatment system. As described in the Draft EIR, based on the Soil and Site Evaluation conducted by Tuolumne County Environmental Health, the soils encountered in the proposed leach fields in the northwest corner of the project site are capable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems. Therefore, there would be no significant changes from the proposed OWTS that would change impacts on geology and soils.

GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

The proposed OWTS would be a pre-fabricated package treatment system that would be delivered to the project site. Therefore, installation of the OWTS would not increase the intensity of construction activity evaluated in the Draft EIR. As such, there would be no additional impacts with respect to greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions from the proposed OWTS to consider.

HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

The OWTS would be in an enclosed building and would not incorporate hazards or hazardous materials. Therefore, there are no additional impacts pertaining to hazards and hazardous materials to consider.

HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

The OWTS would be regulated by the Central Valley RWQCB pursuant to the SWRCB's General Waste Discharge Requirements for Small Domestic Wastewater Treatment Systems (Order WQ 2014-0153-DWQ). Under these regulations, the project applicant would file a Report of Waste Discharge with the Central Valley RWQCB to obtain coverage under the Waste Discharge Requirements. The Report of Waste Discharge would include a technical report that describes the wastewater generation, treatment, storage, and disposal. Upon review of the Report of Waste Discharge, the Central Valley Regional Water Board's Executive Officer would issue a Notice of Applicability (NOA) when coverage under the General Order has been authorized. The NOA will contain the necessary site-specific monitoring and reporting requirements. Furthermore, the recycled water system will comply with the Waste Discharge Requirements and the applicable requirements described in Title 22 of the California Code of Regulations. These measures would ensure the OWTS operation would not compromise surrounding water quality and hydrology.

LAND USE AND PLANNING

Tuolumne County General Plan policies relevant to wastewater treatment include the following:

- Goal 3E: Maintain a healthy environment for the citizenry by setting standards for the types and methods of sewage disposal to be used by new development.
  - Policy 3.E.2: Require that proposed development in areas of known or suspected geological limitations to underground sewage disposal either be served by a public sewer system, or successfully demonstrate that on-site underground sewage disposal can be accomplished with no lessening of quality to ground or surface waters.
  - Policy 3.E.3: Encourage new industrial and commercial development in areas where a public sewer system is available or require evidence that there is a capability of functioning on a private system without any adverse public health impact.
  - Policy 3.E.4: Require development to connect to a public sewer system if it is reasonably available.
  - Implementation Program 3.E.d: Continue to allow development to be served by private water and sewage disposal systems provided that they are first approved by the agency having jurisdiction by law.
- Goal 14B: Maximize the efficient use and reuse of water supplies through water conservation, water recycling, and public education.
  - Policy 14.B.2: Increase water conservation efforts to maximize water use efficiency within Tuolumne County through conservation, recycling and education.
  - Implementation Program 14.B.d: Encourage water reuse/recycling through the treatment and distribution of treated wastewater by working with new development to identify ways to incorporate reuse/recycling into projects.

A public sewer system is not available at the project site location. As discussed above, the proposed private system would require permitting and monitoring in order to comply with local applicable regulations, consistent with General Plan Implementation Program 3.E.d. The project's proposed use of treated wastewater from the OWTS for non-potable water use is consistent with Goal 14B.

NOISE

Appendix L, Supplemental Noise Analysis, of this Final EIR contains a detailed analysis of potential noise impacts associated with the OWTS and finds it would not create any new noise impacts and that therefore no additional mitigation measures would be warranted. As described in more detail in Appendix L, the nearest receivers to the proposed OWTS are receivers 1 and 2, which are located approximately 840 and 680 feet away, respectively, from the maintenance building in which the OWTS would be housed. Based on a reference noise level of 65 dBA at 3 feet (the cited reference noise level including the sound attenuation provided by the proposed maintenance building construction), and assuming standard spherical spreading loss of sound (6 dB decrease per each doubling of distance from a stationary source), OWTS noise levels are predicted to be 16 and 18 dB L_{eq} at receivers 1 and 2, respectively. The predicted equipment noise levels of 16 and 18 dB could be comparable to the sound of a soft whisper at a distance of 5 feet. The day-night average noise level associated with 24-hour

operations of WWTP equipment is calculated to be 22 and 24 dB L_{dn} at receivers 1 and 2, respectively. System equipment noise levels would be even less at receivers located farther away (receivers 3-15). The predicted OWTS equipment noise levels of 16-18 dB L_{eq} at the nearest existing noise-sensitive uses (receivers 1 and 2) would satisfy the applicable General Plan daytime and nighttime hourly average noise level standards by a wide margin.

POPULATION AND HOUSING

The proposed OWTS would not affect the project's potential impacts related to population or housing. Therefore, there are no impacts to population and housing that need to be considered.

PUBLIC SERVICES, PARKS, AND RECREATION

The Draft EIR evaluated the use of on-site wastewater treatment. The proposed OWTS would not change the fact that the proposed project incorporates on-site wastewater treatment, or otherwise change the level of impacts form the proposed project on public services, parks, and recreation.

TRANSPORTATION

The proposed OWTS would not alter circulation on-site, or otherwise affect traffic or transportation. Therefore, there are no impacts to transportation that need to be considered.

UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Compliance with the California Plumbing Code would ensure that the wastewater system is built to current standards and inspected by the County prior to operation. Furthermore, construction of the OWTS would be regulated by the Central Valley RWQCB pursuant to the SWRCB's General Waste Discharge Requirements for Small Domestic Wastewater Treatment Systems (Order WQ 2014-0153-DWQ). The OWTS would treat wastewater to tertiary standards and would be designed and built to incorporate beneficial uses of recycled water. Recycled water would be used for non-potable indoor water fixtures, on-site landscape irrigation, and fire suppression. The OWTS, therefore, would be constructed and operated according to all applicable regulations ensuring a safe and functional system, and would not impact local wastewater utilities as the wastewater would be treated on-site.

WILDFIRE

The Draft EIR evaluated the proposed project with the incorporation of on-site wastewater treatment. There would be no changes to the project as a result of the OWTS that would affect wildfire.

MASTER RESPONSE 3: EMERGENCY USE HELIPAD

Several comments on the Draft EIR expressed concern about the potential noise effect of the proposed emergency helipad. Mitigation Measure NOI-3.1 has been revised as shown in Table 1-1 and Chapter 3, Revisions to the Draft EIR, to require the project applicant, as part of the design and approvals process for the helipad, relocate the helipad to another area of the project site that is further from residential properties, if feasible. The project applicant has identified a potential alternate helipad location west of

Sawmill Mountain Road, but closer to the intersection of Sawmill Mountain Road with Highway 120 (see Figure 5-1). Potential environmental impacts resulting from the alternate helipad location would be secondary impacts as they would be caused by mitigation and not by the proposed project itself. Potential secondary impacts from the alternate helipad location are discussed below.

AESTHETICS

The alternate helipad location would result in the emergency helipad being closer to and therefore more visible from Highway 120. However, as the emergency helipad would only be used for emergency events, it would be rarely used and would appear most of the time as an open area. As there would be minimal changes in the appearance of the project site from the surrounding area as originally proposed in the Draft EIR, therefore there would be no impacts to aesthetics from the alternate helipad location.

BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

The alternate helipad location would relocate the helipad to a location closer to Highway 120 that was not initially planned for development. However, this area was included in the biological resource study (see Figure 4 in Appendix D, Biological Resources Study, of the Draft EIR) and proposed construction of the helipad would be required to comply with the biological resource mitigation measures included in the Draft EIR. Therefore, the helipad would not create any new significant impacts.

HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

The emergency helipad under the alternate helipad location would still need to go through the same review and approvals process with the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) and the Tuolumne County Building Division as described in Chapter 4.9, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, of the Draft EIR. The Terra Vi developers would be required per Federal Aviation Regulations Part 157 to conduct an airspace study to determine whether the proposed emergency helipad would be acceptable from an airspace utilization standpoint and meet all FAA design considerations. The airspace study would be required to show that the FAA does not object to the establishment of the proposed landing area and to provide determinations related to the safe and efficient use of navigable airspace by aircraft, with respect to the safety of persons and property on the ground. Impact discussion HAZ-5 in the Draft EIR states that operation of an emergency helipad on the proposed project could result in safety impacts to people working or residing within the project area, and this significant impact would be reduced to less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measure HAZ-5. The alternate helipad location would place the emergency helicopter landing pad further from existing homes; however, it could still result in safety impacts to people within the vicinity, such as lodge guests or employees. Since only the location of the emergency helipad would change and it would still require all of the same approvals and safety measures, Mitigation Measure HAZ-5 would still apply.

Source: AVRP Skyport, 2019.

Approximate Location for Alternate Helipad Landing Zone

0 2400
Scale (Feet)

Figure 5-1
Alternate Helipad Location

NOISE

Appendix L, Supplemental Noise Analysis, of this Final EIR provides an analysis of helicopter operations at the alternate location shown in Figure 5-1. Based on the results presented in Table 13 of Appendix L, noise levels associated with the alternate helipad location are predicted to result in reduced noise level exposure at over half of the identified existing noise-sensitive uses (receivers 1 to 15). However, noise levels at the alternate helipad location could still result in substantial temporary increases in ambient daytime and/or nighttime noise levels at nearby existing sensitive uses. As with the proposed helipad location analyzed in the Draft EIR, there are no feasible mitigation measures that would ensure that noise impacts would be less than significant. Therefore, the impact would remain significant and unavoidable. Nonetheless, based on the analysis in Appendix L, the alternate helipad location would reduce noise level exposure at a majority of the nearest residential receivers and is therefore recommended as a location that would reduce, but not entirely avoid, noise impacts. Mitigation Measure NOI-3.1 has been revised, as shown in Table 1-1 and Chapter 3, Revisions to the Draft EIR, of this Final EIR, to require the project applicant to relocate the helipad to another area of the project site that is further from residential properties (such as the alternate location shown in Figure 5-1), if feasible.

MASTER RESPONSE 4: EMERGENCY EVACUATION

Emergency access and evacuation are addressed in the Draft EIR in impact discussions HAZ-6, TRANS-4, and WF-1. Standard of Significance #6 in the Hazards and Hazardous Materials chapter of the Draft EIR considers whether the project would “Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.” The Draft EIR concluded in impact discussion HAZ-6 on page 4.9-18: "The proposed project would not involve physical components that would interfere with the ability of the County, and emergency response service providers, to implement emergency response activities within the project site or vicinity." Standard of Significance #4 in the Transportation chapter of the Draft EIR considers whether the project would “Result in inadequate emergency access.” The Draft EIR describes on page 4.15-22 in impact discussion TRANS-4 that the project’s two main driveways and emergency access roadway would provide adequate emergency access. Standard of Significance #1 in the Wildfire chapter of the Draft EIR considers whether the project would “Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.” The Draft EIR describes on page 4.17-25 in impact discussion WF-1 that the project’s proposed weather monitoring, early evacuation, site access, and emergency use helipad would help to ensure that the project does not significantly impact to emergency response or evacuation. This master response provides additional information and analysis which further supports these determinations.

EVACUATION MANAGEMENT

The project site is in an area with several agencies overseeing fire threats, including the County, Groveland Community Services District (GCSD), the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE), and the United States Forest Service (USFS). Different agencies use different evacuation

systems and alert levels.[3] The Tuolumne County Sheriff's Office is the primary County department responsible for evacuation management throughout the county. Off-site evacuation in terms of routes would be dependent on the specific incident and the County's emergency response communications.

Tuolumne County

Emergency evacuation protocols in Tuolumne County are developed and enforced by the Tuolumne County Sheriff with support from the County Office of Emergency Services. Evacuation notifications are implemented based on fire and weather conditions in close communication with regional, State, and federal fire protection services, as described in Chapter 4.14, Public Services, in the Draft EIR. Evacuation protocols include determining and communicating the appropriate evacuation routes and dispatching traffic control units to critical bottleneck areas. Although Highway 120 is a two-lane highway (with one lane in each direction) the County has the ability to create two travel lanes in the same direction to allow traffic to flow more freely to allow more cars to stack in a shorter stretch of roadway in the event of a mass evacuation.[4]

Project Evacuation Components

As described in Section 3.3.6, Wildfire Hazard Reduction, on page 3-23 of the Draft EIR, the proposed project includes communications equipment (radios, cell towers or boosters, satellite phones). The proposed project would also install weather stations and monitor weather and nearby fires. The project would initiate early on-site evacuation procedures to ensure guest safety and to reduce peak traffic on Highway 120.

As noted above, different agencies (such as the County, GCSD, CAL FIRE, and the USFS) use different evacuation systems and alert levels.[5] In the event of a large wildfire, the project would evacuate the project site at the earliest level, which may be issued as a "precautionary," "voluntary," or "Level I" notice, depending on the agency issuing the evacuation notice.

Based on communication with the County Sheriff, [6] the time period required to notify and clear the proposed project would be shorter than the time to clear rural residential neighborhoods, as the lodge proposes to provide critical evacuation information to guests at check-in, with in-room educational materials, and through internal communications systems (such as in-room televisions, phones, and through the in-room emergency fire notification systems or via other technology). Based on communication with the Sheriff and Office of Emergency Services Coordinator, based on previous

[3] CAL FIRE, California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection, Wildfire Evacuation Guide, https://www.readyforwildfire.org/wp-content/uploads/calfire_go_brochure_LINOweb.pdf, accessed September 28, 2020; United States Forest Service, General Descriptions for the Three Evacuation Levels and Necessary Actions by Residents. https://www.fs.usda.gov/Internet/FSE_DOCUMENTS/stelprd3852749.pdf, accessed September 28, 2020.

[4] Bill Pooley, Sheriff, County of Tuolumne. Personal communication with KD Anderson & Associates and PlaceWorks. September 23, 2020.

[5] CAL FIRE, California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection, Wildfire Evacuation Guide, https://www.readyforwildfire.org/wp-content/uploads/calfire_go_brochure_LINOweb.pdf, accessed September 28, 2020; United States Forest Service, General Descriptions for the Three Evacuation Levels and Necessary Actions by Residents. https://www.fs.usda.gov/Internet/FSE_DOCUMENTS/stelprd3852749.pdf, accessed September 28, 2020.

[6] Bill Pooley, Sheriff, County of Tuolumne. Personal communication with KD Anderson & Associates and PlaceWorks. September 23, 2020.

evacuation events the County does not have any concerns about the ability of the project site to be evacuated quickly and safely.[7]

In addition to the centralized communications systems, evacuation of a lodging facility is quicker than evacuation of a community. When the County evacuates a residential area, they are unaware of the occupancy of homes at a given time. In contrast, the hotel is aware of the number of guests and location of occupied rooms at any given time and is also aware of guests with special needs and assistance requirements which can be quickly communicated to County emergency services personnel.[8]

Evacuation efforts would be coordinated and implemented by trained on-site staff, including two firefighters with enhanced communication with local emergency response agencies (as required by Mitigation Measure PS-1).

The potential effects of the proposed project's evacuation on the ability of neighboring properties to evacuate is analyzed below.

EVACUATION SCENARIO CONGESTION ANALYSIS

In the event of a mass evacuation with little advanced warning, it is unknown what the time of day or what the identified evacuation route would be.

The number of vehicles that might need to exit the Terra Vi Lodge site has been estimated under the following assumptions:

- 100 percent of the lodging units are occupied and all guests are on-site with one vehicle per room/cabin (126 vehicles). This assumption is conservative (i.e. it reflects a "worst case" scenario) as it assumes full occupancy.
- 100 percent of the employees are on-site, with one vehicle per employee (42 vehicles). This assumption is conservative as it assumes all employees are on-site at the same time.
- The number of market patrons originating off-site and needing to evacuate would depend on the occupancy of the market at the time an evacuation order was made. Although the average length of a "shopping" event at a convenience store is less than 5 minutes,[9] the scenario assumes that the average length of a visit in the proposed market is 20 minutes. This conservatively calculates the number of vehicles on-site as one third of the peak hour external trip generation.
- All Park & Ride spaces would be occupied by non-guests and would need to evacuate. This assumption is conservative as it assumes all Park & Ride spaces are in use at the same time.
- Three simultaneous deliveries would be made to the site, and all would need to evacuate. This assumption is conservative as it assumes all delivery vehicles are on-site at the same time.

[7] Bill Pooley, Sheriff, and Elizabeth Peterson, OES Coordinator, County of Tuolumne. Personal communication with KD Anderson & Associates and PlaceWorks. September 23, 2020.

[8] Bill Pooley, Sheriff, County of Tuolumne. Personal communication with KD Anderson & Associates and PlaceWorks. September 23, 2020.

[9] National Association of Convenience Stores, "Convenience Stores Offer More Convenience," https://www.convenience.org/Research/FactSheets/ScopeofIndustry/Convenience, accessed September 29, 2020.

TABLE 5-1 MAXIMUM NUMBER OF ON-SITE VEHICLES

Category	Unit	Quantity	Vehicles
Lodging	Rooms/Cabins	126	126
Employees	Each	42	42
		Subtotal	*168*
Market	External Trips per Hour	67	22
Park & Ride	Parking Spaces	30	30
Deliveries, Miscellaneous			3
		Total	**223**

Source: KD Anderson & Associates, 2020.

As shown in Table 5-1, a total of 223 vehicles would need to be evacuated from the site under this conservative scenario.

In addition to the project site vehicles, the residential neighborhood directly north of the project site consists of 17 residential-zoned parcels. These sites would be expected to evacuate the project area using the same roadway(s) as the proposed project. Further to the north, there are other destinations located along the forest routes, including Evergreen Lodge and some campsites. These sites are accessible via other forest routes and their occupants may use other routes to access Highway 120 in the event of an evacuation.

The number of vehicles that might need to exit the Yosemite Under Canvas, Berkeley Tuolumne Camp Restoration, and Thousand Trails/Yosemite Lakes RV Expansion project sites has been estimated under these assumptions:

- 100 percent of the units are occupied and all guests are on-site with one vehicle per room/cabin/campsite. This assumption is conservative as it assumes full occupancy.
- 100 percent of the employees are on-site, and all have a vehicle. This assumption is conservative as it assumes all employees are on-site at the same time.

Table 5-2 summarizes the total number of vehicles that could be on-site at these three cumulative projects under “at capacity” conditions. This estimate includes the existing Thousand Trails/Yosemite Lakes operation, as well as an estimate of an expansion project.

TABLE 5-2 MAXIMUM NUMBER OF ON-SITE VEHICLES EXITING CUMULATIVE PROJECT SITES

Category	Unit	Quantity	Vehicles
Under Canvas Lodging	Campsites	99	99
Under Canvas Employees	Each	20	20
		Under Canvas Subtotal	*119*
Berkeley Tuolumne Restoration Lodging	Cabins	90	90
Berkeley Tuolumne Restoration Employees	Each	5[a]	5
		Berkeley Tuolumne Restoration Subtotal	*95*
Thousand Trails/Yosemite Lakes Sites (Existing)	RV Sites	254	254
	Tent Sites	130	130
	Cabins, Yurts, Other	53[a]	53
Thousand Trails/Yosemite Lakes Employees (Existing)	Each	10[a]	10
Thousand Trails/Yosemite Lakes Sites (Expansion)	RV Sites	100	100
	Cabins	50	50
		Thousand Trails/Yosemite Lakes Subtotal	*597*
		Total	811

a. The count is an estimate as project-specific information is not available.
Source: KD Anderson & Associates, 2020.

As shown in Table 5-2, an estimated total of 811 vehicles could be on-site at the three cumulative project sites. The Yosemite Under Canvas, Berkeley Tuolumne Camp Restoration, and Thousand Trails/Yosemite Lakes RV Expansion project sites are located on Hardin Flat Road. In the event of an evacuation, these sites would utilize Hardin Flat Road, Highway 120, and forest routes south of Highway 120, depending on incident-specific conditions. The Mountain Sage Conditional Use Permit project site is located in Groveland and would be evacuated as part of a Groveland evacuation rather than as part of an evacuation of the immediate Terra Vi project site vicinity.

The capacity of Highway 120 is identified in the 2016 Tuolumne County RTP/SCS based on volume thresholds presented on page 13 of the Transportation Impact Study contained in Appendix J of the Draft EIR. Highway 120 is classified as a two-lane rural minor arterial on “rolling” terrain from State Route 49 to the West Yosemite National Park gate, and its capacity is reported to be 15,600 vehicles per day. The capacity of individual segments of Highway 120 may vary based on a variety of factors such as vertical and horizontal alignment. For example, the capacity of a similar roadway under the “mountainous” terrain is reported to be 14,510 vehicles per day. It is reasonable to expect that the flow of traffic on Highway 120 during an evacuation may vary as individuals within various areas respond to instruction. Some persons in the area may elect to immediately leave with first notice while others may delay until the last minute. It is

reasonable to expect overall travel speeds will be lower during traffic “surges." However, according to the County Sheriff, previous evacuation scenarios in the county, including the 2013 Rim Fire, did not create a queue of westbound traffic that extended back into Big Oak Flat/Groveland. Based on congestion conditions during previous evacuation scenarios, the addition of the maximum of 223 vehicles that could be added onto local roadways during a mass evacuation at the proposed project is not expected to result in major delays that would hinder evacuation of the project area. [10]

In the event of an evacuation, there are several routes that may be selected by the County, depending on incident-specific conditions. Highway 120 provides access to the west toward Groveland along with other points to the west. Highway 120 provides access to the east toward Yosemite National Park and beyond. Big Oak Flat Road east of the project site provides access south to Highway 140 toward Mariposa and Wawona Road toward Fish Camp. Smith Station Road west of the project site provides access to Greeley Hill Road, connecting with Highway 132 and Highway 49 in Coulterville. In the event that one of these roadways is blocked, alternate routes or detours would be determined by the County. If Highway 120 were blocked near the project site, the best alternate route would depend on the location of the incident and the location of the obstruction. Alternate access out of the immediate project area is available southward via Hardin Flat Road and northward via the USFS routes north of the project site.

It is important to note than mass evacuation is not an instantaneous event during which all vehicles that may need to exit would do so at that moment. In addition, during an evacuation, the number of vehicles that could be on local roadways, including Highway 120, at any particular location at any one time would depend on many factors, such as the location and proximity of the incident creating the need for evacuation, the time of year, the time of day, other routes that are available, the overall schedule for evacuation, etc. As shown in Figure 5-2, below, the project site is a 6-mile drive to the east of Buck Meadows and a 7-mile drive to the west of the Big Oak Flat entrance to Yosemite National Park. Given the distance between the project site and nearby communities (such as Buck Meadows, Groveland, Pine Mountain Lake, and Yosemite National Park), the County does not anticipate a scenario in which the project site area would be evacuated at the same time as another community. A wildfire incident requiring an evacuation of Yosemite National Park, Buck Meadows, or Groveland/Pine Mountain Lake would not require the simultaneous evacuation of the project site, given the distances between the project site and those communities. Similarly, an incident requiring evacuation of the project site and nearby homes would not require simultaneous evacuation of these other communities. In the event of a large wildfire, evacuation would occur in stages, and the project site would be evacuated at a different time than these nearby communities due to the distance from the project site and these larger population centers.

[10] Bill Pooley, Sheriff, County of Tuolumne. Personal communication with KD Anderson & Associates and PlaceWorks. September 23, 2020.

Source: ESRI, 2019; National Park Service, 2019; Toulumne County, 2019; PlaceWorks, 2019.

Figure 5-2

Location of Project Site and Nearby Communities, with Rim Fire Overlay

In addition, as described above, project operations would include proactive monitoring that would ensure the issue of early evacuation notifications resulting in the earliest level of evacuation notice, which would further help to avoid exacerbating any local traffic congestion. Monitoring weather, fire conditions, and evacuation advisories is not an atypical activity for businesses located in rural or forested areas. With the combination of proposed measures intended to facilitate a smooth and early evacuation process, the distance between the project site and other population centers using Hwy 120 for evacuation, and ability of the County to manage a staged evacuation protocol, local roadways would be able to accommodate the additional evacuation traffic from the proposed project. Therefore, the proposed project would not exacerbate conditions under an evacuation scenario affecting the project site.

The site would provide a shelter-in-place facility to be used by hotel staff, guests, and, if necessary, nearby residents in the event that evacuation is not feasible. The shelter-in-place structure will require approval from the Tuolumne County Building and Safety Division and the Tuolumne County Fire Prevention Bureau and would be required to conform to applicable building code requirements to ensure its adequacy.

MASTER RESPONSE 5: WILDFIRE

Chapter 4.17, Wildfire, of the Draft EIR addresses potential impacts from wildfire, and describes project design components and mitigation measures that address wildfire hazards. Wildfire and fire-related hazards are also included in Chapter 4.9, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, under impact discussion HAZ-7, and Chapter 4.14, Public Services, Parks, and Recreation, under impact discussions PS-1 and PS-2. Page 4.14-30 of the Draft EIR acknowledges the inherent risk involved with introducing development, vehicles, and people to designated high wildfire risk areas: "Development of the proposed project would result in new paved roads, pedestrian paths, and parking areas. Paved areas create an opportunity for vehicles to create accidental wildfires, since dragging chains, dragging vehicle parts, worn brakes, and exposed wheel rims have the potential to create sparks on the roadway. On-site roadways and pedestrian paths, whether paved or unpaved, could also lead to wildfires as they would provide people access throughout the project site. Human activities are the leading cause of wildfire, with the three most common types of human-caused wildfires being debris burning, arson, and equipment use." The Draft EIR and the County acknowledge that new development and increased activity on the project site could increase wildfire risks.

PROJECT DESIGN FEATURES

The proposed project would be required to comply with all applicable fire safety and prevention regulations in order to obtain a building permit and a certificate of occupancy from the County. The cited regulations in Chapter 4.17 of the Draft EIR, including the California Building Code (CBC), California Fire Code (CFC), and sections of the California Public Resources Code, would improve the life safety of proposed structures. For example, Chapter 7A of the CBC includes standards for ignition-resistant and fire-retardant materials and venting requirements, among others. Similarly, the other regulations and policies are intended to and have the effect of reducing hazards to building occupants.

The project area has been at risk of wildland fires since long before the site was zoned for hotel use on August 20, 1991. County, State, and other public agencies have long experience in adopting policies and

regulations to reduce the risk of ignition during construction to an acceptable, manageable risk. For example, Chapter 7A of the CBC prescribes building materials and construction methods for new buildings in any Fire Hazard Severity Zone or Wildland-Urban Interface Fire Area, and California Public Resources Code Section 4442 requires internal combustion engines like those used in construction to be equipped with a spark arrester, which helps to remove and retain carbon and other flammable particles from the exhaust flow for engines that use hydrocarbon fuels. Policy 17.A.6 of the Tuolumne County General Plan is to ensure that all new construction is completed in a way most resistant to loss or damage from natural hazards. Such policies are based on the agencies' experience and expertise in managing fire risk, and projects consistent with applicable land use regulations and fire and life safety requirements are allowed to proceed in fire-prone areas.

These requirements were reviewed and considered by the project applicant’s team and were integrated into the design and engineering work as part of the initial application package. The project’s fire safety features are integrated into the project design; they are not mitigation measures that were identified through the CEQA process but rather were designed to address regulatory requirements and policy direction. As listed on page 4.9-19 of the Draft EIR, project design and operation features would be incorporated into the proposed project to address wildfire hazards, including but not limited to: the use of exterior building materials consistent with wildland-urban interface building code requirements; vegetation designed and installed in conformance with wildland fire safety best practices, including defensible spaces; including fire sprinklers and fire-fighting equipment, fire alarm systems, fire monitoring and early detection systems, regional communications, first-responder trained personnel, and an emergency helicopter landing area; and monitoring of weather so that staff would be alerted to high fire danger conditions to evacuate the site early where possible. In the event that evacuation is not feasible, the site would provide a shelter-in-place facility. As described in Chapter 3, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, "fire suppression systems and site hydrants for fire protection would be provided using a combination of reclaimed and potable water storage." Collectively, these and other project features would reduce the potential for the project to create or exacerbate a wildfire incident, allow for prompt response to a wildfire incident, and enable the timely evacuation of the project site, if required. In addition, to provide secondary access the project site in the event of an emergency, the project includes an emergency vehicle access road off of Highway 120 to provide direct access for responders from Highway 120. Table 5-3 below elaborates on the wildfire risk reduction features that are listed in Table 4.17-2 in Chapter 4.17, Wildfire, of the Draft EIR. Optional design features are those that are not required for new development but serve as additional features to further enhance wildfire safety under the proposed project.

TABLE 5-3 PROJECT WILDFIRE RISK REDUCTION FEATURES DISCUSSION

Project Feature	Applicable Regulatory Framework and Wildfire Risk Reduction
Construction	
Wide separations between buildings to prevent structure to structure ignitions.	This feature is proposed for consistency with PRC Section 4290 and General Plan Implementation Program 9.E.g. Wide separations between buildings reduce the ability of wildfire to spread from structure to structure by proximity.
Wide separations between buildings to provide easy access by emergency responders.	This feature is proposed for consistency with PRC Section 4290 and General Plan Implementation Program 9.E.b. Wide separations between buildings also enable emergency responders to move between structures easily, and thus be more capable of reaching destinations quicker.
All exterior building materials are proposed to be constructed to comply with the most recent wildland-urban interface building code. ▪ Ignition-resistant ▪ Non-combustible materials ▪ Non-impregnatable vents ▪ Double-paned windows with one pane of tempered glass	This feature is proposed for consistency with CBC Chapter 7A and General Plan Policies 17.A.6 and 17.E.3. Fire-resistant materials are rated based on testing and demonstrated to be resistant to burning. Non-impregnatable vents restrict smoke from traveling through them. Double-paned windows with one pane of tempered glass seal buildings more effectively against fires.
An underground basement designed and constructed to be a refuge place for guests and employees to stay for a short period of time during wildfires or other disasters, when early evacuation is not possible. Enough space, an air filtering system, and positive ventilation to support the people harbored in the project, reducing traffic on possible evacuation routes.	This is an optional feature is proposed for consistency with General Plan Goal 9G, Policy 9.G.3, Goal 9H, Policy 9.H.2, and Goal 17A. While early evacuation is the safest option in the event of a wildfire, fire bunkers can serve as a last resort in the rare event that evacuation is no longer possible. Fire bunkers are designed with features such as reinforced concrete structures, smoke-proof and airtight sealing, and fire doors for radiant heat protection.[11]
Vegetation Management	
Incorporation of a Vegetation Management Plan into landscaping documents that integrates the needs for wildland fire safety.	This feature is proposed for consistency with the CFC; PRC Sections 4290 and 4291; CCR Title 14 Section 1254; and General Plan Policy 9.E.3, Implementation Program 17.A.e, Implementation Program 17.E.c, and Policy 17.E.8. Vegetation management reduces fire risk by reducing surface and ladder fuels, thinning out dense tree stands while preserving mature trees, and creating safety zones for fire fighter and citizen safety.[12]
The landscape would be designed and maintained in compliance with the Vegetation Management Plan.	This feature is proposed for consistency with the CFC; PCR Sections 4290 and 4291; CCR Title 14 Section 1254; and General Plan Policy 9.E.3, Policy 17.E.2, Policy 17.E.3, Policy 17.E.8, and Implementation Program 17.E.t.
The Vegetation Management Plan would be reviewed and approved by the Tuolumne County Fire Prevention Bureau.	This feature is proposed for consistency with General Plan Implementation Program 9.E.f, Implementation Program 17.E.d, and Implementation Program 17.E.f. This feature will allow local fire prevention specialists to review and comment on the proposed vegetation management plan and its adequacy for reducing fire risks.

[11] Oak Hill Area Fire Safe Council, 2020, Characteristics needed for a Fire Bunker. https://www.oakhillfiresafe.org/characteristics-needed-for-a-fire-bunker, accessed November 2, 2020.

[12] California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection, 2020, Vegetation Management Program. https://www.fire.ca.gov/programs/resource-management/resource-protection-improvement/vegetation-management-program/#:~:text=Reducing%20fire%20intensity%20through%20vegetation,to%20modify%2Freduce%20hazardous%20fuels., accessed November 2, 2020.

TABLE 5-3 PROJECT WILDFIRE RISK REDUCTION FEATURES DISCUSSION

Project Feature	Applicable Regulatory Framework and Wildfire Risk Reduction
Landscaping would be irrigated using recycled water system.	This is an optional feature is proposed for consistency with General Plan Policy 17.E.3. Use of recycled water would provide a more efficient and conservative use of water on-site in order to ensure the availability of water in assisting with firefighting and vegetation management.
Fire Prevention	
Smoking would be permitted only in a designated smoking area.	This feature that limit the areas where people would smoke, and therefore reduce the risk of a wildfire occurring due to smoking.
No smoking and no littering signs would be posted in throughout the entire project site.	This feature would serve as a continuous reminder to guests in order to reduce the risk from smoking in non-designated areas and also reducing littering of combustible materials.
Barbecues during times of high fire danger would be prohibited.	This feature would eliminate the risk of barbecues contributing to a fire in high fire risk conditions, including hot, dry windy conditions.
Guests and personnel would be educated on fire-safe behaviors.	This feature would help to increase the awareness of guests and staff to minimize fire-risk behaviors.
Trash cans would be provided throughout the property to reduce litter, and the ground would be cleaned by staff frequently.	This feature would help to reduce the among of combustible debris that could otherwise contribute to starting or fueling a fire.
Fire pits would be located in public areas and would be operated and maintained by hotel staff only.	This feature would allow for guests to enjoy the use of fire pits under supervised conditions from hotel staff trained in proper management of the fire pits to reduce the risk of a fire starting from these sources.
During construction a fire prevention plan would be implemented to reduce the chance of ignition. This plan would prescribe the equipment, training and behaviors of the construction team. All equipment with motors would comply with California Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 4442.	This feature is proposed for consistency with the CBC, the CFC, PRC Section 4442, Tuolumne County MJHMP Goal 5, and General Plan Goal 17A and Policy 17.A.6. This feature would ensure the development of an approach for reducing fire risks during project construction.
Communication and Alerts	
A communication plan would be established to ensure receipt and notification of vital incident information. Equipment necessary to implement the communication plan would be acquired. These are likely to include radios, cell phone towers or boosters, satellite phones, and/or other equipment.	This feature is proposed for consistency with General Plan Policy 9.G.2. An established communication plan would allow for clear communication protocol in the event of an emergency, enabling efficient emergency personnel response. Communication has been recognized as a core emergency response function by the Department of Health and Human Services and the Department of Homeland Security.[13]
Weather stations would be installed and monitored.	This feature is proposed for consistency with General Plan Policies 17.E.3 and 9.G.2. Weather stations would allow for staff to monitor for high fire risk conditions, including strong winds, dry, hot weather, and lightning storms.
Protocols for alerts would be established so that personnel on-site would be notified when high fire danger exists.	This feature is proposed for consistency with General Plan Policy 9.G.2. Notification of high fire danger would serve as a warning for staff to be on watch for signs or potential of a wildfire to occur, and enable them to more quickly prepare to respond in the event of an emergency.
Training	
Appropriate employees would be trained as first-response emergency responders, with trained staff on duty at all times.	This feature would allow for hotel staff to quickly respond to various emergency scenarios, reducing the reliance on local first responders, thereby allowing them to prioritize response to the most critical situations in the area under emergency conditions.

[13] Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2014. Crisis Emergency Risk Communication: Crisis Communication Plans. https://emergency.cdc.gov/cerc/ppt/CERC_Crisis_Communication_Plans.pdf, accessed November 2, 2020.

TABLE 5-3 PROJECT WILDFIRE RISK REDUCTION FEATURES DISCUSSION

Project Feature	Applicable Regulatory Framework and Wildfire Risk Reduction
Key engineering staff would complete certificate programs at the California Regional Fire Academy. The courses would include technical training relating to wildland fires, fire prevention, fire department apparatus, tools and equipment, breathing apparatus, extinguishers, hazardous materials, communication and emergency medical treatment.	This feature that would provide ensure that trained staff are on-site at all times to lead and manage emergency response scenario efforts, resulting in more efficient and effective response times.
Periodic regular fire safety drills would be performed. These would encompass evacuation and shelter-in-place options.	This feature would serve to educate employees and guests hotel staff on emergency response procedures, resulting in more efficient communication and less confusion in the event of an actual emergency.
The expectation is that the guests and employees would remain on-site in the event that a wildland fire nears the project.	This feature is proposed for consistency with General Plan Goal 9G, Policy 9.G.3, Goal 9H, Policy 9.H.2, and Goal 17A.
Guests would be educated on the need for and use of emergency alerts in the county and on-site.	This feature would help increase the number of guests who would know how to respond in the event of an emergency, enabling the likelihood of a more efficient response overall.
Evacuation	
Based on monitoring of both weather conditions and nearby incidents, guests would be notified to evacuate early to minimize peak traffic on Highway 120 in the event of an incident that requires evacuation.	This feature is proposed for consistency with the Tuolumne County EOP; the Tuolumne County MJHMP; and General Plan Goal 9G. Early evacuation would help to reduce traffic congestion, allowing for a quicker and safer evacuation for guests, employees, and neighbors.
Pre-fire evacuation plans would identify triggers for evacuation in terms of proximity of wildfires, and winds. Early response is a function of awareness and communication with fire departments. This implies weather, scanners, and monitoring with agreed-upon set trigger points.	This feature is proposed for consistency with the Tuolumne County EOP and Tuolumne County MJHMP. Pre-fire evacuation plans would enable hotel staff to facilitate a more efficient response; early response would increase the likelihood of safe evacuation of all persons on-site.
Access	
The project proposes direct emergency access to Highway 120 for fire service.	This feature is proposed for consistency with PRC Section 4290 and General Plan Implementation Programs 9.E.b and 17.E.e. This would provide critical secondary access to the project site in the event that Sawmill Mountain Road was blocked. It would also provide two simultaneous locations for fire suppression equipment.
Two driveways from Sawmill Mountain Road are proposed, each with different destinations and routes; one an ingress and egress to access the public market, and one an ingress and egress to access the reception and lodging areas.	This feature is proposed for consistency with PRC Section 4290; Tuolumne County Ordinance Code Chapter 11.12; General Plan Implementation Program 9.E.b, Implementation Program 17.E.e.
One looped roadway would provide emergency access around the cabin guestroom buildings and throughout the entire site.	This feature is proposed for consistency with PRC Section 4290; General Plan Implementation Program 9.E.b, Implementation Program 17.E.e.
All roadways are designed to comply with California PRC 4290 and Tuolumne County Ordinance Code Chapter 11.12 to allow full access for emergency vehicles, with slopes flatter than 12 percent, a radius larger than 40 feet, and a width no less than 20 feet (without parking).	This feature is proposed for consistency with PRC Section 4290; Tuolumne County Ordinance Code Chapter 11.12; General Plan Implementation Program 9.E.b, Implementation Program 17.E.e.
Implementation and Maintenance	

TABLE 5-3 PROJECT WILDFIRE RISK REDUCTION FEATURES DISCUSSION

Project Feature	Applicable Regulatory Framework and Wildfire Risk Reduction
The project Applicant would commit implementation and maintenance of the measures in a Wildfire Protection Plan.	This feature is proposed for consistency with Tuolumne County Community Wildfire Protection Plan. A Wildfire Protection Plan would educate hotel staff on the correct way to respond in the event of a wildfire, and allow for more efficient response in ensuring that all persons on-site are evacuated safely.
Wildfire Response and Support	
The project proposes construction in compliance with the National Fire Protection Association's fire protection system and would include fire sprinkler and standpipe systems.[14]	This feature is proposed for consistency with the CBC; the CFC; and General Plan Policy 9.E.3, Implementation Program 9.E.g, Policy 9.G.2, Policy 9.H.2, Policy 17.E.3, and Implementation Program 17.E.d; and Tuolumne County Code of Ordinance Title 15.
Suppression systems and site hydrants for fire protection would be provided using a combination of reclaimed and potable water storage.	This feature is proposed for consistency with the CBC; the CFC; PRC Section 4290; General Plan Policy 9.E.3, Implementation Program 9.E.g, Policy 9.G.2, Policy 9.H.2, Policy 17.E.3, and Implementation Program 17.E.d; and Tuolumne County Code of Ordinance Title 15. A combination of reclaimed and potable water storage would ensure the availability of water on-site to be used for fire protection, rather than sole reliance on pumping groundwater.
Water supply would be provided by a storage system and augmented with wildland fire hoses.	This feature is proposed for consistency with the CBC; the CFC; PRC Section 4290; General Plan Policy 9.G.2, Policy 9.H.2, Policy 17.E.3, Implementation Program 17.E.d; and Tuolumne County Code of Ordinance Title 15. A combination of reclaimed and potable water storage would ensure the availability of water on-site to be used for fire protection, rather than sole reliance on pumping groundwater.
An emergency helipad would be located on the western side of Sawmill Mountain Road, within the western project site parcel. The helipad would be used for emergency services only and would be available for use to the entire community.	This feature is proposed for consistency with General Plan Policy 17.E.3 and Implementation Program 17.E.d. Helicopter access would allow for faster response by emergency personnel using the helicopter without having to rely on local roadways, which could be impeded by traffic. This would provide an additional emergency resource for the surrounding community to enhance safety.

Notes: CBC = California Building Code; CFC = California Fire Code; CCR = California Code of Regulations; EOP = Emergency Operations Plan; MJHMP = Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan; PRC = Public Resources Code
Source: PlaceWorks, 2020.

POLLUTANT CONCENTRATIONS FROM WILDFIRE

Since the project will have less-than-significant impacts on wildfire risk with mitigation, there are no potential health impacts from wildfire for the EIR to analyze. The standard of significance for impact discussion WF-2 is whether the project would create an impact "Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire OR the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire." This discussion finds that the project site's slope and prevailing wind conditions would not create conditions under which the project would exacerbate pollutant concentrations from a wildfire. However, impact discussion WF-2 identifies that the project's

[14] National Fire Prevention Association (NFPA) 13 Standard for the Installation Sprinkler Systems (2016 Edition); NFPA 22 Standard for Water Tanks for Private Fire Protection (2013 Edition); NFPA 24 Standard for the Installation of Private Service Mains (2016 Edition).

landscaping plan could exacerbate wildfire risks (see Draft EIR page 4.17-29) and acknowledges that the project's landscaping plan requires revision to ensure the planting placement, density, and species would conform to the project's wildfire hazard reduction features, thereby reducing health risks from wildfires.

VEGETATION MANAGEMENT

Figures 4.1-6a through 4.1-9c in the Draft EIR are conceptual simulations to aid in visualizing the proposed project, with landscape screening shown consistent with the project's proposed conceptual landscaping plan. While landscaping will be designed to screen the project where possible, prior to issuance of building permits the project would be required to submit a Wildland Fire Prevention Plan and Vegetation Management Plan to the Tuolumne County Fire Prevention Bureau for review and approval, as described in Mitigation Measure WF-2. Under this mitigation measure, the perimeter of all structures must be surrounded by a 5-foot non-combustible zone, project landscaping must be fire resistant, areas within 200 feet of all structures must be managed as defensible space, and the entire project site must be managed as fire-resistant landscaping. The project site plan and landscaping documents would need to conform to the Vegetation Management Plan to ensure that the landscape plantings and maintenance activities are done in a way conforming with wildland fire prevention requirements.

RELATION TO FIRE PROTECTION SERVICES

The Draft EIR identifies significant impacts and cumulative impacts associated with fire protection services under impact discussion PS-1 and PS-2 as the proposed project would exacerbate existing fire protection service response time deficiencies in the region due to an increase in visitors and employees on the project site. The Draft EIR includes Mitigation Measure PS-1 to address significant impacts:

> Mitigation Measure PS-1: Prior to issuance of the certificate of occupancy, the project sponsor shall provide trained and certified emergency staff. The project shall provide enough staff to ensure that two emergency staff are on premises and available to respond to emergencies at all times.
>
> The emergency staff shall be trained to meet Tuolumne County Fire Department volunteer fire service standards. Staffing may be provided by Terra Vi employees who have completed the required training.
>
> The Terra Vi project shall provide personal protection equipment (PPE) and positive communication equipment for all emergency staff. PPE and communication equipment shall be stored in a central, secure location. Communication systems shall permit uninterrupted contact between all firefighters at all times and at all locations on or within the property. In addition, there shall be communication at all times between a fire officer and recognized Emergency Command Center (ECC). All equipment required shall be approved by and become property of Tuolumne County and maintained per manufacturer and National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) standards by the Terra Vi project sponsor.

MASTER RESPONSE 6: PUBLIC SERVICES

CEQA's treatment of Public Services impacts is narrowly defined to include only those impacts that would arise from the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which

could cause significant environmental effects. The precise significance criteria used in Chapter 4.14 of the Draft EIR, and also in CEQA Guidelines Appendix G (XV)(a) states:

> Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services: 1) Fire protection; 2) Police protection; 3) Schools; 4) Parks; and 5) Other public facilities?

CEQA regulations and applicable case law on this issue demonstrate the threshold concerns only the environmental effects associated with the provision of new or altered physical public service facilities.[15] CEQA treats public recreational facilities in a similar manner. Response times, service ratios, and other performance objectives are relevant to the analysis only within the context of whether or not new or expanded facilities would be required to meet defined objectives related to those service objectives, and what the environmental effects would be of providing those facilities.

Regarding emergency response times, service ratios, and other performance criteria, the rural nature of Tuolumne County creates difficulties in defining what is acceptable and what is not. For instance, according to the Tuolumne County General Plan EIR, the Tuolumne County Fire Department (TCFD) does not use the National Fire Protection Association standard for fire protection services that requires 1 to 2 firefighters per 1,000 residents because this standard does not work with TCFD's personnel resources and service population. TCFD's acceptable response time for urban areas is 9 minutes, for suburban areas is 10 minutes, for rural areas is 14 minutes, and for remote areas the acceptable response time depends directly on travel distance.[16]

The last category of "remote" would apply to the project site. As many commenters have stated, and as presented on page 4.14-3 of the Draft EIR, the nearest all-hazard emergency services resources (structural and wildland firefighters and paramedics) are located in Groveland, approximately 17 road miles west of the project site. Seasonally, wildland-only firefighting resources are nearer, about 9 miles to the west at the USFS'sU.S. Forest Service's (USFS) Groveland ranger station, and 8 miles to the east at Hodgdon Meadow on Yosemite National Park, where a cooperative USFS/National Park Service (NPS) facility is located. The amount of time required for any of these resources to arrive at the project site would be dependent upon travel time and availability of the resource. These same constraints also apply to law enforcement and ambulance service in this area of the county.

[15] CEQA Guidelines Section 15382 restricts the effects that CEQA mitigation addresses to those "significant effects on the environment" which are defined to include "adverse change in any of the physical conditions within the area affected by the project" "An economic or social change by itself shall not be considered a significant effect on the environment." 14 Cal. Code Regs. §15382. This concept was upheld in direct relation to response times for fire and emergency services in *City of Hayward v. Trustees of California State University* (2015) 242 Cal. App. 4th 833, 842–47 where the court found that the protection of public safety is the first responsibility of local government, the "need for additional fire protection services is not an environmental impact that CEQA requires a project proponent to mitigate," and that as it relates to response times for fire and emergency services that there is "no authority…that CEQA shifts financial responsibility for the provision of adequate fire and emergency response services to the project sponsor."

[16] County of Tuolumne, 2018, Draft EIR for the Tuolumne County General Plan Update, https://www.tuolumnecounty.ca.gov/DocumentCenter/View/11305/Section-311-to-314, accessed October 2, 2020, page 3.14-2.

Based upon the realities imposed by distance and availability of resources, the County has therefore not adopted a specific emergency response time standard for the remote areas of the county. This reality is articulated in both the General Plan and in the operational plans of the relevant service providers. Accordingly, there is no impact to a specified response time or staffing ratio requirement that would be triggered by the project, and the project would not trigger a requirement for the construction of new or expanded public services facilities that could cause a significant environmental effect.

All-hazard emergency response service to the project site and the surrounding area is currently provided by the Groveland Community Services District (GCSD,), though resources from other providers (CAL FIRE, USFS, NPS) also could be dispatched to the site depending on the type of incident and resource availability.[17] GCSD responds to emergencies within its district, and also to out-of-district areas like the project site and the surrounding area through its mutual aid agreement with the County. GCSD would therefore have primary responsibility for the provision of all-hazard emergency response services.

The extent to which response times to the area are deficient is an existing condition. If the proposed project is approved and becomes operational, this existing condition would not have been caused by the project. To assign responsibility for the current situation to a single project is neither fair nor appropriate. Nevertheless, because the project could exacerbate this existing condition, the Draft EIR contains Mitigation Measure PS-1 to provide on-site emergency response personnel, alleviating GCSD service demands:

> Mitigation Measure PS-1: Prior to issuance of the certificate of occupancy, the project sponsor shall provide trained and certified emergency staff. The project shall provide enough staff to ensure that two emergency staff are on premises and available to respond to emergencies at all times.
>
> The emergency staff shall be trained to meet Tuolumne County Fire Department volunteer fire service standards. Staffing may be provided by Terra Vi employees who have completed the required training.
>
> The Terra Vi project shall provide personal protection equipment (PPE) and positive communication equipment for all emergency staff. PPE and communication equipment shall be stored in a central, secure location. Communication systems shall permit uninterrupted contact between all firefighters at all times and at all locations on or within the property. In addition, there shall be communication at all times between a fire officer and recognized Emergency Command Center (ECC). All equipment required shall be approved by and become property of Tuolumne County and maintained per manufacturer and National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) standards by the Terra Vi project sponsor.

In 2019, the Board of Supervisors was made aware by the GCSD of the challenges involved with affording the cost of providing fire services for GCSD. Recently, the General Manager has stated that within three

[17] As is the case with all private land parcels in the vicinity, including the adjacent Yosemite Under Canvas site, the Terra Vi site is located within a State Responsibility Area (SRA) for wildfire protection responsibility. The surrounding federal lands of the Stanislaus National Forest are designated as a Federal Responsibility Area. Through an agreement with the USFS, wildfire protection on SRA lands in the area is provided by the USFS. Such arrangements are common in areas where relatively small and scattered private inholdings are present within much larger areas of undeveloped federal land. These agreements are subject to review and are occasionally revised as conditions change. The role of the USFS is restricted to wildland firefighting only; the USFS does not fight structural fires or provide paramedic service. Those services would fall to another provider such as CAL FIRE or GCSD.

years GCSD will find themselves in a difficult place to financially afford to fund CAL FIRE contract for fire services that are provided at the CAL FIRE station at 11700 Merrell Road in Groveland. Due to the current evaluation of several projects that could utilize GCSD resources, the GCSD Board directed their General Manager to work with the County towards future fire revenues and/or services.

As stated on page 4.14-3 of the Draft EIR, there is a CAL FIRE station at 11700 Merrell Road in Groveland. The station is an Amador station, which is a CAL FIRE fire station with CAL FIRE staff and equipment. The cost of running the station is borne by the State during fire season. During the winter, GCSD is charged for providing the service. This contract is currently being considered for a three-year term, for $263,466 a year. After listening to the issues GCSD is facing and comments that the County does not provide any fire services along the Groveland corridor, on September 22, 2020, the County approved an allocation of $263,466 for the Groveland Amador station to fund the GCSD portion of the CAL FIRE contract. This action taken by the Board allows the County to move towards its goal of providing additional first responder services along the Highway 120 corridor as well as providing financial relief to GCSD. As a result of the County taking over the three-year contract, GCSD will have immediate relief of this financial obligation and can direct over $790,000 to other District needs within the district, including additional staffing or equipment.

There is a relationship between public services and the provision of emergency response to wildfire. Therefore, readers are also referred to Master Response 5: Wildfire in this Final EIR for treatment of that issue. That response provides additional detail as to the project's design features and the applicant's commitments related to wildfire prevention and emergency response. Readers are also referred to Master Response 4: Emergency Evacuation for a detailed discussion of the project's emergency evacuation features and a discussion of potential impacts related to evacuation.

MASTER RESPONSE 7: ALTERNATE LOCATION ALTERNATIVE

Chapter 6, Alternatives, of the Draft EIR analyzes project alternatives in comparison to the impact analysis of the proposed project. Section 6.5.2 provides a description of the Alternate Location Alternative and compares potential impacts of the project on the off-site location, commonly referred to as the "Scar" site, to those of the project at its proposed location. This master response provides a summary of the Draft EIR's analysis of this alternative.

As shown in Table 6-1 on page 6-3 of the Draft EIR, the Alternate Location Alternative would potentially result in similar impacts to the proposed project for most environmental categories analyzed except for Noise, where it would potentially result in substantially lessened impacts than the proposed project, and Public Services, Parks, and Recreation, and Utilities and Service Systems, where it would potentially result in slightly lessened impacts than the proposed project.

The Draft EIR acknowledges, on pages 6-16 to 6-18, that the Alternate Location Alternative would avoid the project's significant-but-mitigable public service impacts. At this alternate location, the project would be located within the GCSD service area, closer to existing stations for police and fire protection services. This would result in faster response times for emergency personnel to arrive on-site, as opposed to the estimated 22-minute response time for emergency personnel to reach the project at the proposed project site, which is outside of the GCSD service area. Under this alternative, the project would also pay taxes into the GCSD, contributing to funding for public and emergency services provided.

The proposed project under this alternative would also utilize water and sewer utilities from GCSD, as opposed to including independent facilities for these on-site. However, improvements and upgrades for a project at this site are unknown and could result in significant environmental impacts, particularly related to growth-inducing impacts. Site-specific study of the alternate site would need to be conducted to ensure adequate water supply and pressure, and adequate capacity for wastewater treatment. Overall, with water and sewer services provided through the GCSD, as opposed to stand-alone “package” systems for the proposed project, impacts to utilities and service systems are considered slightly lessened under this alternative to those of the proposed project. The project would incorporate the same features for solid waste disposal as the proposed project, and the electrical service demands and energy conservation efforts would also remain the same. Similar to the proposed project, construction of the project at the alternate location on largely undeveloped land would increase post-project runoff and result in construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities.

It is unknown whether the Alternate Location Alternative would involve a similar landscaping concept as the proposed project and therefore it is unknown whether it would involve fewer plantings. However, as under Mitigation Measure WF-2 recommended for the proposed project, it is expected that screening plantings could be staggered strategically to provide effective screening while reducing vegetation density.

As described in Chapter 6, Alternatives, of the Draft EIR, the Alternate Location Alternative site is not listed as a hazardous materials site on the GeoTracker (maintained by the SWRCB), EnviroStor (maintained by the Department of Toxic Substances Control), or EnviroMapper (maintained by the United States Environmental Protection Agency) online databases. However, further site-specific assessment would be required if this site was to be developed, outside the scope of this EIR.

Wildfire impacts under the Alternate Location Alternative are considered similar to that of the proposed project because they are both located in Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones and would both include similar building features to reduce wildfire risks.

The Draft EIR discusses on pages 6-18 and 6-19 that the Alternate Location Alternative would not achieve all of the project objectives. The Alternate Location Alternative site location does not provide the same far-field mountain views that the proposed project site provides, and the design and layout of the project would need to be modified to be compatible with the alternate site layout. However, the project serving as a "portal" to the nearby Stanislaus National Forest and U.S. Forest Service lands could relate to proximity, rather than adjacency.

Page 6-27 of the Draft EIR acknowledges that "the ability of this alternative to provide a financially viable project similar to the proposed project is not known, as the alternate site was chosen for analytical purposes in this EIR and has not undergone any detailed technical analysis or fiscal review." In addition, page 6-11 of the Draft EIR states that "the project applicant does not own this alternate site, and the feasibility of acquiring it is unknown." Since publication of the Draft EIR, the County has received a project application for that site from a different applicant. Furthermore, while certain impacts under the Alternate Location Alternative would be reduced, the environmentally superior alternative is chosen based on the analysis of impacts taken together from all environmental issue areas. Therefore, the Reduced Footprint Alternative is chosen in the Draft EIR as the environmentally superior alternative, after the No Project Alternative, and not the Alternate Location Alternative.

5.2 COMMENTS AND RESPONSES

Responses to individual comments are provided in this chapter alongside the text of each corresponding comment. Letters are categorized by:

- Governmental Agencies
- Non-Governmental Organizations and Private Companies
- Members of the Public

Table 5-4 presents comments received on the Draft EIR and responses to each of those comments. Letters are arranged by date received. Where the same comment has been made more than once, a response may direct the reader to another numbered comment and response. Where a response requires revisions to the Draft EIR, these revisions are shown in Chapters 1 and 3 of this Final EIR. Comments are presented in their original format in Appendix K, along with annotations that identify each individual comment number.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

TABLE 5-4 RESPONSES TO COMMENTS RECEIVED ON THE DRAFT EIR

Comment #	Comment	Response
Governmental Agencies		
GOV1	State of California Office of Planning and Research State Clearinghouse, Meng Heu, June 15, 2020	
GOV1-01	Your project is published and the review period will begin on 6/16/2020. Please use the "navigation" and select "published document" to view your project with attachments on CEQAnet. Closing Letters: The State Clearinghouse (SCH) would like to inform you that our office will transition from providing close of review period acknowledgement on your CEQA environmental document, at this time. During the phase of not receiving notice on the close of review period, comments submitted by State Agencies at the close of review period (and after) are available on CEQAnet. Please visit: https://ceqanet.opr.ca.gov/Search/Advanced o Filter for the SCH# of your project OR your "Lead Agency" o If filtering by "Lead Agency" ▪ Select the correct project o Only State Agency comments will be available in the "attachments" section: bold and highlighted Thank you for using CEQA Submit.	The comment is a confirmation of receipt and of the beginning of the public review period of the Draft EIR from the State Clearinghouse. No response is required.
GOV2	Groveland Community Services District, Peter J. Kampa, General Manager, July 17, 2020	
GOV2-01	The Groveland CSD respectfully requests that the county extend the DEIR comment deadline for the Under Canvas and Terra Vi projects for 30 days each to allow the district and county to work out the details of an agreement to fund the cost of fire and emergency response services to the respective projects. We firmly believe that a Community Facilities District or other similar funding mechanism can be required as a condition of development of the projects and provide funding to mitigate the impacts of the development on GCSD fire. Please let me know at your earliest convenience as we have a special meeting on this matter at 10 am Monday July 20.	The comment requests an extension of the public review period of the Draft EIR. Please see Master Response 1, which explains the County's decision not to extend the public review period of the Draft EIR.
GOV3	Caltrans, Kevin Shroder, Interim Office Chief, July 30, 2020	
GOV3-01	The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) appreciates the opportunity to review and comment on the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the development of Terra Vi Lodge, a master planned lodge located at 11262 Sawmill Mountain Road, Groveland, CA 95321. The Terra Vi Lodge will include one hundred (100) guest rooms, seven cabins with 26 guestrooms and five employee housing units, a market, a lodge, event space, emergency landing zone for a helicopter, and other support buildings. The project site consists of two parcels	The comment serves as an introduction to the comments that follow. Please see Responses GOV3-02 through GOV3-14.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
	totaling 63.38± acres. The parcels are zoned Commercial Recreation (CK) and Open Space (O) under Title 17 of the Tuolumne County Ordinance Code. The project site is located at the northeast corner of the intersection of Sawmill Mountain Road and State Route (SR) 120. Caltrans has responded to the previous routing of this project on December 27, 2018, May 20, 2019, October 28, 2019, and December 12, 2019. Caltrans has the following comments based on our previous letters and the current Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR):	
GOV3-02	Traffic Operations: ▪ The proposed site plan shows only access on Sawmill Mountain Road, however, on page 386 of the DEIR the document states a third driveway along SR 120 will be constructed for emergency vehicles. Please describe how the traveling public will be prevented from using this exclusive emergency vehicle access?	The emergency vehicle access road would be closed with a locked gate, consistent with applicable CAL FIRE and County requirements.
GOV3-03	▪ The proposed public driveway access will need to be placed furthest away from the intersection of SR 120/ Sawmill Mountain Road to avoid queueing onto the State Route. Please provided measurements and location of the driveway in relation to the intersection in the site plan.	The Terra Vi Lodge site plan includes two driveways on Sawmill Mountain Road to serve the main resort buildings and provide access to the outlying structures. The most southerly access is 200 feet from Highway 120, measured centerline to centerline, the second driveway is 675 feet from Highway 120.
GOV3-04	▪ The Traffic Impact Study (TIS) used to determine mitigations in the DEIR needs to be submitted to Caltrans for review along with the electronic files used for the analysis. In addition, please define the Hardin Flat Road intersection location as it relates to the project location.	The Transportation Impact Analysis Report was included as Appendix J of the Draft EIR. SYNCHRO files used to determine operating conditions at study intersections were transmitted to Caltrans District 3 on August 13, 2020. The Hardin Flat Road intersection on Highway 120 is 1,400 feet from the Highway 120/Sawmill Mountain Road intersection and is about 175 feet from the proposed emergency access.
GOV3-05	▪ Page 379 of the DEIR shows truck traffic may deteriorate Sawmill Mountain Road if used for traffic handling. How will the project mitigate for the truck traffic detour causing this deterioration?	Maintenance of Sawmill Mountain Road is the responsibility of the USFS. Mitigation Measure TRANS-1.2B requires the project proponents to maintain Sawmill Mountain Road as noted below.

Comment #	Comment	Response
		Mitigation Measure TRANS-1.2b: Prior to the start of any construction activity on-site or in the Highway 120/Sawmill Mountain Road intersection, the applicant shall coordinate with the Tuolumne County Public Works Department for an on-site inspection of Sawmill Mountain Road to assess the road surface conditions. Following completion of project construction, but prior to issuance of an occupancy permit, the applicant shall schedule a post-construction inspection to determine if deterioration of the road surface occurred, and if so, the applicant/contractor shall restore the road to pre-construction conditions. Significance with Mitigation: Less than significant.
GOV3-06	▪ Page 383-385 of the DEIR states there will be widening at SR 120 and the proponent will pay fair share. The left turn and acceleration lane are day of opening direct impacts, therefore these improvements should be in place prior to opening day.	As noted on Draft EIR page 4.15-19 the project proposes improvements to the Highway 120/Sawmill Mountain Road intersection, including an east eastbound left turn lane and sight distance improvements. As shown in Table 1-1 and Chapter 3, Revisions to the Draft EIR, of this Final EIR, encroachment permit approval for these intersection improvements would be required prior to the start of construction of the Terra Vi Lodge project and completion of the Highway 120 improvements would be required to be completed prior to operation of the proposed project.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
GOV3-07	▪ The DEIR on page 384 indicates the sight distance to the west from Sawmill Mountain at SR 120 is only 400 ft and does not meet the sight distance of 500 ft for speeds of 55 mph. Page 384 also indicates that the construction of the left turn lane will make the sight distance acceptable. Once the design for the left turn is determined, the sight distance with left turn lane design should be submitted to Caltrans for review.	As noted on page 3-29 and page 4.15-2, improvements to the State highway system would be constructed under an encroachment permit from Caltrans. These improvements are shown conceptually on Sheet C3 of the project application (see Appendix B of the Draft EIR). The design of improvements included under the encroachment permit, including measures to address sight distance, are subject to Caltrans review and approval.
GOV3-08	▪ The development will also include a landing zone for emergency response helicopters and states in the DEIR that it will be easily accessible from SR 120. Where will be the access, in relation to SR 120? Please provide access location on the site plan.	Sheet C1 of the project application (see Appendix B of the Draft EIR) identifies the location of the Helicopter landing zone. The zone is approximately 900 feet from Highway 120.
GOV3-09	▪ The project proposes installing a new Public Transit YART bus stop to Yosemite. Where will this bus stop be relevant to SR 120? Please provide bus stop location on the site plan.	The Yosemite Area Regional Transportation System (YARTS) stop would be developed within the hotel drop-off area located near the northern driveway on Sawmill Mountain Road. The drop-off area is noted in Draft EIR Figure 3-5.
GOV3-10	▪ Please provide a copy of the Temporary construction and lane closures to Caltrans Traffic Management for review.	These details will be provided to Caltrans when these specific construction plans are available.
GOV3-11	Outdoor Advertising: Any proposed directional signs need to be installed by the applicant outside of the state highway right of way and in accordance with State Outdoor Advertising Program regulations and Federal laws. It is important to note that any advertising structure visible to the National Highway System (NHS), which in this case includes SR 49/108, is subject to the provisions of the California Outdoor Advertising Act outlined in Business and Professions Code Section 5200 et seq. Any advertising structure that displays off-premise commercial copy visible from the NHS will require a permit from the Office of Outdoor Advertising (ODA). Any advertising structure that only advertises goods and services available on-premise will not require a permit from ODA, provided it adheres to the provisions of Business and Professions Code Section 5272 and 5274 and	The comment is noted. The comment does not address the adequacy of the Draft EIR.

Comment #	Comment	Response
	California Code of Regulations 2243 and 2246. Each of the proposed advertising structures should refrain from operating in any of the conditions outlined in Business and Professions Code Section 5403. For questions related to the ODA permit application process please contact Kenneth Parmelee at (916) 651-9327.	
GOV3-12	Hydrology: Please provide a copy of the hydrology and hydraulic report to Caltrans for review so we can determine if grading would divert drainage from this proposed project and cause an increase in runoff to existing State facilities. The report must include hydraulic calculations for both existing and proposed conditions, using 25-year storm events and 100-year storm events at the project site location. The calculations should identify the affected drainage inlets, the amount of flow being intercepted and spread width calculations.	All planned improvements along Highway 120 shall be designed and constructed in accordance with Caltrans latest Standard Plans and Standard Specifications. The plans will be submitted to Caltrans for review and approval prior to the submittal for an Encroachment Permit. The Encroachment Permit Application Package (EPAP) shall be submitted to Caltrans at least 60 days prior to the start of construction with detailed information regarding potential lane closures and construction that might impact the roadway. No construction within the Caltrans roadway shall be started prior to receipt of approval by Caltrans.
GOV3-13	Encroachment Permit: For project construction activities which will encroach into Caltrans right of way, the project proponent must submit an application for an Encroachment Permit to the Caltrans Permit Office. Appropriate environmental studies must be submitted with this application. These studies will include an analysis of potential impacts to any cultural sites, biological resources, hazardous waste locations, and/or other resources within Caltrans right of way at the project site. Please include California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) documentation with supporting technical studies when submitting the Encroachment Permit. For more information please visit the Caltrans Website. https://dot.ca.gov/programs/traffic-operations/ep/applications	The comment is noted. The comment does not address the adequacy of the Draft EIR.
GOV3-14	SB 743 is changing CEQA analysis of transportation impacts. It requires local land use projects to provide safe transportation systems, reduce per capita Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT), increase accessibility by mode share of bicycle, pedestrian, and transit travel, and reduce GHG emissions. VMT reduction is necessary to meet the statewide greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions regulations. Caltrans recommends VMT per capita thresholds are 15% below existing regional VMT per capita. Caltrans also recommends establishment of programs or methods to reduce VMT and	The commenter provides recommendations regarding the project's vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and GHG emissions but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. These topics are evaluated in Chapter 4.8, Greenhouse Gas Emissions,

Comment #	Comment	Response
	support appropriate bicycle, pedestrian, and transit infrastructure. If you have any question or would like to discuss these comments, please contact Michael Casas at (209) 986-9830 michael.casas@dot.ca.gov or me at Kevin Schroder (209)Kevin.Schroder@dot.ca.gov	and Chapter 4.15, Transportation, of the Draft EIR.
GOV4	**Groveland Community Services District, Peter J. Kampa, General Manager, July 30, 2020**	
GOV4-01	Groveland Community Services District (GCSD) thanks you for the opportunity to comment on this project. GCSD requested an extension on the comment period to resolve the fire protection and emergency medical services matter with the County, which request was denied. Given that denial, GCSD provides the following comments.	The comment serves as an introduction to the comments that follow, and requests an extension for the public review of the Draft EIR. Please see Responses GOV4-02 through GOV4-06 for further comments and responses and see Master Response 1, which explains the County's decision not to extend the public review period of the Draft EIR.
GOV4-02	GCSD is one of the local fire agencies identified in the Terra Vi Lodge Yosemite Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) as providing fire protection and emergency services to the project pursuant to a mutual aid agreement between GCSD and the Tuolumne County Fire Departments (TCFD). In recognition of a doubling of Groveland Fire Department call volume over the past decade, and in preparation to better understand the impacts to the department by continuing to provide an increased level of service outside the GCSD boundaries, the District commissioned a Fire Department Master Plan update in 2019, which was completed and approved in March 2020. The Fire Master Plan identified increasing demand on GCSD Fire services, with an average of 11.8% of calls occurring outside the District boundaries, but due to the remote location of those calls, 37% of all GCSD Fire Department response time was spent on emergency response outside the District boundaries. This means that an average of 37% of the time, the capacity of GCSD Fire to maintain adequate staffing and equipment for fire protection and emergency response services inside the GCSD boundaries was impaired. Time on out-of-district responses, existing lower than optimal staffing levels and funding shortfalls are identified as the most significant concerns in the 2020 GCSD Fire Master Plan.	The comment summarizes information from a 2020 GCSD Fire Department Master Plan update. Further discussion is included in responses GOV4-03 through GOV4-06 below. Please also see Master Response 6 regarding public services, which explains that there is no impact to a specified response time or staffing ratio requirement that would be triggered by the project, and that the project would not trigger a requirement for the construction of new or expanded public services facilities that could cause a significant environmental effect. Nevertheless, because the project could exacerbate the existing issues posed by the distance of the project area from responding stations, the Draft EIR contains Mitigation Measure PS-1 to provide on-site emergency response personnel and thereby alleviate service demands of GCSD.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
GOV4-03	Our December 21, 2018 response to the project Advisory Notice requested that the EIR evaluate the impacts of the project on the fire services provided by the District in a Fire Services Impact Study. The Fire Impact Analysis contained in the project DEIR incorrectly assumes that all fire department time and resources needed to respond to all calls are equal regardless of whether they are in downtown Groveland or 45 minutes travel time to Evergreen Lodge; and that any impact on GCSD Fire services is based solely on the number of potential emergency calls generated by the project.	Chapter 4.14, Public Services, Parks, and Recreation, and Appendix I, Fire Impact Analysis, of the Draft EIR, adequately acknowledges the distances to the project site from the GCSD Fire Department, TCFD, and Tuolumne County volunteer fire station. The Fire Impact Analysis acknowledges the resources provided at the GCSD, which is the nearest and therefore most-likely first-in station to respond to a fire threat at the project site. The Fire Impact Analysis also acknowledges the County's evaluation of needs regarding fire response and resulting significant challenges based on constrained funding and declining volunteer participation. The EIR consultants and County staff communicated with the GCSD Fire Chief and Deputy Fire Chief during the preparation of the Draft EIR to determine the existing conditions and potential project effects as they relate to fire and emergency medical services. The information in the Draft EIR is based on those communications. Please also see Master Response 6 for more information regarding public services.
GOV4-04	The Impact Analysis also incorrectly assumes that the only factor affecting the need for additional staffing and equipment within the GCSD Fire Department is call volume. While call volume is one factor that drives staffing, the most critical factor affecting staff and equipment availability are the types and locations of calls. The more time the engine is out of the station, the more costly and quickly GCSD must add an additional full compliment of staff and equipment. The Fire Impact Analysis does not adequately or accurately evaluate the impact on or of fire department response times on any type of emergency call, nor does it address the	The comment incorrectly states that the Draft EIR only considers call volume as a factor affecting the need for staffing and equipment. In addition to call volume, page 4 of the Fire Impact Analysis (Draft EIR Appendix I) states that "significant challenges to the ongoing provision of fire/EMS services

Comment #	Comment	Response
	impact to GCSD Fire Department's ability to protect life and property inside the District statutory and Automatic Aid/Mutual Aid boundaries, when on calls at the project site. Due to the flaws in the evaluation of impact on fire department staff and equipment availability, the financial impact analysis is also flawed and incorrect.	within the unincorporated areas of Tuolumne County, including declining participation of volunteer emergency response personnel and a commensurate increase in need for paid emergency response personnel, combined with a constrained ability of the funding mechanisms available to pay for the operational and capital costs of fire/EMS services to keep up with the increased costs to provide these services." The Fire Impact Analysis also states that "concerns have been expressed that an increase of out-of-district calls to the Terra Vi project site will create more times that the existing personnel from the Groveland station are not available to respond to in-district calls, resulting in delayed response times within the district."
GOV4-05	Section 4.14-3 of the Draft Environmental Impact Report identifies fire protection services for the project will be provided through a multi-jurisdictional effort by the GCSD, Tuolumne County Fire Department (TCFD), CAL FIRE, and the United States Forest Service. The closest staffed fire station to the proposed project site is the GCSD Station 78. While GCSD and TCFD have entered into an Automatic Aid/Mutual Aid Agreement, dated April 2016, the Terra Vi Lodge Yosemite Project is located outside the boundaries of both the GCSD and the response boundaries agreed upon in the Automatic Aid/Mutual Aid Agreement. Therefore, GCSD Fire is not the appropriate entity to identify as the first responding agency to the project site. The FEIR should include analysis and identification of necessary resources so GSCD is able to provide the fire protection and emergency medical services otherwise identified in the DEIR. This analysis must be provided in the FEIR to be considered adequate.	The Automatic Aid/Mutual Aid Agreement results in cross-over between the participating fire departments to respond to emergencies within the region as needed, on a case-by-case basis. The Draft EIR assumes that GCSD would be the appropriate first-in responder because it is the nearest all-hazard emergency response station. Stations nearer to the project site include a USFS station 9 miles to the west and an NPS station 8 miles to the east; both of these stations are wildland-only stations. The EIR consultants and County staff communicated with the GCSD Fire Chief and Deputy Fire Chief during the preparation of the Draft EIR to determine the existing

Comment #	Comment	Response
		conditions and potential project effects as they relate to fire and emergency medical services. During that communication, the GCSD provided information that the County has Automatic Aid agreements with the districts within the county and that under this agreement the GCSD and/or CAL FIRE would be the first to respond to incidents at the project site. (White, Josh and Murphy, Andrew, GCSD. Personal communication with Tuolumne County, PlaceWorks, and BAE Urban Economics. September 5, 2019.) Please also see Master Response 6.
GOV4-06	The project is also located in an area deemed a "High Fire Hazard Severity Zone" and is susceptible to wildfire risks with minimal to no fire protection or emergency medical services available. This means that if GCSD Fire is called to respond to an evolving fire emergency related to the project facility and is unable to respond for whatever reason, the result could be small fires becoming large, uncontrolled fire incidents while waiting on response from remote stations. GCSD is agreeable to a condition on the project which would address the facilities, infrastructure and funds necessary to provide adequate fire protection and emergency medical services to the project. We request the revisions and corrections identified above be addressed in the Final EIR.	Chapter 4.14, Public Services, Parks, and Recreation, of the Draft EIR includes Mitigation Measure PS-1 which is intended to ensure the provision of on-site fire protection resources to address the types of small incidents described. This, combined with on-site sprinklers, hydrants, and stored water for fire suppression will aid in preventing larger fires. Please see Master Response 6, which explains that the County Board of Supervisors has recently voted to divert County funds to contract with CAL FIRE and takeover GCSD's contract with CAL FIRE for operation of the Groveland Amador CAL FIRE station on Merrell Road during the winter months. This agreement would alleviate GCSD's budget concerns, increase the County's role in providing first responder services along Highway 120, and help to

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
		ensure year-round service at the Merrell Road station.[18]
GOV5	Groveland Community Services District, Peter J. Kampa, General Manager, July 30, 2020	
GOV5-01	Tracie, As you are aware, the Terra Vi and Under Canvas projects both fall outside of the service area obligations(Area of Obligation) of the Groveland Community Services District (GCSD) and the 2016 Automatic Aid/Mutual Aid Agreement (Agreement). Currently, the nearest emergency services available to seve the area is located in Jamestown over an hour away. While in the past the GCSD has assisted the County by responding to a few calls to areas outside its Area of Obligation, GCSD simply cannot and will not continue to do so and bear the financial burden associated with doing so. Though GCSD is willing to explore entering into an agreement whereby it would receive reimbursement for providing services to those areas, we fully understand the fiscal constraints that the County is undergoing, especially in this time of pandemic. As I promised during our recent meeting, I have reached out to our special tax consultant, SCI, and GCSD legal counsel regarding possible funding options available for the County to consider. One which is typically used in development situations like these is to have the projects fund the ongoing cost of providing fire and emergency response services to them by creating a Community Facilities District (CFD). It can be made a condition of the approval of their projects. That would provide the County the necessary funding to provide emergency services to the projects without depleting existing limited county funding. Following our conversation, I have confirmed that a CFD is a common taxation mechanism used by districts, cities and counties throughout the state to efficiently fund public services provided to projects. To form a CFD, one step is to prepare Financial Impact Study to demonstrate the nexus between the purpose and amount of the CFD tax and the services received. All of this work would be at the expense of the developers for both projects. But to do so, the County would need to make it a condition of the approval of both projects. The funds obtained through the annual CFD taxes could be used to reimburse GCSD for the costs of providing emergency services to those projects should it chose to contract with GCSD. In addition, the County could explore including the Rush Creek and Evergreen lodges as part of the CFD since doing so would be in their interests as well. In addition, once created, future developments projects would also be subject to annexation into the CFD thus addressing emergency service needs of those	The commenter recommends the formation of a Community Facilities District as part of project approval. The comment is not a comment on the Draft EIR. Please see Master Response 6.

[18] Tuolumne County, County Administrator's Office, September 21, 2020, Memo from Tracie M. Riggs, County Administrative Officer to the Board of Supervisors re: Groveland CALFIRE Amador Station.

Comment #	Comment	Response
	projects. Considering the above opportunities for funding essential services to be provided to the projects, we feel that it is in the County's best interest to require the formation of a Community Facilities District or similar assessment district as a condition of approval of the Terra Vi and Under Canvas projects to fund the perpetual cost of fire and emergency response services. That way the County would have the funds to contract with GCSD (or other vendor) to provide those services on behalf of the County. It is very important that the County understand that absent an agreement, GCSD will not be providing fire and emergency response services beyond the boundaries of the Response Plan of the Automatic/Mutual Aid Agreement; leaving both projects and the existing lodges with hour-long plus response times provided out of the remote TCFD stations in Jamestown or Sonora. If the county decides to condition both projects on the formation of a CFD or similar assessment area, GCSD is ready to assist the County in working with the project developers in creating it. GCSD believes that the County should seriously consider conditioning the approval of both projects on the creation of a CFD or other assessment area. That, together with a successful regional Fire Special Tax being considered, would go a long way to solidifying emergency services on the highway 120 corridor. As time is of the essence, we would be happy to meet at your earliest convenience to share thoughts on how the County can take advantage of this development tool.	
GOV6	Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board, Nicholas White, Water Resource Control Engineer, July 31, 2020	
GOV6-01	Pursuant to the State Clearinghouse's 15 June 2020 request, the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (Central Valley Water Board) has reviewed the Request for Review for the Draft Environmental Impact Report for the Terra Vi Lodge Yosemite SDP18-003 Project, located in Tuolumne County. Our agency is delegated with the responsibility of protecting the quality of surface and groundwaters of the state; therefore our comments will address concerns surrounding those issues.	The comment serves as an introduction to the comments that follow. Please see Responses GOV6-02 through GOV6-03.
GOV6-02	I. Regulatory Setting <u>Basin Plan</u> The Central Valley Water Board is required to formulate and adopt Basin Plans for all areas within the Central Valley region under Section 13240 of the Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act. Each Basin Plan must contain water quality objectives to ensure the reasonable	The commenter provides information about the Basin Plan, requests the Draft EIR evaluate impacts to both surface and groundwater quality, and that the Draft EIR shall require best management practices

Comment #	Comment	Response
	protection of beneficial uses, as well as a program of implementation for achieving water quality objectives with the Basin Plans. Federal regulations require each state to adopt water quality standards to protect the public health or welfare, enhance the quality of water and serve the purposes of the Clean Water Act. In California, the beneficial uses, water quality objectives, and the Antidegradation Policy are the State's water quality standards. Water quality standards are also contained in the National Toxics Rule, 40 CFR Section 131.36, and the California Toxics Rule, 40 CFR Section 131.38. The Basin Plan is subject to modification as necessary, considering applicable laws, policies, technologies, water quality conditions and priorities. The original Basin Plans were adopted in 1975, and have been updated and revised periodically as required, using Basin Plan amendments. Once the Central Valley Water Board has adopted a Basin Plan amendment in noticed public hearings, it must be approved by the State Water Resources Control Board (State Water Board), Office of Administrative Law (OAL) and in some cases, the United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA). Basin Plan amendments only become effective after they have been approved by the OAL and in some cases, the USEPA. Every three (3) years, a review of the Basin Plan is completed that assesses the appropriateness of existing standards and evaluates and prioritizes Basin Planning issues. For more information on the Water Quality Control Plan for the Sacramento and San Joaquin River Basins, please visit our website: http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/water_issues/basin_plans/ <u>Antidegradation Considerations</u> All wastewater discharges must comply with the Antidegradation Policy (State Water Board Resolution 68-16) and the Antidegradation Implementation Policy contained in the Basin Plan. The Antidegradation Implementation Policy is available on page 74 at: https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/water_issues/basin_plans/sacsjr_201805.pdf In part it states: Any discharge of waste to high quality waters must apply best practicable treatment or control not only to prevent a condition of pollution or nuisance from occurring, but also to maintain the highest water quality possible consistent with the maximum benefit to the people of the State. This information must be presented as an analysis of the impacts and potential impacts of the discharge on water quality, as measured by background concentrations and applicable water quality objectives.	(BMPs) with the treatment and control of wastewater, but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. Wastewater is evaluated in Chapter 4.16, Utilities and Service Systems, of the Draft EIR. Please also see Master Response 2.

Comment #	Comment	Response
	The antidegradation analysis is a mandatory element in the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System and land discharge Waste Discharge Requirements (WDRs) permitting processes. The environmental review document should evaluate potential impacts to both surface and groundwater quality.	
GOV6-03	II. Permitting Requirements <u>Construction Storm Water General Permit</u> Dischargers whose project disturb one or more acres of soil or where projects disturb less than one acre but are part of a larger common plan of development that in total disturbs one or more acres, are required to obtain coverage under the General Permit for Storm Water Discharges Associated with Construction Activities (Construction General Permit), Construction General Permit Order No. 2009-009-DWQ. Construction activity subject to this permit includes clearing, grading, grubbing, disturbances to the ground, such as stockpiling, or excavation, but does not include regular maintenance activities performed to restore the original line, grade, or capacity of the facility. The Construction General Permit requires the development and implementation of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). For more information on the Construction General Permit, visit the State Water Resources Control Board website at: http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/stormwater/constpermits.shtml <u>Phase I and II Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) Permits1</u> The Phase I and II MS4 permits require the Permittees reduce pollutants and runoff flows from new development and redevelopment using Best Management Practices (BMPs) to the maximum extent practicable (MEP). MS4 Permittees have their own development standards, also known as Low Impact Development (LID)/post-construction standards that include a hydromodification component. The MS4 permits also require specific design concepts for LID/post-construction BMPs in the early stages of a project during the entitlement and CEQA process and the development plan review process. For more information on which Phase I MS4 Permit this project applies to, visit the Central Valley Water Board website at: http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/water_issues/storm_water/municipal_permits/ For more information on the Phase II MS4 permit and who it applies to, visit the State Water Resources Control Board at: http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/stormwater/phase_ii_municipal.shtml	The comment discusses required storm water and storm sewer system permits but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. These topics are evaluated in Chapter 4.16, Utilities and Service Systems, of the Draft EIR. Please also see Master Response 2.

Comment #	Comment	Response
	Industrial Storm Water General Permit Storm water discharges associated with industrial sites must comply with the regulations contained in the Industrial Storm Water General Permit Order No. 2014-0057-DWQ. For more information on the Industrial Storm Water General Permit, visit the Central Valley Water Board website at: http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/water_issues/storm_water/industrial_general_permits/index.shtml Clean Water Act Section 404 Permit If the project will involve the discharge of dredged or fill material in navigable waters or wetlands, a permit pursuant to Section 404 of the Clean Water Act may be needed from the United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE). If a Section 404 permit is required by the USACE, the Central Valley Water Board will review the permit application to ensure that discharge will not violate water quality standards. If the project requires surface water drainage realignment, the applicant is advised to contact the Department of Fish and Game for information on Streambed Alteration Permit requirements. If you have any questions regarding the Clean Water Act Section 404 permits, please contact the Regulatory Division of the Sacramento District of USACE at (916) 557-5250. Clean Water Act Section 401 Permit – Water Quality Certification If an USACE permit (e.g., Non-Reporting Nationwide Permit, Nationwide Permit, Letter of Permission, Individual Permit, Regional General Permit, Programmatic General Permit), or any other federal permit (e.g., Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act or Section 9 from the United States Coast Guard), is required for this project due to the disturbance of waters of the United States (such as streams and wetlands), then a Water Quality Certification must be obtained from the Central Valley Water Board prior to initiation of project activities. There are no waivers for 401 Water Quality Certifications. For more information on the Water Quality Certification, visit the Central Valley Water Board website at: https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/water_issues/water_quality_certification/ Waste Discharge Requirements – Discharges to Waters of the State If USACE determines that only non-jurisdictional waters of the State (i.e., “non-federal” waters of the State) are present in the proposed project area, the proposed project may require a Waste Discharge Requirement (WDR) permit to be issued by Central Valley Water Board. Under the California Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act, discharges to all waters of the State, including all wetlands and other waters of the State including, but not limited to, isolated	

Comment #	Comment	Response
	wetlands, are subject to State regulation. For more information on the Waste Discharges to Surface Water NPDES Program and WDR processes, visit the Central Valley Water Board website at:https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/water_issues/waste_to_surface_water/ Projects involving excavation or fill activities impacting less than 0.2 acre or 400 linear feet of non-jurisdictional waters of the state and projects involving dredging activities impacting less than 50 cubic yards of non-jurisdictional waters of the state may be eligible for coverage under the State Water Resources Control Board Water Quality Order No. 2004-0004-DWQ (General Order 2004-0004). For more information on the General Order 2004-0004, visit the State Water Resources Control Board website at: https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/board_decisions/adopted_orders/water_quality/2004/wqo/wqo2004-0004.pdf <u>Waste Discharge Requirements – Discharges to Land</u> Pursuant to the State Board's Onsite Wastewater Treatment Systems Policy, the regulation of the septic system may be regulated under the local agency's management program. Please note that only domestic wastewater coming from bathrooms and kitchens should be discharged to septic systems. Cannabis cultivation can generate other wastewaters such as irrigation runoff, water treatment effluent, cleaning agents, and wash waters. Discharges of these wastewaters to an on-site wastewater system such as a septic tank and leach field must obtain separate regulatory authorization, such as waste discharge requirements (WDRs), a conditional waiver of WDRs, or other permit mechanism, prior to discharge. The application to obtain WDRs or a conditional waiver of WDRs can take over a year to process and requires that you characterize the wastewater chemistry and volume. In lieu of discharging to a septic system, Water Board staff recommends that wastewaters from cannabis cultivation activities be discharged to a holding tank and then hauled by a servicing company to a community wastewater treatment plant for disposal. For more information on waste discharges to land, visit the Central Valley Water Board website at: http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/water_issues/waste_to_land/index.shtml <u>Dewatering Permit</u> If the proposed project includes construction or groundwater dewatering to be discharged to	

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
	land, the proponent may apply for coverage under State Water Board General Water Quality Order (Low Threat General Order) 2003-0003 or the Central Valley Water Board's Waiver of Report of Waste Discharge and Waste Discharge Requirements (Low Threat Waiver) R5-2018-0085. Small temporary construction dewatering projects are projects that discharge groundwater to land from excavation activities or dewatering of underground utility vaults. Dischargers seeking coverage under the General Order or Waiver must file a Notice of Intent with the Central Valley Water Board prior to beginning discharge. For more information regarding the Low Threat General Order and the application process, visit the Central Valley Water Board website at: http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/board_decisions/adopted_orders/water_quality/2003/wqo/wqo2003-0003.pdf For more information regarding the Low Threat Waiver and the application process, visit the Central Valley Water Board website at: https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/board_decisions/adopted_orders/waivers/r5-2018-0085.pdf <u>Limited Threat General NPDES Permit</u> If the proposed project includes construction dewatering and it is necessary to discharge the groundwater to waters of the United States, the proposed project will require coverage under a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit. Dewatering discharges are typically considered a low or limited threat to water quality and may be covered under the General Order for Limited Threat Discharges to Surface Water (Limited Threat General Order). A complete Notice of Intent must be submitted to the Central Valley Water Board to obtain coverage under the Limited Threat General Order. For more information regarding the Limited Threat General Order and the application process, visit the Central Valley Water Board website at: https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/board_decisions/adopted_orders/general_orders/r5-2016-0076-01.pdf <u>NPDES Permit</u> If the proposed project discharges waste that could affect the quality of surface waters of the State, other than into a community sewer system, the proposed project will require coverage under a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit. A complete Report of	

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
	Waste Discharge must be submitted with the Central Valley Water Board to obtain a NPDES Permit. For more information regarding the NPDES Permit and the application process, visit the Central Valley Water Board website at: https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/help/permit/ If you have questions regarding these comments, please contact me at (916) 464-4856 or Nicholas.White@waterboards.ca.gov.	
GOV7	**Caltrans, Alan Roberts, Encroachment Permit Staff, July 31, 2020**	
GOV7-01	Hello Ms. Yaley, I wanted to share with you some new information regarding the Terra Vi DEIR comment letter that we emailed. One of our Encroachment Permit staff Aland Roberts has the following statement regarding NEPA documentation. Did the EIR include any NEPA consideration for Highway 120 Right of Way impacts? Please see email from Alan Roberts. If you have questions or comments please email me or call me.	The comment asks whether NEPA analysis was conducted for the project. The commenter, Caltrans, submitted a subsequent letter with additional information. Please see responses to Comment Letter GOV8. Please see Comment GOV8-05.
GOV7-02	Michael, I can't tell from the letter that was sent to the County if they will be accomplishing a NEPA clearance on the project's impacts in the Highway 120 right-of-way. I did see the original APE and I do not believe any portion of Highway 120 was included. The letter does mention access improvements in the state Highway 120 right-of-way, with regard to traffic analysis and safety concerns. Our department is currently requiring that the Environmental Clearance be provided with the applications for commercial developments. If the area is not covered acceptably in the County's environmental clearance determination then the Developer will need to open a Cooperative Agreement with the County and Caltrans to fund environmental study at a future date. Please notify the County if they are not aware of this matter.	The comment references a potential need for NEPA documentation for the proposed project. The commenter, Caltrans, submitted a subsequent letter with additional information. Please see responses to Comment Letter GOV8. Please see Comment GOV8-05.
GOV8	**Caltrans, Kevin Schroder, Acting Branch Office Chief, August 26, 2020**	
GOV8-01	Dear Ms. Yaley, The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) appreciates the opportunity to review and comment on the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the development of the Terra Vi Lodge, a master planned lodge located at 11262 Sawmill Mountain Road, Groveland, CA 95321. The Terra Vi Lodge will include one hundred (100) guest rooms, seven cabins with 26 guestrooms and five employee housing units, a market, a lodge, event spaces, emergency	The comment does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
	landing zone for a helicopter, and other support buildings. The project site consists of two parcels totaling 63.38± acres, APN 068-120-060 and 068-120-061. The parcels are zoned Commercial Recreation (C-K) and Open Space (O) under Title 17 of the Tuolumne County Ordinance Code. The project site is located at the northeast corner of the intersection of Sawmill Mountain Road and State Route (SR) 120.	
GOV8-02	Caltrans has responded to the previous routing of this project on December 27, 2018, May 20, 2019, October 28, 2019, December 12, 2019 and July 30, 2020. Caltrans has the following comments based on our previous letters and proposal for sight distance improvements at Sawmill Mountain Road for acceleration and deceleration lanes, including turn lanes on SR 120.	The comment is noted. Caltrans is aware of the proposal to improve the Highway 120/Sawmill Mountain Road intersection.
GOV8-03	Right of Way: • In reviewing the location of TUO-120 PM 50.82 at Sawmill Mountain Road through TUO-120-PM 50.3, Caltrans has fee ownership at the location where the break of access lies within an access-controlled right of way (ROW). At Sawmill Mountain Road TUO-120-PM 50.82, the request for highway improvements prompts a Decertification Process and would require the Private or Public requestor to submit a deposit with a Decertification application. • Caltrans rights are by easement only through U.S. Forest Service (USFS) lands within the proposed development post mile range. Our easement is limited to the operation and maintenance of SR 120 within 66' left and right of the centerline, together with any and all man-made features including drainages adjacent to and appurtenant to the existing SR 120.	The comment outlines the steps needed to obtain the right to install improvements to Highway 120 in this area of Highway 120. The comment is noted.
GOV8-04	Caltrans Right of Way Manual Section for Decertification 16.05.12.0 Requests to Decertify and Purchase An adjoining owner or public agency may request the Caltrans to decertify a portion of operating right of way, sell, or otherwise convey access or other property rights not considered as excess land. Excess Land shall not initiate any action until the requesting party has deposited, as a minimum amount, the estimated costs of processing the request, including appropriate overhead assessments. Accounting for the overhead should be done pursuant to procedures set forth in the Accounting Manual. Project Development reviews requests for decertification and obtains approval from Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) where necessary. If the Private or Public requestor is requesting access within National Forest Service (NFS) lands, Caltrans does not have fee rights. Caltrans has only easement rights within NFS lands. Since Federal funding was involved in the development of SR 120, then the improvements,	The comment outlines the steps needed to obtain the right to install improvements to Highway 120 in this area of Highway 120. The comment is noted.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
	commercial approach, left turn lane, acceleration, deceleration lanes, and utility crossing improvements would need to meet the design standards for the facility. Any design exception will require FHWA approval of sign-off and they would request National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) clearance documentation in their evaluation.	
GOV8-05	8.18.18.00 Environmental Clearance Requests for a federal land transfer may need an environmental document that assures compliance with NEPA of 1969 (42 USC 4332, et seq.), the Historic Preservation Act [16 USC 470(f)], and Preservation of Parklands Act [49 USC 1653(f)]. Under the Caltrans' NEPA assignment from the FHWA, Caltrans is the lead agency and author of the NEPA document for Federal-aid highway projects.	The comment outlines the steps needed to obtain the right to install improvements to Highway 120 in this area of Highway 120. The comment is noted.
GOV8-06	• For additional information regarding 16.05.12.0 Requests to Decertify and Purchase and 8.18.18.00 Environmental Clearance, please view the Caltrans website: https://dot.ca.gov/programs/right-of-way/right-of-way-manual	The comment outlines the steps needed to obtain the right to install improvements to Highway 120 in this area of Highway 120. The comment is noted.
GOV8-07	Environmental: • Prior to Caltrans approval for work in our ROW, Caltrans needs to see approval from USFS for work in their ROW. Please note a NEPA document will be required from the USFS.	The comment outlines the steps needed to obtain the right to install improvements to Highway 120 in this area of Highway 120. The comment is noted.
GOV8-08	• Caltrans will need to see resolutions to all comments made in the draft EIR including the May 29, 2019 Calfire comment regarding the California Forest Improvement Program (CFIP) and public comments regarding pedestrian crosswalk across SR 120.	The comment outlines the steps needed to obtain the right to install improvements to Highway 120 in this area of Highway 120. The comment is noted.
GOV8-09	Encroachment Permit: • The permit applicant needs to provide a copy of the easement they have to Sawmill Mountain Road that is given to them from the property owner. The Permit office grants permits only to abutting property owners to the State Highway or to a third party in case they have a legal easement to that property and the easement is defined. • Caltrans comments that will be incorporated into the final conditions of approval are not approval of design plans for traffic mitigation improvements inside of SR 120. Those design plans will be submitted at a future date.	The Draft EIR acknowledges that an encroachment permit is required for improvements in the State right of way and that the design of improvements to Highway 120 will be determined at that time.
GOV8-10	For project construction activities which will encroach into Caltrans ROW, the project proponent must submit an application for an Encroachment Permit to the Caltrans Permit Office. The NEPA and California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) clearances must be submitted with the	The comment explains the documentation required for the project to obtain an encroachment permit from Caltrans. The

Comment #	Comment	Response
	application for encroachment permit which address all improvements and soil disturbance activities within the SR 120 ROW. Copies of all appropriate environmental studies must be submitted with this application. These studies shall include analysis of potential impacts to any cultural sites, biological resources, hazardous waste locations, and/or other resources within Caltrans ROW at the project site. The permit package submittal must have a complete engineered set of plans that meets all Caltrans standards. For more information please visit the Caltrans website. https://dot.ca.gov/programs/traffic-operations/ep/applications	project will be required to comply with these submittal requirements in order to secure the encroachment permit. The comment does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR.
GOV8-11	If you have any questions or would like to discuss these comments, please contact Michael Casas at (209) 986-9830 michael.casas@dot.ca.gov or me at Kevin Schroder (209) 986-9635 Kevin.Schroder.dot.ca.gov	The comment does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR.
Non-Governmental Organizations and Private Companies		
ORG1-01	Please read the attached formal request for an extension of time for all of us who are struggling to wade through 3,000+ pages in the two massive draft EIRs for the Yosemite Under Canvas and the Terra Vi Lodge projects. Both are the largest EIR documents for a project that have ever been presented to the public for comments. Because they are directly adjacent, in order to understand what one EIR claims it is essential to consider what the other EIR claims. In addition, as you know the COVID-19 situation adds additional stress, reduced ability to meet and dialogue, etc. I respectfully ask that you skim over the attached extension request and then grant the requested extension of the comment period. I know all of you want informed comments. On behalf of our Center (as well as numerous private citizens who have contacted me over the past week as they struggle to wade through the incredibly lengthy DEIR for the “Yosemite Under Canvas” project), I am formally asking the County for an extension of the deadline for public comments. Because our staff values the State requirement for CEQA analysis and because (as you know) we take the time to actually carefully read planning documents, I respectfully point out that this DEIR is truly overwhelming in size and technical content. Whether the information and judgments within it are accurate, consistent with CEQA, etc. is not the focus of this letter.	The comment requests an extension of the public review period of the Draft EIR. Please see Master Response 1, which explains the County's decision not to extend the public review period of the Draft EIR.

Comment #	Comment	Response
	But what matters is that after I have personally invested roughly 50 hours in an intensive review of the 272 pages of the key Under Canvas EIR analysis and an additional review of the next 300+ pages of the overall document, I am still struggling to read through the remainder of the 1,263 total pages. THIS IS THE SINGLE LARGEST EIR DOCUMENT PRODUCED FOR A TUOLUMNE COUNTY PROJECT THAT OUR CENTER HAS EVER REVIEWED. Property owners and concerned citizens who are attempting to dig into this intensely detailed document must be struggling even more. 45 days is simply not enough time. In addition, the COVID-19 pandemic situation already adds considerable stress and challenges because state mandates restrict gatherings for face-to-face discussions with project neighbors, with other local conservation activists, etc. The pandemic situation adds to the already difficult challenge of not only reading the 1,263 pages of the Under Canvas DEIR, but to simultaneously work to develop well-informed responses and comments. An additional compelling reason for an extension of the comment period is that for some reason the County chose to release the EVEN MORE MASSIVE DEIR for Terra Vi Lodge at the same time that county residents are being asked to review the massive Yosemite Under Canvas DEIR. What one EIR claims or asserts for transportation, wildfire, water, biological resources, etc. matters to the other project because they are directly adjacent and because the projects are openly acknowledged to produce combined cumulative impacts. Our staff has seen that Vol. I and Vol. II of the Terra Vi Lodge DEIR total 1,866 pages that also need to be read through in order to be informed. THERE IS NO CONCEIVABLE WAY THAT COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSIONERS OR COUNTY SUPERVISORS WILL HONESTLY BE ABLE TO CAREFULLY REVIEW THE YOSEMITE UNDER CANVAS DEIR BY JULY 2OTH OR TO POSSIBLY READ AND PROCESS THE INFORMATION IN THE ADDITIONAL TERRA VI LODGE DEIR BY JULY 30TH. There is no way for our staff or concerned county residents to complete a review of either or both documents by the current deadlines. FORMAL REQUEST: Because the County obviously desires well-informed citizen involvement and desires that comments on projects will be accurate and appropriate, then it is essential to allow adequate time for the review of both the Yosemite Under Canvas DEIR and the Terra Vi Lodge DEIR. CSERC respectfully requests an extension of 30 days for each DEIR since they are interconnected and together require the review of more than 3,000 pages of dry reading, data, Timber Harvest	

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
	Plans, well reports, site plans, etc. If 30 days is not somehow acceptable, our Center asks for at least an extension of 20 days for each, but 30 days for each is our clear request. Please respond back to this request for an extension as soon as reasonably feasible. Thank you. Stay healthy.	
ORG2	Tuolumne Group of the Sierra Club, Dr. Kevin Rice, PhD, Conservation Chair, July 13, 2020	
ORG2-01	The Tuolumne Group of the Sierra Club is respectfully requesting a 30 day extension to the review periods for both the Under Canvas DEIR and the Terra Vi DEIR. The almost simultaneous release of both these DEIRs when coupled with the enormous size of each, makes it very difficult to adequately review either under the current time constraint. Thank you for considering our request and please let us know your response as soon as possible. I've sent a similar request to the Board of Supervisors.	The comment requests an extension of the public review period of the Draft EIR. Please see Master Response 1, which explains the County's decision not to extend the public review period of the Draft EIR.
ORG3	Central Sierra Environmental Resource Center, John Buckley, Executive Director, July 15, 2020	
ORG3-01	I am checking as to what the County has decided in response to our Center's July 10th request for a meaningful extension of the public comment deadline for the Yosemite Under Canvas DEIR and the Terra Vi Lodge DEIR comment periods. Could you confirm that you received my formal request (attached again below) and give me a response as soon as possible?	The comment requests an extension of the public review period of the Draft EIR. Please see Master Response 1, which explains the County's decision not to extend the public review period of the Draft EIR.
ORG3-02	On behalf of our Center (as well as numerous private citizens who have contacted me over the past week as they struggle to wade through the incredibly lengthy DEIR for the "Yosemite Under Canvas" project), I am formally asking the County for an extension of the deadline for public comments. Because our staff values the State requirement for CEQA analysis and because (as you know) we take the time to actually carefully read planning documents, I respectfully point out that this DEIR is truly overwhelming in size and technical content. Whether the information and judgments within it are accurate, consistent with CEQA, etc. is not the focus of this letter. But what matters is that after I have personally invested roughly 50 hours in an intensive review of the 272 pages of the key Under Canvas EIR analysis and an additional review of the next 300+ pages of the overall document, I am still struggling to read through the remainder of the 1,263 total pages. THIS IS THE SINGLE LARGEST EIR DOCUMENT PRODUCED FOR A TUOLUMNE COUNTY PROJECT THAT OUR CENTER HAS EVER REVIEWED. Property owners and concerned	The comment requests an extension of the public review period of the Draft EIR. Please see Master Response 1, which explains the County's decision not to extend the public review period of the Draft EIR.

Comment #	Comment	Response
	citizens who are attempting to dig into this intensely detailed document must be struggling even more. 45 days is simply not enough time. In addition, the COVID-19 pandemic situation already adds considerable stress and challenges because state mandates restrict gatherings for face-to-face discussions with project neighbors, with other local conservation activists, etc. The pandemic situation adds to the already difficult challenge of not only reading the 1,263 pages of the Under Canvas DEIR, but to simultaneously work to develop well-informed responses and comments. An additional compelling reason for an extension of the comment period is that for some time that county residents are being asked to review the massive Yosemite Under Canvas DEIR. What one EIR claims or asserts for transportation, wildfire, water, biological resources, etc. matters to the other project because they are directly adjacent and because the projects are openly acknowledged to produce combined cumulative impacts. Our staff has seen that Vol. I and Vol. II of the Terra Vi Lodge DEIR total 1,866 pages that also need to be read through in order to be informed. THERE IS NO CONCEIVABLE WAY THAT COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSIONERS OR COUNTY SUPERVISORS WILL HONESTLY BE ABLE TO CAREFULLY REVIEW THE YOSEMITE UNDER CANVAS DEIR BY JULY 2OTH OR TO POSSIBLY READ AND PROCESS THE INFORMATION IN THE ADDITIONAL TERRA VI LODGE DEIR BY JULY 30TH. There is no way for our staff or concerned county residents to complete a review of either or both documents by the current deadlines. FORMAL REQUEST: Because the County obviously desires well-informed citizen involvement and desires that comments on projects will be accurate and appropriate, then it is essential to allow adequate time for the review of both the Yosemite Under Canvas DEIR and the Terra Vi Lodge DEIR. CSERC respectfully requests an extension of 30 days for each DEIR since they are interconnected and together require the review of more than 3,000 pages of dry reading, data, Timber Harvest Plans, well reports, site plans, etc. If 30 days is not somehow acceptable, our Center asks for at least an extension of 20 days for each, but 30 days for each is our clear request.	

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
	Please respond back to this request for an extension as soon as reasonably feasible. Thank you. Stay healthy.	
ORG4	Shute, Mihaly & Weinberger LLP, Ellison Folk, July 20, 2020	
ORG4-01	On behalf of Save Sawmill Mountain, we write to request additional time for public comment on the Draft Environmental Impact Report ("DEIR") for the proposed Terra Vi Lodge Yosemite Project ("Project") in Tuolumne County ("County"). Like all concerned members of the public, Save Sawmill Mountain relies on the DEIR required by the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") to obtain a thorough assessment of the environmental impacts of the Project, and we are in the process of carefully reviewing the document. However, in light of the DEIR's unusually voluminous length, the concurrent review period for the DEIR for the neighboring Yosemite Under Canvas Project, and extenuating circumstances caused by the COVID-19 pandemic, there has not been sufficient time for public review of the DEIR. We therefore request that the County extend the deadline for the public comment period from July 30, 2020 to August 30, 2020. Save Sawmill Mountain is carefully and expeditiously reviewing the DEIR for the Project in order to gain a clear understanding of the Project's environmental impacts. We intend to comment on the document's adequacy and consistency with CEQA in a forthcoming letter once our review is complete. However, the existing public comment period is too short to allow meaningful public review in light of the document's overwhelming length and technical complexity. The main volume of the DEIR (Volume I) is nearly 500 pages long, while the technical appendices (Volume II) are over 1,300 pages long. The DEIR was made available for public comment on June 16, 2020, and the deadline for public comments is July 30, 2020, a period of only 45 days. This period does not provide enough time for Save Sawmill Mountain or members of the public to conduct a thorough review of the many complex issues raised by the DEIR. Informed decision-making and informed public participation are fundamental purposes of the CEQA process. See Union of Med. Marijuana Patients, Inc. v City of San Diego (2019) 7 C5th 1171, 1184-1185; California Bldg. Indus. Ass'n v Bay Area Air Quality Mgmt. Dist. (2015) 62 C4th 369, 381; Laurel Heights Improvement Assn. v. Regents of University of California (1988) 47 Cal.3d 376, 404. The public must have a meaningful opportunity to comment on a draft EIR. See Laurel Heights Improvement Assn. v. Regents of University of California (1993) 6 Cal.4th 1112, 1120, 1129. Here, in light of the length and complexity of the Project DEIR, the review period should be extended to allow adequate time for informed public participation.	The comment requests an extension of the public review period of the Draft EIR. Please see Master Response 1, which explains the County's decision not to extend the public review period of the Draft EIR.

Comment #	Comment	Response
	The inadequacy of the public comment period for the Project's DEIR is compounded by the concurrent public review period for the DEIR for the neighboring Yosemite Under Canvas Project. The public review period for that project runs from June 5, 2020 to July 20, 2020, significantly overlapping with the review period for the Terra Vi Project. The main volume of the DEIR for the Under Canvas project is over 270 pages long, while the technical appendices are almost 1000 additional pages. Because the two projects would be located directly adjacent to each other across SR-120, they will produce combined cumulative impacts on transportation, wildfire risk, emergency response, water supply, biological resources, and other issues. Thus, in order for members of the public to fully understand the cumulative impacts of the Terra Vi Project, they must also review the Under Canvas DEIR, an even more difficult task in light of the limited time for public review and the combined length of the two documents. Finally, the COVID-19 pandemic has made it more difficult for Save Sawmill Mountain to complete its review of the Project DEIR within the allotted public comment period. State mandates restrict gatherings for face-to-face discussions with Project neighbors and with other local concerned citizens, and the ongoing public health emergency complicates efforts to consult with experts better equipped to evaluate the DEIR's many technical aspects. The pandemic situation adds to the already difficult challenge of reviewing two unusually lengthy DEIRs while working to develop well-informed responses and comments. In light of the DEIR's length, the need for simultaneous review of the Under Canvas DEIR, and the COVID-19 emergency, the current public comment deadline of July 30 does not allow sufficient time for Save Sawmill Mountain to complete its review of the Project DEIR. In order to enable meaningful public review of the Project DEIR, we therefore respectfully request that the County extend the deadline for the public comment period for the Terra Vi DEIR from July 30, 2020 to August 30, 2020. For the same reason, we also request that the County extend the public comment deadline for the Under Canvas DEIR to the same date. We request your response to this extension request as soon as reasonably feasible. Thank you for your consideration.	
ORG5	Tuolumne Group of the Sierra Club, Dr. Kevin Rice, PhD, Conservation Chair, July 26, 2020	
ORG5-01	Please find attached our comments (Word and PDF) on the Terra Vi Lodge DEIR. Unfortunately we found that the DEIR did not adequately address many of the concerns that we had when we reviewed the ISMND for this project last year. In particular, we were very disappointed that the developer did not appear to seriously consider building this on the suggested alternate "Scar"	Please see Master Response 7.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
	site. We think most of the current problems with this project in terms of wildfire risk, water supply, and wastewater disposal issues would be solved if it was built at the alternate site.	
ORG5-02	Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Terra Vi Lodge DEIR. This DEIR is even bigger than the associated Under Canvas Yosemite DEIR, but it also fails to adequately address the many previously identified problems associated with this project. In particular, the fears and concerns expressed previously by local Tuolumne County citizens about this project are clearly not addressed in any real way by this DEIR. The DEIR consistently uses unrealistic estimates of potential impacts of different aspects of the project to minimize the overall impact. This consistent "minimization of impact game" then allows the developer to conveniently dismiss the potential use of a very viable alternate site (The Scar site). Using the concerns of the local residents as a guide, we will focus our comments on three primary areas of concern: water supply, wastewater contamination, and wildfire risk.	The comment serves as an introduction to the comments that follow and states concern that the Draft EIR did not adequately address previously identified issues but does not cite any information to support the claim. Please see Responses ORG5-03 through ORG5-09.
ORG5-03	Water supply – Previous reaction to this project from Tuolumne County residents at the town hall meeting and in comment letters are dominated by deep concerns about the likelihood that water use by this huge development will have severe impact on local residential water supply. These folks still remember the recent multiyear drought that was truly frightening in reducing the amount and reliability of the water supply to the local community. It is worth repeating that this site is an area with no aquifers and "…subsurface material consists primarily of impermeable granitic and greenstone bedrock which can result in a low groundwater yield." and "The characteristics of the fractured rock and weather fluctuations have led to some wells providing unreliable sources of water." (previous IS/MND). Even the current DEIR for this project notes that Fractured rock provides inconsistent groundwater conditions; some parcels are underlain by small pools of groundwater that are reliable, and others tap into less reliable subsurface rills and streamlets. The Tuolumne-Stanislaus Integrated Regional Water Management Plan determined that existing data are insufficient to quantify the total available sustainable groundwater supply. This is not atypical in fractured rock environments such as those that occur throughout the Sierra foothills". This DEIR further admits that this type of groundwater source is significantly influenced by yearly variation in precipitation. This is something that you do not need to tell the local residents; they saw how the effects of a multiyear drought consistently lowered the water levels in their wells. Given that groundwater supply is so strongly influenced by annual variation in precipitation, it is completely misleading to use pumping estimates from test wells taken in October 2019. Why? Because the snowpack in 2018-19 was double the normal amount and one of the highest in the last 50 years. As a result, these water supply numbers are not even good for normal years, much	The source capacity assessment was completed in accordance with the established procedures set forth by the Tuolumne County. The County uses procedures developed by the SWRCB (22 CAADC § 64554). The methodology selected from the County guidelines for the analysis (see Appendix C of the Hydrogeology Study contained in Appendix G of the Draft EIR) is designed specifically to evaluate fractured bedrock (Hard Rock wells). The methodology prepared by the SWRCB addresses the variation in annual rainfall by only allowing 50 percent of the tested well capacity to be used as the long-term well capacity for source supply. To ensure that testing during any given year would account for dry and multiple dry years, Geoscience contacted the SWRCB staff (see page 15 of Hydrogeology Study contained in Appendix G of the Draft EIR) to

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
	less an estimate of pumping capacity during a multiyear drought. In addition, there is no scientific evidence provided to support the contention that the 50% reduction factor will come even close to accurately predicting reduced capacity during multiyear droughts. The use of this highly atypical pumping capacity estimate (38,160 gpd) is the first component of a deceptive analysis used to minimize the impact of water use by this project.	verify that the methodology included consideration of dry and multiple dry years. Their response was that the regulations and methodology using a 50 percent reduction as a factor of safety was intended as a conservative estimate for situations in which limited time-sequence data is available. The capacity cited is one-half the pumping rate established over 10 days or 240 continuous hours of pumping at a constant and consistent pumping rate. To be overly cautious, the Hydrogeology Study elected to pump both wells at the same time and during the period that the Yosemite Under Canvas project study was conducting a pumping test on the well closest to Terra Vi. (see Appendix B of the Hydrogeology Study contained in Appendix G of the Draft EIR for the actual test data). The 38,160 gpd is simply 26.5 gallons per minute (gpm) converted to units of gallons per day by multiplying by the appropriate conversion factor. Over 76,000 gpd were pumped during test with complete recovery as defined by the County protocol. This amount is over four times the daily requirement for the project, even when considering the revised water demand calculations presented in Appendix M of this Final EIR. Further, while 2019 was a wet year, testing was conducted in late October to early November, which is the driest portion of the year. Rainfall in 2019 was 27 percent above average for an approximately 100-year

Comment #	Comment	Response
		record. So far, 2020 is among the 10 driest years of record (over 60 percent below average), but water levels in the wells are a maximum of 5.24 feet below the 2019 levels. The major difference in precipitation compared to the minor change in water levels demonstrates the significant volume of water in fracture storage and that the 50 percent factor of safety established in the State and County Protocol is both appropriate and conservative.
ORG5-04	The second deceptive component of this flawed analysis is to grossly underestimate the potential water demand of the project. The DEIR indicates that 16,640 gpd is sufficient to supply 500+ people with their daily water requirements. Assuming 500 people, this results in only a 33 gpd allocation per person! To inject some reality into this analysis, it is helpful to look at a more realistic rate of water consumption that is still highly conservative. A recent water use conservation goal that has gotten a lot of attention is the 55 gpd per person limit (https://docs.house.gov/meetings/II/II13/20190924/109994/HHRG-116-II13-20190924-SD004.pdf). As has been noted repeatedly, this is a very tough water conservation goal. Nonetheless, if one uses a 55 gpd consumption rate per person for 500 people, the daily demand at Terra Vi is now estimated to be 27,500 gpd. This more realistic demand comes much closer to the highly optimistic (i.e. very wet year) pumping rate of 38,160 gpd. To exceed the pumping capacity, consumption would only have to increase to 77 gpd per person (not unlikely). Even worse, this analysis does not seriously consider the cumulative effects that water pumping by the proposed Under Canvas Yosemite project just across the road will have on groundwater supply. Under Canvas Yosemite DEIR daily water use (using another unrealistically low estimate of 20 gpd per person) was estimated at 7,755 gpd. Given the close proximity of these two developments, it is not unreasonable to suspect that they share groundwater sources and so,	The average occupancy of the proposed project would be closer to 400 people rather than 500 people. The water demand calculations for the project have been revised in response to comments received on the Draft EIR. The proposed project's revised water demand (see Appendix M of this Final EIR) of 17,832 gpd would equate to a usage of 44 gallons per capita per day (gpcd). It should also be noted that the 55 gpcd target set by Assembly Bill (AB) 1668 and Senate Bill 606 is an averaged rate that applies to a wide range of land uses. Hotels and motels are considered to use less water than other types of residential uses (i.e. multi-family, single-family, and mobile homes). Referring to CalEEMod Default Data Tables for indoor water use,[19] hotels and motels average a consumption rate of about 35 gpcd (at an average occupancy rate of 2

[19] California Air Pollution Control Officers Association, 2016, http://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/caleemod/upgrades/2016.3/05_appendix-d2016-3-1.pdf, accessed October 9, 2020.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
	with the Under Canvas use added in, the demand is now 35,255 gpd which is almost equal to the optimistic pumping capacity of 38,160 gpd. If I had a home near this project, I would be very concerned about the future viability of my well. Finally, (just like the Under Canvas project) there is no potential back-up water supply if wells prove inadequate during a drought period because this site is not located near any municipal source of water.	people), whereas other residential land uses average around 59 gpcd (at an average occupancy rate of 3 people). This information indicates that a 44 gpcd rate is reasonable for the proposed project. Furthermore, non-potable water needs (for example toilet flushing and water used for laundry) would be met by using treated water (see Master Response 2 for more details on wastewater treatment). For a discussion on cumulative impacts, please see Responses ORG6-88 and PUB28-04.
ORG5-05	Wastewater treatment and potential groundwater contamination – Even if one uses the very low estimate of pumping rate of 16,640 gpd for this project, wastewater production will exceed 6 million gallons per year. The DEIR estimates that 7,000 gpd of grey water will be produced and used for irrigation. Thus, over 2.5 million gallons of grey water would be available for irrigation; that is a lot of irrigation for native vegetation! Realistically, and as noted in the DEIR, there will thus be a surplus of grey water that will also have to be released into the leach fields. Combining this grey water surplus with the remaining 3.5 million gallons of blackwater sewage, the load on the septic system is immense. Given this incredible loading, it is absolutely astounding that there is not a real analysis of whether the proposed leach fields will be able to accommodate this wastewater load. The only evidence provided is a quote from the soil analyst that the site "should provide a more than adequate area for the wastewater system". However, the analyst also said that "The exact amount of area needed for the commercial development wastewater system can only be determined during the wastewater system design process". Because there does not appear to be any real design at this point, the ability of these leach fields to handle this load is completely unknown. As far as I can tell, the DEIR does not give even the most minimal tests that are used in designing leach fields such as a percolation test or soil loading rates. These are tests that are commonly used even when designing septic systems for single family dwellings. The fact that this has not been done for a huge development truly boggles the mind. The DEIR assumes without evidence that this wastewater will have been adequately treated before moving into the groundwater. Percolation tests are necessary to determine whether the	Please see Master Response 2. The project proposes an on-site package wastewater treatment system that would be sized to treat up to 130 percent of the proposed project's water demand of 17,833 gpd.

Comment #	Comment	Response
	wastewater will be sufficiently treated before it mixes with the groundwater. The soil analyst also notes that "This area is a low-lying saddle that has the potential to accumulate excess moisture from winter storm events." Accumulation of excess moisture means that the soils at this site could become saturated. This soil saturation can cause backups of the entire wastewater treatment system and thus increase the chance of groundwater contamination. Again, percolation tests and soil loading studies are needed to assess the possibility of this major malfunction in wastewater storage capacity. Finally, this flawed analysis of the wastewater load from Terra Vi does not even consider the potential wastewater input from the nearby proposed Under Canvas project. In sum, this analysis of the potential problems with wastewater disposal and groundwater contamination is totally inadequate.	
ORG5-06	Wildfire risk – The project area is located within a CALFIRE "Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone" and so the concentration of a very large number of people in a relatively isolated (and highly flammable) location is a very bad idea. In fact, it seems pretty unconscionable to expose the 500+ folks at this facility (plus an additional 250+ at the proposed Under Canvas Project) to the extreme fire danger at this site when the closest fire station is a half hour away in Groveland. The crew from Groveland has only one engine and if there is a significant wildfire at this site, the crew would face an almost impossible job of trying to adequately protect this project and the Under Canvas development (and other facilities); especially difficult given that they would likely arrive fairly late to the fire scene. In addition, during a large wildfire event the station would likely prioritize Groveland and thus this site would be completely unprotected. The potentially deadly traffic congestion that might result during combined evacuation of this facility and the Under Canvas glamping project across the street bring to mind visions of what happened at Paradise on a road that was bigger than Route 120. One of the more bizarre suggestions in this DEIR to reduce evacuation congestion was to have people shelter in place; apparently in a basement room that somehow would maintain proper ventilation for those inside while a firestorm rages above (!).	Regarding emergency access and evacuation, please see Master Response 4. Please see Chapter 4.17, Wildfire, of the Draft EIR for analysis of impacts related to wildfire.
ORG5-07	Although the DEIR argues that this development will reduce the danger of wildfire at the site, one only must look at the plans to visually screen the development from the road to see this is not the case. In Figures 4.1 – (6a through 9c), the growth of landscape plantings at different locations is projected over a 10-year period to demonstrate effective visual screening for aesthetics. When I looked at these projections, all I saw was the growth of ladder fuels and a dramatic increase in fuel loading at the site. The canopies of the trees within these landscape	Figures 4.1-6a through 4.1-9c in the Draft EIR are conceptual images to aid in visualization. While landscaping will be designed to screen the project where possible, prior to issuance of building permits the project would be required to submit a Wildland Fire Prevention Plan and Vegetation

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
	plantings are completely overlapping in what looks like a tree plantation desperately in need of thinning! This is definitely not fuel reduction.	Management Plan to the Tuolumne County Fire Prevention Bureau for review and approval, as described in the Impact Analysis in Chapter 4.17, Wildfire, of the Draft EIR. Under Mitigation Measure WF-2, the perimeter of all structures must be surrounded by a 5-foot non-combustible zone, project landscaping must be fire resistant, areas within 200 feet of all structures must be managed as defensible space, and the entire project site must be managed as fire-resistant landscaping. The project site plan and landscaping documents would need to conform to the Vegetation Management Plan to ensure that the landscape plantings and maintenance activities are done in a way conforming with wildland fire prevention requirements.
ORG5-08	As a final example of the vague rationale that is often found in this DEIR, the solution proposed to reduce overcrowding on the YARTS transportation system is to hire a transportation coordinator. This coordinator is somehow supposed to solve the problem of not enough seats on YARTS. How this is to happen is not explained.	The purpose of the on-site transit coordinator is to oversee ridership, identify operational issues that arise, and serve as a point person for the County and YARTS. If ridership data show a pattern of lack of capacity on certain transit runs, any potential changes to the YARTS system (e.g. increased headways or capacity) would be implemented by YARTS, as the project applicant and County do not have the authority to change YARTS operations. Page 4.15-14 of the Draft EIR describes the general process that YARTS uses to analyze demand patterns and plan for operational change: "The YARTS Joint Powers Authority compiles and analyzes ridership data and other information as part of its transit

Comment #	Comment	Response
		planning efforts. YARTS utilizes its Short Range Transit Plan to identify and implement needed expansions and improvements to service. As ridership patterns and transit needs change within the county, the YARTS Joint Powers Authority Board and Authority Advisory Committee implement changes to the transit system. Increased system ridership that may occur following the opening of the proposed project would be monitored by the YARTS Joint Powers Authority, which would be responsible for identifying any system changes (such as schedule or route adjustments) to better serve the project and the region as a whole."
ORG5-09	As noted earlier, this DEIR disingenuously dismissed the possibilities of the alternate site (i.e. the "Scar" site) by inaccurately minimizing impacts of the current project; significant impacts that would be truly mitigated at an alternate site. For example, the very real problems with water supply and wastewater disposal would be adequately addressed at the alternate site because of the capacity for municipal water supply and sewage service. Similarly, wildfire risk issues would be mitigated by being closer to the fire station and a reduced necessity for landscape screening (AKA fuel loading). I really believe that the Tuolumne Group – Sierra Club would not have a problem with this project if it were at the alternate site. However, as currently proposed, this project is a total environmental and socio-economic disaster for the people of Tuolumne County. The residents of this County depend on their elected officials and planners to do the right thing for their well-being in the face of financially driven development. Please do the right thing and deny this project as it currently stands and encourage the developer to seriously consider the alternate site.	Please see Master Response 7.
ORG6	**Shute, Mihaly & Weinberger LLP, Laurel Impett, Urban Planner, July 29, 2020**	
ORG6-01	On behalf of Save Sawmill Mountain, we have reviewed the Draft Environmental Impact Report ("DEIR") for the proposed Terra Vi Lodge Yosemite Project ("Project") in Tuolumne County ("County"). We submit this letter to state our position that the DEIR fails to meet the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA"), Public Resources Code § 21000 et seq., and the CEQA Guidelines, California Code of Regulations, title 14, § 15000 et seq.	The comment serves as an introduction to the comments that follow and expresses concern that the Draft EIR fails to adequately comply with the requirements of CEQA but does not cite any information to support the

Comment #	Comment	Response
	("Guidelines"). Like all concerned members of the public, Save Sawmill Mountain relies on the environmental review document required by CEQA for an honest and thorough assessment of the environmental impacts of a project such as this. We urge the County to correct the errors in the DEIR and provide the required assessment. The EIR is "the heart of CEQA." Laurel Heights Improvement Assn. v. Regents of University of California (1988) 47 Cal.3d 376, 392. It "is an environmental 'alarm bell' whose purpose it is to alert the public and its responsible officials to environmental changes before they have reached ecological points of no return. The EIR is also intended 'to demonstrate to an apprehensive citizenry that the agency has, in fact, analyzed and considered the ecological implications of its action.' Because the EIR must be certified or rejected by public officials, it is a document of accountability." Id. (citations omitted). After carefully reviewing the DEIR for the proposed Project, we have concluded that it fails in numerous respects to comply with the requirements of CEQA. As described below, the DEIR violates the statute because it fails to: (1) analyze the significant environmental impacts of the Project, including impacts involving wildfire risk, emergency access and evacuation, hydrology, water quality, water supply, noise, and transportation; and (2) propose adequate mitigation measures and alternatives to address those impacts. To comply with CEQA and to ensure that the public as well as the County's decisionmakers have adequate information to consider the effects of the proposed Project, the County must prepare and recirculate a revised draft EIR that properly analyzes Project impacts, and considers adequate mitigation measures that would address those impacts.	claim. Please see Responses ORG6-02 through ORG6-127.
ORG6-02	In addition, numerous aspects of the Project are inconsistent with the Tuolumne County General Plan, thereby violating the California Planning and Zoning Law, Gov. Code § 65000 et seq. Because these conflicts result in significant environmental impacts, the County's failure to identify them in the EIR violates CEQA as well. Therefore, the County may not legally approve the Project or certify the EIR.	The comment does not specify the conflicts it is claiming, therefore no further response is required.
ORG6-03	I. THE DEIR'S INADEQUATE ANALYSIS OF AND MITIGATION FOR THE IMPACTS OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT VIOLATES CEQA. A. The DEIR Lacks Evidence that the Project Would Not Expose People and Structures to Significant Risks Relating to Wildland Fire. The DEIR dramatically understates the Project's potential wildfire risks and fails to provide an adequate analysis in support of its conclusion that these risks are less than significant. The end	Please see Master Response 5 for a thorough discussion of the project's proposed features to reduce wildfire hazards. The commenter does not explain why, in the opinion of the commenter, these features and Mitigation Measure WF-1 would not be effective at

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
	result is a document which is so deficient that decision makers and the public are left with no real idea as to the severity and extent of the Project's environmental impacts. See, e.g., Berkeley Keep Jets Over the Bay Comm. v. Bd. of Port Comm'rs. (2001) 91 Cal.App.4th 1344, 1370-71; Galante Vineyards v. Monterey Peninsula Water Management Dist. (1997) 60 Cal.App.4th 1109, 1123. The proposed Project lies within a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone. DEIR p. 4.19-19. The Project site itself has burned at least three times, most recently in the 2013 Rim Fire, and there have been six wildfires in the immediate vicinity of the Project within the last 100 years. DEIR, Fig. 4.17-1. From 2001 to 2016, twelve fires have occurred in or near Tuolumne County that destroyed over 750 acres, while the 2013 Rim Fire burned a total of 257,314 acres, including the Project site. DEIR p. 4.9-12. Although the DEIR recognizes that the Project will inherently increase the risk of fire ignitions by bringing people and vehicles to the area, DEIR p. 4.17-30 (Impact WF-3), the document erroneously concludes that "[t]he [P]roject would not expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires." DEIR p. 4.19-19 (Impact HAZ-7). The DEIR's analysis is inadequate for several reasons. First, the DEIR fails to provide any substantive analysis of wildfire-related impacts, opting instead to simply list Project design features that would purportedly reduce these risks. Second, although the DEIR admits that fire protection services would be unable to reach the Project within established response times, the DEIR never actually grapples with this issue (i.e., never discloses the actual effects of a wildfire igniting on or near the Project site and the inability of emergency responders to access the site in a timely manner). Third, the DEIR fails to adequately analyze or mitigate public health impacts resulting from human exposure to wildfire.	reducing wildfire risks. The construction requirements are part of the application process for the project. The project area has been at risk of wildland fires since long before the site was zoned for hotel use on August 20, 1991. County, State, and other public agencies have long experience in adopting policies and regulations to reduce the risk of ignition during construction activities to an acceptable, manageable risk. For example, Chapter 7A of the CBC prescribes building materials and construction methods for new buildings in any Fire Hazard Severity Zone or Wildland-Urban Interface Fire Area, and California Public Resources Code Section 4442 requires internal combustion engines like those used in construction to be equipped with a spark arrester, which helps to remove and retain carbon and other flammable particles from the exhaust flow for engines that use hydrocarbon fuels. Policy 17.A.6 of the Tuolumne County General Plan is to ensure that all new construction is completed in a way most resistant to loss or damage from natural hazards. Such policies are based on the agencies' experience and expertise in managing fire risk. The very purpose of these standards and policies is to allow construction to proceed in fire-prone areas. The project improvements would serve to protect the surrounding area by reducing this existing fire risk by removing native

Comment #	Comment	Response
		combustible fire fuel and unmanaged wildland areas (trees and brush) and creating engineered separation and defensible spaces, constructing non-combustible structures, and including fire sprinklers and fire-fighting equipment, fire alarm systems, fire monitoring and early detection systems, regional communications, evacuation refuge, first-responder trained personnel, and an emergency helicopter landing area. Because the project will have less-than-significant impacts on wildfire risk with mitigation, there are no potential health impacts from wildfire for the EIR to analyze. In addition, impact discussion WF-2 finds that the project site's slope and prevailing wind conditions would not create conditions under which the project would exacerbate pollutant concentrations from a wildfire. However, this discussion acknowledges that the project's landscaping plan requires revisions in order to ensure the planting placement, density, and species would conform to the project's wildfire hazard reduction features, thereby reducing health risks from wildfires. The Draft EIR is intended to analyze the impacts of the proposed project on the environment, not those of the environment on the proposed project, such as existing fire protection services. The Draft EIR includes the estimated response times for fire protection services, acknowledging the

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
		distances from existing fire stations and time it would take for services from existing fire stations to reach the project area.
ORG6-04	1. The DEIR Provides No Evidence that Project Design Features Would Reduce Wildfire Risk to a Less than Significant Level. Instead of analyzing Project impacts involving wildfire risk, the DEIR relies on incorporation of Project design features and other measures intended to mitigate that risk, then boldly asserts that these features would reduce the impacts of wildland fires to a less than significant level. DEIR p. 4.19-19 (Impact HAZ-7). As an initial matter, CEQA does not allow an environmental document to fold an assumed mitigation measure (i.e., the Project design features) into the project description. The Project's significant impacts must be determined first, and then the EIR must identify enforceable mitigation that will "offset" the impacts. See Lotus v. Department of Transportation (2014) 223 Cal.App.4th 645, 656, 658 (rejecting EIR that relied on project designs to find no significant impact, instead of identifying significant impacts and considering potential mitigation measures). In Lotus, the court held that an EIR was legally inadequate where it assumed certain mitigation techniques would be incorporated into the project, and thus the EIR did not disclose the impacts of the project without those special techniques. See id. Further, the court in Lotus criticized the EIR's failure to consider whether other possible mitigation measures would be more effective than the ones that were assumed to be incorporated into the Project. Id. at 657. Here, by listing what are effectively mitigation measures as part of the Project, the EIR replicates the error made by the agency in Lotus. the Project design features include separations between buildings, fire-resistant exterior building materials, an early evacuation protocol, an underground basement which could be used as a temporary shelter, a Vegetation Management Plan, "[p]rohibitions against risky behaviors," a construction fire prevention plan, fire pits operated by hotel staff, a communication plan, weather stations with alert protocols, employees trained as emergency responders, access to SR-120, compliance with the National Fire Protection Association's fire protection system, and an emergency helipad. DEIR p. 4.19-19 (Impact HAZ-7). However, the DEIR contains no analysis of the effectiveness of any of these Project features in mitigating wildfire risk, and it certainly provides no evidence that these features would be sufficient to make the development "safe." Common sense dictates that many of the listed Project features would be insufficient to protect the Project and its occupants in the event of a large wind-driven wildfire. For example, while the DEIR asserts that fire risk would be reduced by an early evacuation protocol, the DEIR provides	The standards for the application for a Site Development Permit are set forth in Tuolumne County Ordinance Code Chapter 17.68.120. The County Director shall review the application for conformance to the "latest accepted planning and engineering standards" covering the following areas: site layout, structure design, landscaping, water and sewer service and other utilities, surface drainage and erosion control, fire protection, access, traffic circulation and parking, and render his/her decision. The project features are not "mitigation measures" but rather part of the application for the permit. The ordinance requirements and regulatory standards were carefully reviewed prior to the design documents being developed and were an integral component of all design and engineering work thereafter. The required design documents and Project Summary were prepared and attached to the site development application submittal on November 19, 2018. The Project Summary identified many of the design elements that were contemplated to meet or exceed these regulatory standards covering the required project work, in conformance of the County Ordinance requirements. These are standard design elements that were developed several months before the County Draft EIR was initiated. These included site layout, structure design, landscaping, water and

Comment #	Comment	Response
	no evidence regarding the feasibility of early evacuation or the likely effectiveness of such a protocol. Wildfires may ignite suddenly, with little or no notice, and spread quickly with the wind, providing little time for early evacuation to occur. Wildfire early warning systems have often failed to work effectively in practice. See, e.g. Paige St. John, Alarming failures left many in path of California wildfires vulnerable and without warning, Los Angeles Times (Dec. 29, 2017), attached as Exhibit A (noting that in the October 2017 Tubbs fire in Santa Rosa, efforts to warn residents of approaching flames were successful only 50% of the time, and the entire warning system was fraught with multiple levels of malfunction and incompleteness). As discussed in detail below, the DEIR does not analyze evacuation scenarios and fails to evaluate the adequacy of SR-120 as an evacuation route. Also as discussed below, the DEIR suggests that Project occupants could shelter in place, yet it makes no attempt to evaluate whether this "shelter" would be a viable and safe alternative to evacuation.	sewer facilities, power utilities, surface drainage and erosion control, fire protection, access, traffic circulation and parking. These design features do not to create a fireproof environment, but rather reduce fire risk to an acceptable level to allow the project to manage the risk of fire ignition and fire resistance. For more details, please see Master Response 5. The newspaper articles provided by the commenter describe community-wide evacuation decisions and procedures. The proposed project is a privately managed hotel property. Evacuation of project occupants would be very different from a community-wide evacuation process as it would involve a much smaller number of people, occupying a cluster of buildings rather than an entire jurisdiction. The impact of the environment on the project is not an "environmental impact" for CEQA purposes. While the comment is correct that evacuation measures can fail, this is true of every building in any fire-prone area, and there is nothing to indicate that the proposed project's evacuation protocol will fail. Rather, by providing protected areas, water resources, trained personnel, and a helipad, the project would go beyond the minimum requirements for a project allowed in this location.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
		Please see Master Response 4 for more details on emergency evacuation.
ORG6-05	Nor does the DEIR analyze the effectiveness of the Project design features intended to reduce the potential for a wildfire ignition or acknowledge that ignitions could occur despite such features. For example, the DEIR suggests that "prohibitions against risky behaviors" would be developed, such as limiting smoking to a designated smoking area, prohibiting barbecues during times of high fire danger, educating guests and personnel on fire-safe behaviors, and providing trash cans to reduce litter. DEIR p.3-23. Yet, it is important to reiterate that the Project will inherently increase the risk of fire ignitions because it will introduce roads, paths, and parking areas into areas where they were previously absent, providing access for people and their vehicles. DEIR p. 4.17-30 (Impact WF-3). The Project would accommodate up to 400 guests in addition to staff, and a large wildfire can easily be started by a single individual taking risky or "prohibited" actions, as happened with the 2013 Rim Fire. See Eric Heinz, Rim Fire Cause Determined by Investigators, Tahoe Daily Tribune (Sept. 6, 2013), attached as Exhibit B (noting that Rim Fire was caused by a hunter's illegal fire that escaped out of control). Indeed, a fire can start from mere acts of carelessness (e.g., falling asleep before extinguishing a wildfire or disposing of a lit cigarette in a trash can) or through no human action at all (e.g., parts of a car or trailer dragging on the ground or a vehicle's exhaust system parked or driving through extremely dry vegetation).	Page 4.14-30 of the Draft EIR acknowledges the inherent risk involved with introducing development, vehicles, and people to areas of heightened wildfire hazard. The Draft EIR and the County acknowledge that new development and increased activity on the project site increases wildfire risks. The Draft EIR evaluates the potential for the construction and operation of project to result in an impact, in impact discussion WF-2 of the Draft EIR. Please also see Master Responses 5 and 6.
ORG6-06	The DEIR also does not provide the required evidentiary support for its conclusion that the use of ignition-resistant buildings materials or vegetation management techniques (e.g. low-fuel landscaping) would reduce wildfire risks to a less than significant level. The 2013 Rim Fire destroyed 112 structures, including 11 residences and several commercial buildings. See Headwaters Economics, Rim Fire - California, 2013 (2018), attached as Exhibit C. Fire-resistant building codes and vegetation management plans are not enough to protect communities at high risk of wildfire. Ignition-resistant modern building materials are less flammable than their older counterparts, but this does not make them "safe" or immune to wildfire. Indeed, the Thomas Fire in December 2017 showed that the highest fire-resistant building standards were not enough to protect structures from destruction. More than 90% of the structures destroyed had fire resistant construction. See JP Theberge, Stop Dismissing Concerns About The Risks Of New Homes In Wildfire Zones, Voice of San Diego, June 5th, 2019, attached as Exhibit D. Similarly, in the Tubbs Fire in October 2017, 86% of the homes destroyed were built after 2008 and used the highest wildfire construction standards. Id. As these fires demonstrated, noncombustible siding and roofing, interior sprinklers, and enclosed eaves are no match for softball-size embers slamming into homes at 60 mph. Id. The DEIR fails to recognize that building	Please see Responses ORG6-04 and ORG6-05.

Comment #	Comment	Response
	the Project within a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone (on a site that has already burned three times) inherently poses severe wildfire risks to the Project occupants and the surrounding communities, even where fire-resistant building materials and landscaping are used.	
ORG6-07	The DEIR also baselessly suggests that because certain Project features would comply with regulatory requirements intended to reduce wildfire risk, those features would therefore reduce the Project's wildfire risks to a less than significant level. See DEIR p. 4.19-19 (Impact HAZ-7) (noting that building materials would be compliant with Chapter 7A of the California Building Code and that construction would be in compliance with the National Fire Protection Association's fire protection system); see also DEIR p. 4.17-31 (noting that Project would be designed to comply with State Responsibility Areas Fire Safe Regulations, California Fire Code, Tuolumne County General Plan policies, and Tuolumne County Code of Ordinances, Chapter 15.20). Regulatory compliance does not mean Project features are sufficient to protect people from a significant risk of injury or death from wildland fires. Even if the Project developer does adopt these design features, the DEIR's reliance on asserted compliance with regulatory requirements cannot be used to bypass the County's obligation to study the Project's potentially significant impacts, and to mitigate those impacts. See Communities for a Better Environment v. Cal. Resources Agency (2002) 103 Cal.App.4th 98, 111-14 (compliance with an environmental regulatory program cannot displace an agency's separate obligation to consider whether a project's environmental impacts are significant); Californians for Alternatives to Toxics v. Department of Food & Agriculture (2005) 136 Cal.App.4th 1, 15-17 (same). Regulatory compliance does not determine the significance of impacts nor the effectiveness of mitigation measures.	The cited regulations improve the life safety of proposed structures. For example, Chapter 7A of the CBC includes standards for ignition-resistant and fire-retardant materials and venting requirements, among others. Similarly, the other regulations and policies are intended to and have the effect of reducing hazards to building occupants. Fire-resistant material ratings are based on laboratory testing, and with improvements in materials and codes, new buildings generally fare better than older buildings in fires. Based on an analysis of the Camp Fire in Paradise, California, the majority of homes built after 2008 were undamaged, compared to just 18 percent of homes built prior to 2008. This is attributed to a 2008 building code designed for California's fire-prone regions requiring fire-resistant roofs, siding, and other safeguards. "Experts said the regulations seem to be particularly effective at protecting structures from the types of wildfires that are increasingly common in California, where wind gusts can blow embers a mile or two ahead of the main wall of flames and do some of the worst damage."[20]
ORG6-08	2. The DEIR Entirely Ignores Wildfire Risks Resulting From Inadequate Fire Protection Services. As discussed further below, the DEIR acknowledges that the Project will not be adequately	The likelihood of longer response times during an evacuation scenario is a likelihood

[20] The Denver Post, 2019, *How a building code change could be a pivotal moment in California's wildfire fire*, https://www.denverpost.com/2019/04/11/california-building-code-wildfires/, accessed October 30, 2020.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
	served by existing fire protection services, as firefighters will not be able to reach the Project site in a timely manner. DEIR p. 4.14-7. However, the DEIR fails to evaluate the impacts of inadequate fire service response times on wildfire risk at the site. The closest staffed fire station to the Project site, the Groveland Community Services District ("CSD") station, is located approximately 17 miles away, which translates to an approximately 22-minute response time with no traffic.1 DEIR p. 4.14-3. The service standard goal for the Groveland CSD fire station is to respond to 90 percent of calls for service within the GCSD boundaries within 7 minutes. DEIR p. 4.14-4. Given the distance between the Project site and the Groveland CSD station, the DEIR acknowledges that is not possible for firefighters to achieve this service standard when responding to calls to the Project site. DEIR p. 4.14-4. The already inadequate 22-minute estimated fire service response time from Groveland CSD represents a best-case scenario, and the DEIR does not analyze the even longer response times that would result from traffic on SR-120 during a wildfire evacuation, including traffic from the surrounding community. The DEIR must consider the likelihood of longer fire response times during wildfire evacuation scenarios and their potential effects on wildfire risk at the Project site.	that exists today and in future scenarios without the project. As mentioned by the commenter, the Draft EIR acknowledges existing inadequate firefighting response times from local public services providers to the project area due to distance. However, the purpose of the EIR is to evaluate the potential impacts of the proposed project on the environment and not those of the environment on the project. Please see Master Response 4 for more details on evacuation. For GCSD's comments on the Draft EIR, please see Comment Letter GOV4 from GCSD and the associated responses. Please also see Master Response 6.
ORG6-09	Moreover, in addition to inadequate fire service response times, the DEIR must also address the possibility that during a large wind-driven wildfire, the Groveland CSD fire station and other, more distant fire stations in the area (e.g. the Tuolumne County Fire Department and CAL FIRE).may need to direct their limited firefighting resources and equipment elsewhere in order to combat the fire. The fire engines from these stations may be needed for fire suppression activities or protection of other threatened structures across a large service area. As a result, there may not be adequate firefighting equipment available to protect the Project site, possibly only one fire engine or even none at all. During a large wind-driven wildfire, a single fire engine would be entirely inadequate to protect the Project and its hundreds of guests, not to mention other nearby lodging facilities. Until the DEIR discusses these implications, it has no basis to conclude that impacts relating to wildfire exposure would be less than significant.	Please see Master Response 4 and Response ORG6-08. For GCSD's comments on the Draft EIR, please see Comment Letter GOV4 from GCSD and the associated responses. Please also see Master Response 6.
ORG6-10	3. The DEIR Fails to Adequately Analyze or Mitigate Public Health Impacts From Wildfire-related Pollutant Concentrations. The DEIR acknowledges that the Project has the potential to expose people to elevated pollutant concentrations due to wildfire. DEIR p. 4.17-26 (Impact WF-2). It states that "due to the location of the proposed Project in a forested area, historic fires in the region, and the fact that the proposed Project would bring people and vehicles to a site within a fire-prone area, the Project has the potential to exacerbate wildfire risks and thereby expose Project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire." DEIR p. 4.17-28. This statement is no substitute for a detailed analysis of these impacts. Under CEQA, such self-	The full standard of significance for WF-2 is whether the project would create an impact "Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire." The Draft EIR appropriately considers the factors of slope, prevailing winds, and vegetation

Comment #	Comment	Response
	evident ruminations cannot substitute for meaningful analysis. City of Antioch v. City Council (1986) 187 Cal.App.3d 1325. Rather, an EIR must contain analysis sufficient to allow informed decision making. Here, the DEIR must actually analyze the potential levels of human exposure to air pollutants which might result during a wildfire at the Project site, including projected air pollutant concentrations. The DEIR lists Project features that it asserts would reduce potential wildfire hazards, including landscaping measures intended to reduce fire risk, but immediately acknowledges that "planting placement, density, and species on the Project's landscaping plans are not consistent with these proposed wildfire hazard reduction features." DEIR p. 4.17-29. The DEIR then identifies mitigation measures, including the preparation of a Wildland Fire Prevention Plan and Vegetation Management Plan, and revising the Project site plan and landscaping to conform to this Vegetation Management Plan. DEIR p. 4.17-29. However, the DEIR provides no evidence that these mere landscaping features would be sufficient to protect public health from wildfire-related pollutant concentrations. When a lead agency relies on mitigation measures to find that project impacts will be reduced to a level of insignificance, there must be substantial evidence in the record demonstrating that the measures are feasible and will be effective. Sacramento Old City Assn. v. City Council of Sacramento (1991) 229 Cal.App.3d 1011, 1027; Kings County Farm Bureau v. City of Hanford (1990) 221 Cal.App.3d 692, 726-29. To conclude, as the DEIR does, that an impact is less than significant, substantial evidence must demonstrate that mitigation measures will reduce an impact to a less-than-significant level. Substantial evidence consists of "facts, a reasonable presumption predicated on fact, or expert opinion supported by fact," not "argument, speculation, unsubstantiated opinion or narrative." Pub. Res. Code § 21080(e)(1)-(2). Because the DEIR's conclusion of insignificance is premised on unsupported assumptions, it falls far short of this threshold.	and identifies that the project's landscaping plan could exacerbate wildfire risks (see page 4.17-29 of the Draft EIR) of an uncontrolled spread of wildfire. Because of the project's less-than-significant impacts with mitigation with respect to wildfire, there are no potential health impacts for the Draft EIR to further analyze. Furthermore, Mitigation Measure WF-2 addresses the potential exacerbation of wildfire risks that could then result in air pollutants, but as the specific circumstances of wildfire events are unpredictable and can vary widely, it is speculative to quantify resulting air pollutant concentrations. Impacts to visitors and employees, then, would be reduced by the incorporation of project features and mitigation measures that would reduce the risk of wildfire itself.
ORG6-11	4. The DEIR Fails to Analyze the Project's Cumulative Impacts on Wildfire Risk. An EIR must discuss a project's significant cumulative impacts. CEQA Guidelines § 15130(a). The cumulative impacts concept recognizes that "[t]he full environmental impact of a proposed . . . action cannot be gauged in a vacuum." Whitman v. Board of Supervisors (1979) 88 Cal.App.3d 397, 408. Cumulative impacts are defined as "two or more individual effects which, when considered together, are considerable or which compound or increase other environmental impacts." CEQA Guidelines § 15355(a). "[I]ndividual effects may be changes resulting from a single project or a number of separate projects." CEQA Guidelines § 15355(a). "Cumulative impacts can result from individually minor but collectively significant projects taking place over a period of time." CEQA Guidelines § 15355(b). A legally adequate cumulative impacts analysis	The Draft EIR analyzes cumulative impacts on wildfire risk under impact discussion WF-5. Other nearby, known projects that would be cumulatively considerable include those listed in Chapter 4.0, Environmental Evaluation, of the Draft EIR: Yosemite Under Canvas, Berkeley Tuolumne Camp Restoration, Thousand Trails/Yosemite Lakes RV Expansion, and Mountain Sage Conditional Use Permit.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
	views a particular project over time and in conjunction with other related past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects whose impacts might compound or interrelate with those of the proposed project. Here, the DEIR fails to provide any analysis of the Project's cumulative wildfire-related impacts and is therefore legally inadequate. The DEIR concludes that "the [P]roject would not contribute to significant cumulative wildfire impacts." DEIR p. 4.17-34 (Impact WF-5). Once again, the DEIR provides no analysis to support this conclusion. The DEIR lists other nearby development projects that contribute to fire risk, including the proposed Yosemite Under Canvas development located to the south of the Project site across SR-120, the Thousand Trails/Yosemite Lakes RV Expansion, the Berkeley Tuolumne Camp Restoration project southeast of the Project site, and the Mountain Sage Conditional Use Permit project located west of the site. Id. The DEIR then simply asserts that "[c]ompliance with regulatory requirements, proactive fire suppression design features, the inclusion of project components that would reduce wildfire risks," and the implementation of mitigation measures would reduce the impacts from the proposed Project to less than significant. DEIR p. 4.17-35. As explained above, regulatory compliance cannot substitute for informed impact analysis. The DEIR must actually analyze the potential cumulative effects of the Project in combination with fire risks posed by other developments. A critical component of this analysis will be an evaluation of how the proposed Project, together with cumulative development, would affect fire protection services. In conclusion, the EIR must be revised to provide a comprehensive analysis of the Project's potential to expose people and structures to wildfire-related risks. As part of this analysis, the EIR must undertake fire behavior modeling to document the type and intensity of fire that would be expected in the Project area. This analysis must take into account cumulative impacts and identify feasible mitigation measures or Project alternatives capable of reducing these impacts.	The cited regulations under impact discussion WF-5 improve the life safety of proposed structures. For example, Chapter 7A of the CBC includes standards for ignition-resistant and fire-retardant materials and venting requirements, among others. Similarly, the other regulations and policies are intended to and have the effect of reducing hazards to building occupants. When applied to all projects, when applicable, these would have the effect of reducing cumulative wildfire impacts. In addition, cumulative impacts to public services including fire protection services are addressed in impact discussion PS-2. This discussion found impacts to be significant based on an assessment by the TCFD as the cumulative projects would create the need to expand fire services to meet service demand. However, this would be reduced to less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measure PS-2, which would provide resources on-site including trained and certified emergency staff, personal protection equipment, and communication equipment to reduce the proposed project's contributions to impacts on fire protection services.
ORG6-12	B. The DEIR Provides No Evidence that Impacts Relating to Emergency Access, Emergency Evacuation, and Emergency Response Would Be Less Than Significant. The DEIR addresses emergency access and emergency evacuation in several areas of the EIR. In each instance, after a cursory discussion, the document concludes that the Project's impacts	The comment serves as an introduction to the comments that follow and expresses concerns regarding emergency access, evacuation, and response but does not provide evidence to support the claim. Please see Responses ORG6-13

Comment #	Comment	Response
	would be less than significant. As discussed below, the DEIR lacks the required analytical support for these conclusions.	through ORG6-28. For further information on emergency access, evacuation, and response, refer to Chapter 4.14, Public Services and Recreation, of the Draft EIR. Please also see Master Responses 4 and 6.
ORG6-13	1. The DEIR Does Not Analyze the Project's Impacts on Emergency Access. The DEIR's one-paragraph discussion of the Project's impacts on emergency access is entirely inadequate, as it lacks any substantive analysis. DEIR p. 4.15-21 (Impact TRANS-4). Once again, the document is so deficient that decisionmakers and the public are left with no real idea as to whether access during an emergency such as a wind-driven wildfire would even be possible. The DEIR simply asserts that because the Project includes two driveways providing vehicle access to Forest Route1S03, also known as Sawmill Mountain Road, and a third driveway providing access to SR-120 for emergency vehicles only, the Project would not result in inadequate emergency access and the Project's impacts in this regard would be less than significant. DEIR p. 4.15-22. The existence of three driveways connecting the Project to adjacent roads is not sufficient to demonstrate that there would be no significant impacts on emergency access.	Potential impacts to emergency access are addressed in impact discussion HAZ-6. In order for building permits to be issued, the proposed project would be required to undergo thorough review by the County Building and Fire Department and be found in compliance with applicable codes, such as the CBC, CFC, and County Code requirements. The number, size, and design of access roadways, which are used as emergency access, are subject to these codes. For example, the project is required to have roadway access within 150 feet of all structures to ensure adequate accessibility for firefighting apparatus throughout the site and proximity to structures. Roadways shall meet minimum width requirement and shall provide adequate area for turning, to ensure that fire apparatus can be accommodated.[21]
ORG6-14	As an initial matter, the DEIR fails to accurately describe Forest Route 1S03. The EIR refers to this route as Sawmill Mountain Road. Forest Route 1S03 is a 22-foot wide Forest Service route with no shoulders ending in a cul-de-sac. The applicant proposes that access to the Project be from this Forest Service route rather than from the main highway, SR-120. This is entirely illogical, as Forest Route 1S03 was never intended for commercial access.	Sawmill Mountain Road (U.S. Forest Service Route 1S03) traverses through the project property by means of a 66-foot easement, the terms of which permit the project site owner to use the roadway. The proposed project proposes primary access via Sawmill Mountain Road to reduce visual impact of the project when viewed from Highway 120. Tuolumne County staff have communicated

[21] Gregory, Steven, Senior Fire Inspector, 2018, Site plan review comments re: Hardin Flat LLC/Hansji SDP18-003.

Comment #	Comment	Response
		with the U.S. Forest Service throughout the EIR process and are unaware of any concerns regarding the proposed access points or use of the roadway. In addition, no comments were received by the Forest Service during the EIR process. The Draft EIR concludes that use of the roadway during project construction could physically deteriorate the roadway and includes Mitigation Measure TRANS-1.2b to require the project applicant to restore the roadway to pre-construction conditions.
ORG6-15	In another egregious error, the DEIR appears to intentionally ignore the fact that Forest Route1S03 provides access to about 15 residences and two large campgrounds. In the event that a fire erupts on or near the Project site, residents in the area and campers (including those with RVs!), along with the Project's occupants and employees, would all rely on Forest Route1S03 to escape, while emergency responders would need to use this same 22-foot route to access the fire. The EIR's failure to disclose accurate information about Forest Route1S03 or the land uses that are located along this route is a fatal flaw. The revised EIR must identify each of the land uses that rely on Forest Route1S03 and then analyze whether this route would provide adequate access and egress during an emergency such as a major wildfire.	The Draft EIR describes the surrounding land uses in Section 3.1, Project Location and Site Characteristics. As stated on page 3-24 of the Draft EIR, the project proposes direct access to Highway 120 for fire service. To access the project site, fire responders could use the emergency vehicle access road off of Highway 120 and would not need to use Sawmill Mountain Road. The project is also proposing an early evacuation protocol, where if evacuation of the project site is needed, guests would be notified early where possible to minimize peak traffic on Highway 120 in the event of an incident that requires evacuation. Please see Master Response 4 for more details on evacuation.
ORG6-16	Nor does the DEIR consider the capacity of SR-120 or the amount of traffic that could be on this roadway in the event of a wildfire evacuation, which could impede access by emergency vehicles. The revised EIR must provide this information. It must also examine whether fire or other natural hazards could obstruct SR-120, thereby limiting the ability of emergency vehicles to reach the Project area.	If, as posited by the commenter, fire or other hazards obstructed Highway 120, those conditions are outside of the control of the project and are not considered effects of the project. The Draft EIR evaluates the effects of the project on the environment, not the environment on the project. Impact

Comment #	Comment	Response
		discussion HAZ-6 on page 4.9-18 of the Draft EIR states "The proposed project would not involve physical components that would interfere with the ability of the County, and emergency response service providers, to implement emergency response activities within the project site or vicinity." Please see Master Response 4 for more details on emergency evacuation.
ORG6-17	While the DEIR asserts that the inclusion of a helipad in the Project "would provide improved emergency helicopter access," DEIR p. 4.17-25, this is not a substitute for ground-based emergency vehicle access, and the DEIR includes no substantive analysis of the helipad's potential limitations in providing emergency access to the site. Nor does the DEIR provide any analysis of impacts caused by the helipad's location directly adjacent to residents' access driveways off Forest Route1S03. The revised DEIR must explicitly identify the location of each driveway that has access from Forest Route1S03 and evaluate whether these driveways would be obstructed as a result of helicopter operations.	The helipad has not yet been designed or reviewed by the regulating agencies. Consistent with Mitigation Measure HAZ-5, the helipad would be required to obtain approvals from the FAA, and Tuolumne County, including the Airport Land Use Commission, which will assess the safety and appropriateness of the helipad location and design. Please also see Master Response 3, which explains that an alternate location has been identified for the helipad and will be used if feasible.
ORG6-18	Given the wildfire crisis plaguing the West, it is imperative that EIRs comprehensively analyze emergency access impacts especially for projects that are located within Very High Fire Hazard Severity zones. The revised EIR must include this critical analysis. Given that the emergency access impacts would undoubtedly be significant, the revised EIR must also evaluate an alternative to the Project in which access to the Project site is from SR-120 instead of Forest Route1S03.	The Draft EIR analyzes emergency access and evacuation under impact discussions HAZ-6, TRANS-4, and WF-1. Please see Chapter 4.17, Wildfire, of the Draft EIR for analysis of impacts related to wildfire. As described on page 6-5 of the Draft EIR, this alternative was considered and rejected. CEQA requires that the EIR includes alternatives that would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project. The proposed project will not cause significant impacts associated with the location of the project's proposed access

Comment #	Comment	Response
		point, so the alternative proposed by the commenter would not avoid any significant environmental impacts.
ORG6-19	2. The DEIR Fails to Evaluate Any Evacuation Scenarios. In the hazards chapter of the DEIR, the document acknowledges that the Project would be reliant on SR-120 as the primary means of evacuation from the site. DEIR p. 4.19-19 (Impact HAZ-7). Yet the DEIR makes no attempt to determine the adequacy of this primary evacuation route. It does not consider whether SR-120 could accommodate the Project's traffic together with the traffic from other evacuees during a wildfire event, nor does it address the possibility that SR-120 might be blocked during a wildfire. Instead, the DEIR merely assumes, with no evidence, that emergency evacuation from the site will be feasible. During the 2013 Rim Fire, which burned approximately 402 square miles, including the Project site, an 18-mile segment of SR-120 passing through the fire area was closed to traffic for nine days, forcing many people to seek alternative evacuation routes. See Mary Forgione, Rim fire: New road closure, long detours for some Yosemite visitors, Los Angeles Times (Aug. 28, 2013), attached as Exhibit E ("Tioga Road, also known as Highway 120, was closed between Tamarack Flat and Yosemite Creek campgrounds, a roughly 18-mile stretch"); Highway 120 to reopen after Rim fire closure, Modesto Bee (Sept. 6, 2013), attached as Exhibit F. The DEIR fails to mention this fact, let alone analyze how the Project's occupants would fare when another wildfire affects the Project area. Moreover, even if SR-120 remains open, evacuation during a wildfire event would almost certainly be impeded by heavy traffic, as many evacuees would simultaneously attempt to flee the area. In the DEIR's wildfire chapter, the document simply asserts that guests would be notified early of any natural hazards requiring evacuation, and that guests could shelter in place at the Project site if evacuation were not feasible. DEIR p. 4.17-25 ("If evacuations are needed, guests would be notified early to minimize peak traffic on SR-120 in the event of an incident that requires evacuation. The expectation is that the guests and employees would remain on-site in the event of a wildfire or other disaster when early evacuation is not possible."). However, the DEIR fails to analyze the feasibility of evacuation or the effectiveness of shelter-in-place measures. In the event of a severe wind-driven wildfire, early evacuation may not be feasible, as wildfires may arise quickly and may block egress via SR-120.	Please see Master Response 4 regarding emergency evacuation.

Comment #	Comment	Response
	Despite the expectation that guests and employees may have to shelter in place, the DEIR lacks the necessary information to determine whether shelter-in-place would even be a viable and safe alternative to evacuation. Asking Project occupants to shelter in place and thereby experience the danger of an extreme wind-driven fire is not a substitute for offering them a reliable means of evacuation from the site. While the DEIR notes that the Project will include a basement that could be used as a shelter in the event of a fire, DEIR p.4.19-19 (Impact HAZ-7), it lacks critical details that would allow for a determination of the safety and effectiveness of this shelter during a prolonged wildfire (e.g., whether the basement would be large enough to accommodate all guests and employees, the effectiveness of the basement's ventilation system in the event that the above-ground building burns, or details regarding how long the basement could provide effective shelter). Regardless of any shelter-in-place protocol, it is likely that in the event of a severe wind-driven wildfire, many guests will attempt to flee the area. It is imperative that the DEIR comprehensively analyze emergency evacuation, yet the document fails to identify the amount of time needed to implement a full evacuation of the Project site, including whether the evacuation could be accomplished within an acceptable time period. It is now common practice for local agencies to require the preparation of evacuation analyses for land use development projects. These analyses identify the time it will take an area to evacuate by dividing the number of vehicles that need to evacuate by total roadway capacity. See e.g., Safari Highlands Ranch and Citywide SOI Update Wildfire Hazard Analysis, attached as Exhibit G. These evacuation analyses also routinely take into account the fact that neighboring communities could also be evacuating in a similar time frame. Id. These analyses actually model various scenarios of wildland fire that could occur in a project's vicinity based on various factors to determine whether project residents or visitors would have adequate time to escape, and the ability of emergency services to access the site in a timely manner, consistent with emergency service provider's response time goals. It is essential that such an analysis be conducted for the proposed Project, given its location in a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone and because SR-120 would likely experience heavy traffic congestion during a wildfire evacuation (e.g. a westward evacuation of Yosemite National Park). In short, the EIR will remain inadequate until the following questions are answered: • If a fire is approaching from a direction that necessitates travel to the west on SR-120, does this two-lane road have adequate capacity to accommodate all of the Project and non-Project-related traffic, and emergency response vehicles that might be on the road during an evacuation?	

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
	• If a fire is approaching from a direction that necessitates travel to the east on SR-120, does this two-lane road have adequate capacity to accommodate all of the Project and non-Project-related traffic, and emergency response vehicles that might be on the road during an evacuation? • How long would it take to evacuate the Project site in the event of a wildland fire?	
ORG6-20	3. The DEIR Fails to Adequately Analyze or Mitigate Impacts Relating to An Increased Demand for Fire Protection Services. The DEIR acknowledges that the Project will not be adequately served by existing fire protection service and will put additional strain on already-overburdened fire departments. DEIR p. 4.14-7. The closest staffed fire station to the Project site is the Groveland Community Services District ("CSD") station in Groveland. The Groveland CSD Station is located approximately 17 miles from the Project site, which translates to an approximately 22-minute drive time with no traffic. DEIR p. 4.14-3. Other fire stations are located even further away. The service standard goal for the Groveland CSD fire station is to respond to 90 percent of calls for service within the GCSD boundaries within 7 minutes. DEIR p. 4.14-4. The DEIR acknowledges that given the distance between the Project site and the Groveland CSD station, it is not possible for the CSD to achieve this service standard when responding to calls to the Project site. DEIR p. 4.14-4. The DEIR also acknowledges that "[t]he [P]roject would result in the need for new or physically altered fire protection facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives." DEIR p. 4.14-7 (Impact PS-1). Instead of actually grappling with this serious impact by examining how, for example, the County could add additional fire protection to meet the needs of the Project and analyzing the associated environmental impacts, the EIR looks to a series of Project features that could purportedly limit the number of incidents on the Project site. DEIR p. 4.14-7. Again, as we explained previously, the DEIR cannot substitute the implementation of Project features for a detailed analysis of impacts. See Lotus v. Department of Transportation, 223 Cal.App.4th at 656, 658. Setting aside this legal error, the DEIR concedes that these Project features (which include measures such as fire-resistant physical design features, a fire extinguishing and alarm system, on-site water storage, a helipad, emergency communications equipment, and employee training) would not resolve Project impacts relating to fire response time deficiencies. DEIR p. 4.14-8. The DEIR correctly identifies this as a significant impact. Id.	The Fire Impact Analysis in Appendix I of the Draft EIR analyzes the potential service call volume of the proposed project, stating "If the average call generation rate for the Rush Creek and Evergreen Lodge properties is applied to the number of accommodations proposed for the Terra Vi site, including employee housing bedrooms, the estimated annual calls for service would be approximately 11" (page 8). As detailed in the Draft EIR, the inadequate response time to the project site is an existing condition and not an effect caused by the proposed project. Mitigation Measure PS-1 would ensure that trained fire staff are on-site and able to respond at all times. These staff would be able to serve as first responders and could address small fire and emergency medical incidents. For instance, minor injuries could be treated or assessed on-site without necessitating a call for an ambulance, or small kitchen fires or minor fire calls could be handled by these on-site staff. For GCSD's comments on the Draft EIR, please see Comment Letter GOV4 from GCSD and the associated responses. Regarding evacuation, please see Master Response 4.

Comment #	Comment	Response
	However, the DEIR then identifies a mitigation measure which differs only slightly from the aforementioned Project features, and inexplicably asserts that while those Project features would not reduce impacts to a less than significant level, the very similar mitigation measure would in fact reduce impacts to be less than significant. Id. This mitigation measure calls for staff training, this time in accordance with "Tuolumne County Fire Department volunteer fire service standards," DEIR p. 4.14-8 (Mitigation Measure PS-1), yet it does not explain how the simple act of training staff could begin to substitute for the provision of actual firefighting units which would of course be needed to protect the site in the event of a large wildfire. Mitigation Measure PS-1 also calls for emergency communications equipment, but the DEIR does not explain how this would differ from the other emergency communications equipment which the DEIR previously concluded was insufficient to avoid significant impacts to fire protection services. See DEIR p. 4.14-7 (explaining that the Project's features relating to enhanced communications would not be sufficient to maintain adequate fire response times). The DEIR's failure to adequately analyze these impacts or identify effective mitigation measures is a fatal flaw requiring that the EIR be revised and recirculated for public review and comment.	Please also see Master Responses 5 and 6.
ORG6-21	4. The DEIR Does Not Analyze the Project's Impacts on the County's Emergency Response and Evacuation Plans. The DEIR asserts that the Project would not interfere with the County's emergency response plans or emergency evacuation plans but provides no evidence in support of this claim. The DEIR notes the existence of Tuolumne County's Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan (HMP), Emergency Operations Plan, and various General Plan policies related to emergency response, claiming that "[c]ompliance with applicable laws and regulations regarding emergency preparedness, and the General Plan policies, would ensure that the proposed [P]roject would not interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan and impacts would be less than significant." DEIR p. 4.9-18. However, the DEIR never explains how compliance with these plans and policies would reduce Project impacts to less than significant levels, or why the Project would not interfere with emergency operations. While the County's Emergency Operations Plan sets emergency response policy, assigns emergency response responsibilities, and coordinates planning for disasters including wildfires (DEIR p. 4.9-8), the existence of the plan does not negate the Project's potential impacts. Similarly, the County's Hazard Mitigation Plan and General Plan policies do not eliminate the need to evaluate the Project's impacts under CEQA. Compliance with applicable laws and regulations is not sufficient and does not demonstrate that the Project's impacts would be less	Table 4.17-2 in the Draft EIR provides a detailed regulatory compliance analysis, indicating the project features that help to implement applicable policies and regulations. Please see Master Response 5 for further discussion regarding these project features. Please see Master Response 4 for more details on emergency evacuation.

Comment #	Comment	Response
	than significant. As we explained previously, alleged regulatory compliance cannot substitute for detailed analysis of impacts. Even if a project complies with all applicable regulations, the project is still subject to CEQA's full disclosure requirements. Kings County Farm Bureau v. City of Hanford (1990) 221 Cal.App.3d 692, 716 (permit applicant could not rely on conformance with local air district rules to establish that the project would have no significant impact for CEQA purposes). Consultation and compliance with agencies' rules do not cure the errors in an environmental document that "leave the reader in the dark about what land management steps will be taken, or what specific criteria or performance standard will be met." San Joaquin Raptor Rescue Center v. County of Merced (2007) 149 Cal.App.4th 645, 670. Here, the DEIR must actually explain how the Project would comply with the specific requirements of these plans.	
ORG6-22	5. The DEIR Fails to Analyze Cumulative Impacts Relating to Emergency Access, Emergency Response and Fire Protection Services. The DEIR lists several other developments in the vicinity of the Project, including the proposed Yosemite Under Canvas development located to the south of the Project site across SR-120, the Thousand Trails/Yosemite Lakes RV Expansion, the Berkeley Tuolumne Camp Restoration project southeast of the Project site, and the Mountain Sage Conditional Use Permit project west of the site. DEIR p. 4.15-22. Like guests at the Project, occupants of those other developments would very likely use SR-120 as an evacuation route. Simultaneous evacuation of occupants from multiple developments in the area due to wildfire would likely cause traffic congestion on SR-120 and would thus have cumulative effects on emergency evacuation and emergency vehicles. However, the DEIR fails to analyze how the Project, together with cumulative development in the area, would impact emergency access, emergency evacuation, and emergency response. Rather than analyze these impacts, the DEIR once again asserts that compliance with applicable local, state, and federal regulations means the Project's cumulative impacts on fire risk, emergency response plans, and emergency evacuation plans would be less than significant. DEIR p. 4.9-20 (Impact HAZ-8). As explained above, the DEIR's reliance on asserted compliance with regulatory requirements cannot be used to bypass the County's obligation to study the Project's potentially significant impacts, and to mitigate those impacts. Notably, the latest plans for the Yosemite Under Canvas project, located immediately south of the Project site across SR-120, indicate that the development will include an emergency access road providing a second means of egress to SR-120 inaddition to the main entrance on Hardin Flat Road. See Yosemite Under Canvas Draft Environmental Impact Report (June 2020), p. 2-5, Fig. 3; excerpts attached as Exhibit H. The Under Canvas project's second access road would	The potential effects of the Yosemite Under Canvas project are the subject of a separate EIR being prepared for that project. Visitors to the Terra Vi project site would access the site using Sawmill Mountain Road, which would require either turning left from eastbound Highway 120 or turning right from westbound Highway 120; neither of these movements would conflict with a future emergency access driveway on the south side of Highway 120. Sawmill Mountain Road is an existing roadway, and the project proposes modifications to its intersection with Highway 120 to improve sight lines; whether or not the proposed Under Canvas project would conflict with the existing roadways adjoining that project would be subject to review of the Under Canvas project, and not the Terra Vi project. Table 4.17-2 in the Draft EIR provides a detailed regulatory compliance analysis, indicating the project features that are designed and planned to address applicable policies and regulations. Please see Master

Comment #	Comment	Response
	connect to SR-120 via Forest Service Road 1S09, which intersects SR-120 approximately 100 feet west of SR-120's intersection with Forest Route1S03. Id. pp. 2-5, 2-10. The close proximity of these two intersections could create dangerous traffic conditions during an emergency evacuation. In the event of a wildfire, evacuating traffic from the Terra Vi Project would combine with traffic from homes on Forest Route1S03, traffic from the Under Canvas project, and other traffic on SR-120, including other evacuation traffic and emergency vehicle traffic. The DEIR must evaluate the cumulative effects of Project traffic and Under Canvas traffic on SR-120 during an emergency evacuation.	Response 5 for further discussion regarding these project features. The analysis in the Draft EIR analyzes cumulative conditions, whether from existing or future surrounding development, and considers the effects of the project evacuating along with surrounding properties in the county. Please see Master Response 4 for more details on evacuation.
ORG6-23	Regarding fire protection services, the DEIR does acknowledge that the Project, in combination with other nearby projects, could result in significant cumulative impacts, as these developments would collectively place further strain on already overstretched fire departments. DEIR p. 4.14-9 (Impact PS-2). Again, the DEIR includes no analysis of these cumulative impacts. As noted above, in addition to inadequate fire service response times, the DEIR must also address the possibility that during a large wind-driven wildfire, the Groveland CSD fire station and other fire stations in the area may need to direct their limited firefighting resources and equipment elsewhere in order to combat the fire. Their fire engines may be needed for fire suppression activities or protection of other threatened structures across a large service area. As a result, there may not be adequate firefighting equipment available to protect the Project site along with other nearby developments. By placing hundreds of guests in harm's way in a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone, the Project would exacerbate firefighting capacity challenges.	Please see Response ORG6-20 and Master Responses 4, 5, and 6.
ORG6-24	The DEIR must disclose and analyze these cumulative impacts and may not simply declare them to be significant without any substantive discussion. A conclusion of significance cannot take the place of description and analysis of a project impact. As the courts have made clear, "[t]his approach has the process exactly backward and allows the lead agency to travel the legally impermissible easy road to CEQA compliance. Before one brings about a potentially significant . . . change to the environment, an EIR must be prepared that sufficiently explores the significant environmental effects created by the project." Berkeley Keep Jets Over the Bay, 91 Cal.App.4th at 1371; see also Stanislaus Natural Heritage Project v. County of Stanislaus (1996) 48 Cal.App.4th 182 (invalidating EIR that had failed to adequately analyze water supply impacts but found them to be significant).	As shown on page 4.14-9 of the Draft EIR, the significance determination was made in consultation with the TCFD Fire Chief. This analysis considered the proposed project in combination with other cumulative projects, stating "the proposed project, in combination with cumulative projects in the area, would create the need to expand existing fire services and hire additional staff to adequately meet the additional service demand", and determined the impact to be significant. Please also see Master Response 6.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
ORG6-25	The DEIR relies on the same mitigation measures proposed for Impact PS-1 (e.g. communications equipment and emergency fire response training for Project staff), suggesting that they would be sufficient to reduce cumulative impacts on fire protection services, but provides no evidence or analysis in support of this conclusion. DEIR p. 4.14-9. Because the DEIR fails to provide adequate mitigation for the Project's impacts on fire protection services, its conclusion that such impacts would be less than significant cannot be sustained.	Please see Response ORG6-20 and Master Responses 4, 5, and 6.
ORG6-26	6. The DEIR Fails to Adequately Analyze the Project's Numerous Inconsistencies with the General Plan's Wildfire/Emergency Evacuation-Related Policies. If approved, the Project would be clearly inconsistent with a number of goals and policies in the Tuolumne County General Plan, yet the DEIR fails to identify these inconsistencies as significant impacts. In other instances, the DEIR fails to undertake the analysis clearly required by the General Plan. The Project would be located in a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone and would subject its occupants and nearby communities to a severe risk of exposure to wildfire. The Project is therefore inconsistent with General Plan Goal 17A, which calls for the County to "[a]void the exposure of people and structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury or death involving natural hazards," DEIR p. 4.17-8. The Project is also inconsistent with General Plan Policy 17.E.1, which seeks to "[r]educe the exposure to risk from wildland fire to an acceptable level by only allowing development in high or very high fire hazard areas if it can be made safe by planning, construction, or other fire safety measures." DEIR p. 4.9-10. The DEIR does not demonstrate that any of the proposed Project features or mitigation measures would be sufficient to make the development "safe."	The project will not change the zoning or General Plan designation at the site. The project site is zoned as Commercial Recreation and the project is consistent with that zoning. The project site has a General Plan land use designation of Parks and Recreation and the project is consistent with that designation. Specifically, the project is consistent with General Plan Goal 17A and Policy 17.E.1. As listed on page 4.9-19 of the Draft EIR, project design features would be incorporated into the proposed project to reduce wildfire hazards, including but not limited to the use of exterior building materials consistent with wildland-urban interface building code requirements; vegetation designed and installed in conformance with wildland fire safety best practices; monitoring of weather so that staff would be alerted to high fire danger conditions to evacuate the site early where possible, and the site would provide a shelter-in-place facility to be used in the event that evacuation is not feasible. Collectively, these and other project features would ensure the project does not create or exacerbate a wildfire incident, allow for prompt response to a wildfire incident, and

Comment #	Comment	Response
		enable the timely evacuation of the project site, if required. Please see Master Response 4 for more details on evacuation.
ORG6-27	As discussed above, the Project would contribute to traffic congestion during an evacuation, thereby worsening delays by emergency responders. Implementation Program 9.E.b calls for the County to "[r]equire that new development be provided with access roads that allow for safe and efficient response by emergency apparatus and the safe evacuation of residents in the event of structural or wildland fire." DEIR pp. 4.17-7. To further this goal, General Plan Policy 9.E.1 calls for the County to "evaluate the circulation system to identify areas causing delay of emergency vehicle response and evacuation due to traffic congestion." DEIR pp. 4.14-2, 4.17-7. The DEIR fails to undertake the analysis explicitly required by this policy. What little information that has been provided reveals that the Project would interfere with safe evacuation and emergency response, which is in direct violation of this General Plan Implementation Program.	Consistent with General Plan Implementation Program 9.E.b, the proposed project includes a dedicated emergency vehicle access roadway to minimize traffic on Sawmill Mountain Road. Consistent with Policy 9.E.1 of the General Plan, the County has evaluated the potential traffic operational impacts of the project. Appendix J1, Transportation Impact Analysis, of the Draft EIR includes an evaluation of traffic operations. It identifies that one intersection – the westernmost Ferretti Road/Highway 120 intersection – as continuing to operate under cumulative plus project conditions with a level of service (LOS) that exceeds the minimum LOS D standard on midday peak hour summer Saturday.[22] While congestion impacts are not impacts under CEQA, Master Response 4 provides a detailed response regarding emergency evacuation, including an evaluation of whether the project could contribute to congestion that would hinder evacuation procedures.
ORG6-28	The Project is also blatantly inconsistent with General Plan policies pertaining to fire protection service levels. General Plan Goal 9E calls for the County to "[p]rovide structural fire protection to persons and property within Tuolumne County consistent with the needs dictated by the level of development and in accordance with current Federal, State, and local fire protection agency regulations and policies." DEIR pp. 4.14- 2. General Plan Policy 9.E.2 calls for the County to	The Draft EIR acknowledges the existing response times and distances as they relate to fire services at the project site, as well as the project's ability to exacerbate this existing condition, under impact discussions

[22] KD Anderson & Associates, 2020, Transportation Impact Analysis for Terra Vi Resort, page 44.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
	"[m]aintain adopted levels of fire protection service," and General Plan Policy 9.G.3 requires the County to "[d]etermine the impact proposed development will have on the provision of fire protection services and maintain the established level of service as outlined in the current Tuolumne County Fire Department Service Level Stabilization Plan." DEIR pp. 4.17-7; 4.17-8. As discussed above, under the best of circumstances, the Project would not come close to achieving the service standard goal for the Groveland CSD fire station. The aforementioned General Plan goals and policies are critically important, as they were adopted specifically to protect public safety in a County with a well-known history of devastating wildfires. The DEIR's failure to undertake the analyses required by these goals and policies and to identify these inconsistencies as significant effects of the Project are fatal flaws requiring that the EIR be revised and recirculated.	PS-1 and PS-2, and includes associated Mitigation Measures PS-1 and PS-2.
ORG6-29	D. The DEIR's Analysis of and Mitigation for the Project's Water Quality and Hydrology Impacts is Inadequate. Along with Greg Kamman, a hydrologist with CBEC Eco Engineering, we have reviewed the DEIR's water quality, hydrology, and water supply sections. See CBEC Eco Engineering, Report re: Terra Vi Lodge DEIR, July 27, 2020, attached as Exhibit I and incorporated by reference into this letter. As discussed below, and further explained in the CBEC report, the DEIR fails to adequately analyze and mitigate the Project's water quality and hydrology impacts.	The commenter states that the Draft EIR analysis of water quality and hydrology impacts is inadequate. Evidence for this claim is provided in Exhibit I of the comment letter. Please refer to Responses ORG6-30 through ORG6-37 for further discussion on water quality as indicated in Exhibit I. These issues are further evaluated in Chapter 4.10, Hydrology and Water Quality, of the Draft EIR.
ORG6-30	1. The DEIR Does Not Adequately Analyze or Mitigate the Project's Stormwater and Drainage Impacts on Water Quality. The DEIR acknowledges that the proposed Project would impact drainage patterns and increase the overall amount of impervious surfaces, thus increasing runoff, creating changes to stormwater flows, and potentially degrading water quality. DEIR pp. 4.10-8, 4.10-13, 4.10-14. However, the DEIR fails to analyze these impacts. Instead, the document simply notes that the Project will produce stormwater runoff, which "typically" includes pollutants such as oil and sediment from parking lots or pesticides from landscaped areas. DEIR pp. 4.10-8, 4.10-9. As the CBEC report explains, EIRs typically include detailed hydrologic analyses to quantify the magnitude of project runoff in order to evaluate if it would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems structures (e.g., the existing drainage culvert under Highway 120) or otherwise degrade water quality. CBEC report at 1. As with other sections of the DEIR, the document substitutes the required analysis of impacts with a list of Project	The Draft EIR states that, without mitigation, impacts would be significant because the project applicant has not prepared a detailed hydrologic analyses that evaluates if runoff would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems structures or otherwise degrade water quality. The Draft EIR therefore includes a mitigation measure (see Mitigation Measures HYD-1a and HYD-1b) that mandates the preparation of a drainage plan.

Comment #	Comment	Response
	features (e.g., use of drainage swales and landscaped stormwater detention areas) that would allegedly reduce impacts. DEIR pp. 4.10-9, 4.10-13. However, the DEIR makes no attempt to explain how these features would protect water quality. Moreover, despite calling for the implementation of these features, the DEIR concludes that without mitigation, the Project would have significant impacts on water quality. DEIR p. 4.10-8, 4.10-10 (Impact HYD-1).	The Draft EIR lists the proposed drainage design (as shown in Appendix B of the Draft EIR) which includes detaining stormwater on-site during storm events in landscaped detention areas and metering the outflow in order not to exceed the capacity of the existing culvert under Highway 120. Landscaped surface drainage swales are also proposed. These landscaped areas regulate flow and are treatment BMPs that improve the quality of runoff. The landscaped areas would meet the requirements of Chapter 15.28 of the County's Code of Ordinances. These requirements include retaining existing site vegetation, maintaining soil conditions that promote water retention and reduce water loss from evaporation, and implementing stormwater management practices that minimize runoff and increase water retention and infiltration. By limiting contact water on developed sites and promoting infiltration, opportunities for direct discharge of contaminated stormwater to receiving waterbodies is limited. However, the proposed drainage plan does not include enough analysis to ensure that the post construction requirements of the construction general permit would be met by the proposed project. The construction general permit requires that dischargers replicate the pre-project runoff water balance for the smallest storms up to the 85th percentile storm event, or the smallest storm event that generates runoff,

Comment #	Comment	Response
		whichever is larger. The construction general permit also includes BMP sizing requirements to meet water quality goals. The Draft EIR, therefore, includes a mitigation measures to ensure that a Drainage Plan for the site will be prepared that specifies how runoff on the site will be managed in order to protect water quality. The purpose of the plan will be to prevent the creation of localized on- or off-site flooding and to prevent any negative water quality effects off-site. Detention and/or retention facilities would be designed to the satisfaction of the Tuolumne County Engineering Development Department staff and shall capture surface runoff and retain flows such that the rate of surface runoff does not exceed existing flows. Chapter 3 of this Final EIR includes revisions to Mitigation Measure HYD-1a to ensure that the Drainage Plan is completed prior to issuance of a building permit and per the requirements of the Statewide construction general permit. This analysis would ensure that post-project runoff matches pre-project conditions and that water quality is not impacted.
ORG6-31	Rather than identify mitigation measures that would effectively reduce water quality impacts, the DEIR defers development of these measures until after the Project is approved. CEQA allows a lead agency to defer mitigation only when: (1) an EIR contains criteria, or performance standards, to govern future actions implementing the mitigation; (2) practical considerations preclude development of the measures at the time of initial project approval; and (3) the agency has assurances that the future mitigation will be both "feasible and efficacious." Communities for a Better Environment v. City of Richmond (2010) 184 Cal.App.4th 70, 94-95 ("CBE"); San	Mitigation Measure HYD-1a has been revised, as shown in Table 1-1 and Chapter 3, Revisions to the Draft EIR, of this Final EIR to include performance standards and a timeframe for the completion of the Drainage Plan. The updated language is

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
	Joaquin Raptor Rescue Center v. County of Merced (2007) 149 Cal.App.4th at 669-71; CEQA Guidelines §15126.4(a)(1)(B). Here, the DEIR identifies two measures, Mitigation Measure HYD-1a, calling for preparation of a drainage plan, and Mitigation Measure HYD-1b, calling for stormwater facilities to be designed to County standards. DEIR p. 4.10-10. Yet the DEIR fails to provide any performance standards to govern future implementation of these measures, does not give any reason why it would be impractical to develop mitigation measures now, and contains no assurances that future mitigation will be effective. Moreover, as discussed above, merely promising to comply with applicable regulations is not sufficient to ensure that impacts would be less than significant. See Kings County Farm Bureau, 221 Cal.App.3d at 716. As the CBEC report explains, "design of effective runoff and erosion control best management practices (BMPs) requires a hydrologic analysis to quantify the potential changes and impacts associated with project runoff. Thus, in addition to presenting vague and unproven mitigation measures, the DEIR should be deemed incomplete as it does not provide (or defers) a hydrologic analysis necessary to identify and quantify project induced impacts on hydrology and water quality." CBEC report at 2.	reflected with double underlining and strikethrough as follows: Mitigation Measure HYD-1a: A Drainage Plan for the site shall be prepared prior to issuance of building permits to address the post-construction requirements of the Statewide Construction General Permit. The Drainage Plan shall specify ~~that specifies~~ how runoff on the site will be managed in order to protect water quality. The plans will include detailed runoff calculations to appropriately size culverts, bridges, retention ponds/areas, and roadside ditches to meet the drainage requirements of the project site. The purpose of the plan will be to prevent the creation of localized on- or off-site flooding and to prevent any negative water quality effects off-site. If necessary, the plan shall be submitted to the Engineering Development Division of the Tuolumne County Public Works Department for review and approval. The mitigation would be required prior to issuance of a building permit. Post construction performance standards, as detailed in the Statewide Construction General Permit, have been approved by the SWRCB and are capable of managing water quality and hydrology impacts to surface water and groundwater effectively. The construction general permit requires that

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
		dischargers replicate the pre-project runoff water balance for the smallest storms up to the 85th percentile storm event, or the smallest storm event that generates runoff, whichever is larger. Dischargers are required to calculate pre- and post-construction runoff volumes to substantiate adequate drainage management on-site.
ORG6-32	2. The DEIR Provides No Analysis in Support of its Conclusion that Water Quality Impacts Relating to the Project's Septic Systems and Drinking Water Contamination Levels Would Be Less Than Significant. Although the DEIR does not address this, numerous residences in the Project area rely on groundwater as their drinking water supply. Consequently, the DEIR must thoroughly analyze the Project's potential to degrade water quality in these wells. It is particularly concerning that the Project includes a septic system (DEIR, p. 2-1) yet, as the CBEC report explains, the DEIR does not adequately address impacts to groundwater quality from this system. Here too, the DEIR wrongly claims that wastewater impacts would be less than significant simply because the Project's wastewater treatment system and leach field would comply with applicable regulations. DEIR p. 4.10-11. As explained above, Project features' compliance with relevant regulations does not mean the Project's septic system would not harm water quality. See Communities for a Better Environment, 103 Cal.App.4th at 111-14; Californians for Alternatives to Toxics, 136 Cal.App.4th at 15-17.	County guidelines require 8 feet of overburden over bedrock to provide the needed soil treatment for direct disposal of sewage into a septic system of leach field. The project area has 54 to 104 feet of overburden, much more than is required for wastewater constituents to be attenuated and treated by the soil. In addition, the proposed project no longer includes a septic system. Instead, the proposed project would include a package OWTS (see Master Response 2). Wastewater will be treated to tertiary standards (see Master Response 2), unlike the existing residential sites that dispose of raw sewage to treatment systems. The Draft EIR preparers are not aware of any complaints among neighbors of cross-contaminating each other's wells.
ORG6-33	The DEIR notes that subsurface conditions in the Project area consist of fractured bedrock. DEIR p. 4.10-6. Although the DEIR's discussion of the Project's septic system does not address this, the document's technical appendix explains that groundwater storage in the underlying bedrock is associated with interconnected fractures. DEIR Appendix G, p. 6-7. Water levels in many Project production wells, monitoring wells and adjacent residential wells are hydraulically connected by these fractures. See CBEC report at 2. Project plans and fracture maps indicate that the Project's septic system would be located within the interconnected fracture zone area that supplies groundwater to the Project, and to monitoring wells and off-site wells. See id. The Project's production wells would cause drawdown of fracture water levels. Id. This will result in	Please see Response ORG6-32.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
	induced recharge of leach field water into the fracture aquifer and preferentially capture leach field infiltration into the fractured bedrock aquifer, potentially causing adverse impacts to aquifer water quality. Id. Despite this fact, the DEIR fails to provide any analysis of how infiltration from the Project's leach fields will interact with the fractures and associated groundwater system. The failure of the DEIR to evaluate how the Project's septic system would impact neighboring wells is a fatal flaw, and the EIR must be revised and recirculated to correct it.	
ORG6-34	The DEIR fares no better in its analysis of potential impacts relating to contamination in the Project's drinking water supply. Here, the DEIR notes that water wells at the Project site contain arsenic, iron, turbidity, and color levels that exceed drinking water maximum contaminant standards. DEIR p. 4.10-12. The DEIR calls for further water testing and asserts that if contaminant levels remain high, the Project would install a water treatment unit, which it claims would reduce impacts to be less than significant. Id. However, the DEIR fails to provide any detail about this water testing or the water treatment unit. Again, the DEIR's "trust us" approach lacks the required factual support that the Project's impacts involving violation of drinking water quality standards would be less than significant. The revised DEIR must identify all of the residential wells in the Project vicinity and then analyze the Project's potential to impact these wells.	CEQA is concerned with whether the proposed project would result in significant hydrology and water quality impacts with the threshold specifically concerned with whether the proposed project would "violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality." The water quality issue cited by the commenter is an existing condition and is not a result of project implementation. Furthermore, per Chapter 13.16 of the Tuolumne County Code of Ordinance, water from the wells would be tested both bacteriologically and chemically by a State-certified laboratory prior to placing the well into service. The results would be submitted to the Environmental Health Division and must be found to meet state bacteriological and chemical standards as a condition prior to finalizing the permit. The extent of chemical and bacteriological analysis shall be determined by the Environmental Health Division. If the installation of a water treatment unit is required, treated well water would go through the same testing protocol. The well must be found to meet State standards, prior

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
		to use. Please see Master Response 2 regarding the project's proposed wastewater treatment system.
ORG6-35	3. The DEIR Provides No Analysis in Support of its Conclusion that the Project Would Not Obstruct or Conflict with the Implementation of a Water Quality Control Plan or Sustainable Groundwater Management Plan. The DEIR simply claims that the Project would not conflict with water quality control plans or sustainable groundwater management plans, and that impacts would be less than significant because the Project would comply with applicable State and County regulations. DEIR p. 4.10-15 (Impact HYD-5). This lack of analysis is inadequate. As explained above, the DEIR cannot simply rely on asserted regulatory compliance to support a conclusion that impacts would be less than significant. See Kings County Farm Bureau, 221 Cal.App.3d at 716. Instead of merely claiming the Project would comply with applicable regulations, the DEIR must actually analyze the Project's consistency with water quality control plans and sustainable groundwater management plans. See Communities for a Better Environment, 103 Cal.App.4th at 111-14; Californians for Alternatives to Toxics, 136 Cal.App.4th at 15-17. The EIR should be revised to include this analysis and recirculated for public review and comment.	The Basin Plan for the Sacramento and San Joaquin River Basins consist of the designated uses of navigable waters and the water quality criteria for such waters based upon such uses. The Tuolumne County Water Quality Plan (WQP)is concerned with water quality concerns within the County. Adherence to the State construction general permit, implementation of the Stormwater Prevention Pollution Plan, and adherence to the County's Code of Ordinance requirements for grading, landscaping, OWTSs, on-site sewage treatment and disposal, water wells, and groundwater management would ensure that surface and groundwater quality are not adversely impacted during construction. In addition, implementation of the post-construction BMP measures per the construction general permit and Mitigation Measures HYD-1a and HYD-1b, would ensure that water quality is not impacted during the operational phase of the project. Furthermore, on-site groundwater wells will be installed per the California Department of Water Resources' (DWR's) Well Standards and will require a permit from the Tuolumne County Environmental Health Division and

Comment #	Comment	Response
		completion of a DWR 188 Well Completion Form. These requirements ensure that surface and groundwater quality is not impacted by the proposed project thus ensuring that the proposed project does not obstruct the implementation of the Sacramento and San Joaquin River Basin Plan or the Tuolumne County WQP. Please see impact discussions HYD-1, HYD-2, and HYD-5 in the Draft EIR for further discussion of these topics.
ORG6-36	4. The DEIR Fails to Analyze Construction Impacts on Water Quality. The DEIR notes that "[c]learing, grading, excavation, and construction activities would have the potential to impact water quality through soil erosion and increased silt and debris discharged into runoff." DEIR p. 4.10-9. However, instead of analyzing water quality impacts from Project construction, the DEIR asserts that the Project's impacts would be less than significant because construction would comply with applicable regulations such as a Construction General Permit issued by the State Water Resources Control Board and Tuolumne County's erosion control plan requirements. DEIR p. 4.10-9. As discussed above, regulatory compliance does not mean water quality impacts from construction would be insignificant. See Kings County Farm Bureau, 221 Cal.App.3d at 716. The DEIR must actually analyze construction water quality impacts. See Communities for a Better Environment, 103 Cal.App.4th at 111-14; Californians for Alternatives to Toxics, 136 Cal.App.4th at 15-17.	The Construction General Permits are instituted and approved by the SWRCB and is the statewide regulatory mechanism to ensure that impacts from construction are managed to a less-than-significant level. In addition, the Tuolumne County's erosion control plan requirements add local mandates to further ensure that stormwater is managed appropriately. Under the terms of construction general permit, applicants must file Permit Registration Documents (PRDs) with the SWRCB prior to the start of construction. The PRDs include a risk assessment, and SWPPP. The SWPPP must list BMPs that would be implemented to prevent soil erosion and discharge of construction-related pollutants that could contaminate nearby water resources. Additionally, the SWPPP must contain a visual monitoring program, a chemical monitoring program for nonvisible pollutants if there is a failure of the BMPs,

Comment #	Comment	Response
		and a sediment-monitoring plan if the site discharges directly to a water body listed on the 303(d) list for sediment. Construction sites cannot proceed without these requirements being met first. Furthermore, Chapter 12.20 of the Tuolumne County Code establishes minimum standards and provides regulations for the construction and maintenance of excavations, site reclamation, drainage control, stockpiling, as well as for protection of exposed soils surfaces, and cut and clearing of vegetation related to any or all of these practices in order to promote the safety, public health, convenience and general welfare of the community.
ORG6-37	5. The DEIR Fails to Analyze Cumulative Impacts on Water Quality. The DEIR concludes that the Project, in combination with the Yosemite Under Canvas project, Thousand Trails/ Yosemite Lakes RV Expansion, Berkeley Tuolumne Camp Restoration project, and Mountain Sage Conditional Use Permit project, would result in less-than-significant cumulative impacts on hydrology, water quality, and groundwater. DEIR pp. 4.10-15, 4.10-16 (Impact HYD-6). However, the DEIR contains no analysis in support of this conclusion, instead relying on Project features and regulatory compliance to claim impacts would be less than significant. Once again, a DEIR cannot rely on a recitation of project features to avoid analysis of a project's impacts. See Lotus v. Department of Transportation, 223 Cal.App.4th at 656, 658. Moreover, as explained, asserted regulatory compliance cannot be used to support a conclusion that a project's impacts would be less than significant. See Kings County Farm Bureau, 221 Cal.App.3d at 716.	Please see Response ORG6-36. When individual projects all abide by the requirements in the Statewide Construction General Permit and the County's erosion control plan, cumulative construction impacts to water quality are reduced to a less-than-significant level. Similarly, when individual projects abide by the statewide regulatory requirements in the Construction General Permit that pertain to post-construction measures, cumulative impacts are less than significant. Post-construction requirements include the installation of onsite BMPs that manage water quality impacts and ensure that post-construction runoff is hydraulically

Comment #	Comment	Response
		equivalent to pre-construction runoff in a way that does not result in flooding on- or off-site. Furthermore, individual projects also undergo the CEQA analysis process which further ensures that water quality impacts are managed appropriately.
ORG6-38	E. The DEIR's Analysis of the Project's Water Supply Impacts is Inadequate. CEQA requires that an EIR present decisionmakers "with sufficient facts to evaluate the pros and cons of supplying the amount of water that the [project] will need." Vineyard Area Citizens for Responsible Growth, Inc. v. City of Rancho Cordova (2007) 40 Cal.4th 412, 430-31. This includes identifying and analyzing water supplies that "bear a likelihood of actually proving available; speculative sources and unrealistic allocations ('paper water') are insufficient bases for decision making under CEQA." Id. at 432. Here, the DEIR fails to adequately analyze the Project's water supply impacts.	The commenter states that the Draft EIR analysis of water supply is inadequate but does not provide evidence to support the claim. Water quality is evaluated in Chapter 4.10, Hydrology and Water Quality, and Chapter 4.16, Utilities and Service Systems, of the Draft EIR. Impact Discussion HYD-2 in Chapter 4.10 of the Draft EIR evaluated water supply based on the Hydrogeology Study conducted for the proposed project, included in the Draft EIR as Appendix G. The Hydrogeology Study and the evaluation in impact discussion HYD-2 determined that the project would result in a less-than-significant impact on water supply because the results of the Hydrogeology Study found that ground water recharge on the project site was in compliance with regulations of the SWRCB. Impact discussion UTIL-2 in Chapter 4.16 of the Draft EIR evaluates the results of the Hydrogeology Study included as Appendix G of the Draft EIR. Impact discussion UTIL-2 finds that the proposed project would have a less-than-significant impact on water supply for the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry, and

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
		multiple-dry years. This determination was made due to results in the Hydrogeology Study which demonstrates that water levels in the aquifer beneath the site stabilized while the wells were pumping 53 gpm, which is more than four times the peak demand. The water levels stabilized approximately 188 feet above the most productive fractures in Well PW-1 and approximately 354 feet above the most productive fractures in Well PW-2. Therefore, even in periods of single and multiple dry years, the on-site wells have more than enough capacity to meet the water demands of the site.
ORG6-39	1. The DEIR Underestimates the Project's Water Demand. The DEIR estimates that the Project's water demand will be 16,636 gallons per day. DEIR pp. 4.10-12, 4.10-13, 4.16-4, 4.16-5; see also Appendix G, Shamim Engineering Consultants, Inc. Report (March 30, 2020). However, the DEIR's water demand study calculates water demand based solely on domestic visitor use associated with guest rooms, cabins, and employee housing. DEIR Appendix G, p. XX. The DEIR's estimated water demand calculations fail to include the Project's other water- consuming components, including food preparation and dining, cleaning and maintenance activities of facilities, the swimming pool, and firefighting water storage. Therefore, the DEIR's water demand estimate does not account for all water demands associated with the Project, and the DEIR is inadequate in characterizing and quantifying potential adverse impacts to groundwater supply. This failure to fully account for the Project's water demand violates CEQA. City of Rancho Cordova, 40 Cal.4th at 430.	Project water demand was reviewed and recalculated in response to comments to capture water demand associated with on-site amenities, including the bar, market, food and beverage facility, common area restrooms, and pool. Activated demand is now 17,832.18 gpd, or 12.38 gallons per minute. Irrigation, firefighting storage, and all other permitted uses will be met with recycled tertiary treated water.
ORG6-40	2. The DEIR Lacks Adequate Analysis in Support of its Conclusion that the Project Would Not Substantially Interfere with Groundwater Recharge. The Project is located on a watershed divide and is in an area of groundwater recharge. DEIR Appendix G, pg. 16. The DEIR states that captured roof drainage and surface runoff will be redirected via a grey water system for landscaping irrigation and other uses. DEIR p. 4.10-13. There is no analysis in the DEIR of how this change will affect the volume and timing of water available for infiltration and groundwater recharge. The DEIR states that minimizing water consumption, use of grey water systems for landscape irrigation, use of low-flow plumbing	Potential loss of recharge can be estimated by considering precipitation volume, project area, and what percentage of precipitation is recharged to groundwater. Data from the Northwest Alliance for Computational Science and Engineering PRISM model indicate the average precipitation in the project area is 38.3 inches per year for the

Comment #	Comment	Response
	fixtures, capture of rainwater to be used for other non-potable uses, and return flow from the grey water irrigation system and from the on-site septic systems will provide additional recharge to the groundwater aquifer. DEIR pp. 4.10-13, 4.16-8. The DEIR concludes that the Project would not substantially interfere with groundwater recharge, and that impacts would be less than significant. DEIR p. 4.10-13, 4.16-7, 8. However, the document fails to provide analysis in support of this conclusion. As the CBEC report explains, no water balance analysis has been prepared to demonstrate how these reallocations will balance out against the losses in recharge due to Project-induced changes in surface water runoff. CBEC report at 3. The DEIR's failure to provide factual support for its conclusion that impacts would be less than significant is inconsistent with CEQA's clear requirements. Sierra Club v County of Fresno (2018) 6 Cal.5th 502, 522; Citizens of Goleta Valley v Board of Supervisors (1990) 52 Cal.3d 553, 568. The revised EIR should include a water balance analysis.	100-year record between 1919 to 2019 or 3.19 feet per year.[23] Therefore, natural rainfall over the 28-acre project development area would be on average 89 acre-feet per year (28 acres x 3.19 feet = 89.32 acre-feet). Typical groundwater recharge will be 3 percent to 8 percent of the rainfall for most areas.[24] However, data[25] suggests recharge of 10 to 35 percent. Based on the soil types noted at the site (loam, silt loam, and sandy loam and decomposed and weather granite) the lower rates should be applied. Using a rate of 10 percent, 8.9 acre-feet might be expected for loss of recharge if the 28 acres was completely covered (although plans indicate a mix of hardscape and landscape areas). It is estimated that irrigation demand for the project would be approximately 5,400 gpd. Over a 6-month period (assuming rain and snowfall is used for irrigation the remainder of the year, consistent with the project landscaping proposal), this would amount to 3.1 acre-feet of direct recharge. Additionally, any reclaimed water from the WWTP that is not used for irrigation or dual plumbed fixtures would be percolated into the ground in the leach fields. Assuming wastewater generation is 90 percent of water demand, the project would generate approximately

[23] Northwest Alliance for Computational Science and Engineering PRISM model, https://prism.oregonstate.edu/explorer/, accessed September 1, 2020.

[24] Nichols, W David. Pers. Com. 2000 regarding Nichols 2000, Regional Ground-Water Evapotranspiration and Ground-Water Budgets, Great Basin, Nevada, U.S. GEOLOGICAL SURVEY PROFESSIONAL PAPER 1628.

[25] Kirk John, 2014 "Preliminary Evaluation of Water Resources Demand and Availability Three Rivers, CA Area" Presentation.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
		16,200 gpd of wastewater that would be reclaimed. This reclaimed water would be used for non-potable indoor uses such as toilet flushing and clothes washing. Assuming this amounts to 40 percent of indoor water use, 6,480 gpd of reclaimed water would be used for indoor non-potable water use. Therefore, a total of 4,320 gpd will be released into the leach field when irrigation water is being used, and 9,720 gpd when there is no irrigation. This amounts to 7.74 acre-feet per year. Therefore, direct infiltration through irrigation water and percolation in the leach field would result in a recharge of 10.8 acre-feet per year and the proposed project would not decrease groundwater recharge.
ORG6-41	3. The Project Would Exacerbate Existing Groundwater Depletion at the Site. The DEIR notes that the Project area includes several springs. See DEIR p. 4.3-47. However, the DEIR's hydrogeology analysis finds that these springs are no longer active or producing. DEIR Appendix G, Geoscience Hydrogeology Study, p. 7. Appendix G finds that "[t]his is likely because wells in the area have drawn the groundwater surface below the surface elevation of the former springs." Id. at 7. The Appendix concludes that these springs "are no longer flowing, which suggests groundwater levels are currently lower than they have been historically." Id. at 8. Although the main body of the DEIR does not discuss this, these statements indicate that groundwater supply within the Project area is currently in a state of depletion, and that any further groundwater extraction will lead to further depletion, as the CBEC report explains. CBEC report at 4. In addition to worsening groundwater depletion, the Project will further exacerbate the ecological impacts associated with lost spring flow. Id. The depleted springs likely provide ecologically valuable habitat to sensitive species, whether seasonal or year-round. The DEIR must disclose and fully analyze the possibility that the Project will exacerbate existing groundwater depletion at the site.	The comment incorrectly states that the groundwater at the project site is in a state of depletion. The project hydrogeologist, Geoscience, has conducted an additional review of USGS mapping products. The springs north and south of the project area are still mapped on the 2018 USGS 24-minute quadrangle maps. The springs were not included in maps initially reviewed, but are included on different map series, including the current US TOPO national map. The discussion and reference to springs was provided to show how fracture sets might conduct groundwater and the intersection of fracture sets in this case could historically

Comment #	Comment	Response
		result in the daylighting of groundwater (as springs). However, spring flow may not necessarily be associated with the same fracture sets as wells or may be due to another mechanism to bring water to the surface, such as faults. Geoscience conducted an additional review of mapping by the USGS to confirm spring location and mapped history. The 2018 version of the USGS National Map series - US Topo (referred to in the project Hydrogeology Study as the most current map) does not show springs, this is likely because the map series has removed many of the classic map features shown on the traditional USGS 24 Minute Quadrangle maps. However, in reviewing the traditional 1990, 1992, 2001, 2012, 2015, and 2018 USGS 24-minute quadrangle maps, spring locations are shown to the north and south of the project site. No evidence of spring activity is present at the site. The northerly of the two springs noted is located north of the residential wells and off-site. Groundwater pumping from at least three residential wells is occurring between the Terra Vi site and the mapped spring. If the north spring is in fact still present, then residential pumping has not impacted the spring, strongly suggesting that the spring is not associated with the same deep fractures that provide water to the residential wells, and from which Terra Vi wells will draw.
ORG6-42	4. The DEIR Does Not Include Sufficient Analysis in Support of its Conclusion that the Project Would Have Sufficient Water Supplies to Meet Demand During Multiple Dry Years. The DEIR relies on a well pump test conducted over a 10-day period in October 2019 to assert	The comment incorrectly states that groundwater supply at the project site is depleted. Area springs to the north and

Comment #	Comment	Response
	that two onsite wells would be adequate to supply the Project's estimated water demand. DEIR pp. 4.16-5, 4.16-7, 4.16-8. The DEIR claims that applying a 50 percent capacity pumping rate to Project wells based on a 10-day capacity test per County standards provides an adequate safety margin to avoid supply deficiencies during dry years and multiple-year dry periods. DEIR p. 4.16-7. As the CBEC report explains, however, the October 2019 groundwater pump test does not demonstrate that the Project wells would be adequate to meet the Project's projected water demand. 2019 was a wet year-type occurring within a 4-year period of average to predominantly above-normal precipitation (i.e., a multi-year wet period). DEIR Appendix G, Geoscience Hydrogeology Study, Fig. 9. The DEIR provides no quantitative assessment of how Project well pumping would impact groundwater supplies during dry years or multi-year dry periods, i.e. droughts. Excess stress and adverse impacts to California water resources are far more likely to occur during dry years or drought than during wet years or multiyear wet periods. As noted above, evidence suggests the groundwater supply beneath the Project site has already been depleted, and the County standards for pump capacity testing are therefore inadequate, as they are likely intended for applications to groundwater systems in a natural or unimpacted condition. See CBEC report at 3. The DEIR must analyze the effect of Project water demand on groundwater supplies during dry years and multi-year droughts.	south of the project site still appear on current US Topo National Map products. The comment also incorrectly states that the Draft EIR does not provide a quantitative assessment of how well pumping would impact groundwater supplies during dry years and multi-year dry periods. Please see Section 8.4.5 of the hydrogeology study in Appendix G of the Draft EIR. Please also see Response ORG5-03. In addition, the rainfall for 2018/2019 was 47 inches, or about 23 percent above the average. The rainfall for the previous year (2017/2018) was 9 percent below average. The year 2014 was 32 percent below, 2015 was 35 percent below, 2016 was 7 percent above, and 2017 was 50 percent above. The rainfall for the previous 6 years was the average of the 100-year record between 1919 and 2019, or 38 inches. Since rainfall to recharge does not occur in a single year, because rainfall must percolate through many feet of overburden to the fractures that conduct the groundwater, a single wet year is not significant. Rather, the long-term average is more appropriate for long -term water supply analysis. At a minimum, the testing period reflects conditions for average long-term supply. From the 100-year record, only two years (1976 and 2013) had below 50 percent average rainfall. 98 years of rainfall ranged from 46.2 percent to 200 percent of average rainfall. Therefore, the

Comment #	Comment	Response
		methodology required by Tuolumne County is not only appropriate, it is conservative. There was a 9-day overlap of the Terra Vi and Yosemite Under Canvas pumping tests. In that time, the fractured bedrock aquifer system produced approximately 93 gpm flow (or 133,920 gpd). During the testing, water levels in all of the wells being monitored stabilized. Following the pumping, the wells showed full recovery as defined by County testing guidelines. Terra Vi's calculated water demand is 17,832.18 gpd. Yosemite Under Canvas calculated demand is 10,000 gpd. The cumulative demand of the two projects is 27,832 gpd or approximately 19.3 gpm. During the 9-day period in which the tests overlapped, the fractured rock system produced 93 gpm, approximately 4.8 times the anticipated combined demand for the projects. During testing, water levels in nearby wells showed a maximum 54 feet of interference. This interference is not significant considering the available drawdown, the standard operation of fractured bedrock wells, and the design of the pumping test to maximize impacts to the groundwater system. The testing occurred in October 2019, just after an above average water year (water year 2019 precipitation was 48.3 inches. PRISM climate group reports and average precipitation of 38.06 inches from 1919-2019). While the water year overall was the

Comment #	Comment	Response
		23rd wettest since 1919, precipitation in the July to September period was 0.27 inches, well below the 0.67 inch average for the same period. While water year 2020 is not yet complete, precipitation from October 2019 to July 2020 was 23.56 inches, making it the 9th driest year since 1919. The precipitation in water year 2020 is approximately 50 percent of precipitation in water year 2019. Water levels measured in the Terra Vi wells in September 2020 were between 3.38 and 2.75 feet below water levels measure in October of 2019. Water levels did not show significant variability with significant change in precipitation. The 10-year period between 2009 and 2019 is below average precipitation, as is the 5-year period from 2014 to 2019.
ORG6-43	5. The DEIR Fails to Analyze the Adequacy of Fire Protection Water Supply. The DEIR states that water for firefighting would be provided using reclaimed, grey, and potable water, which would be retained in a storage system and augmented with wildland fire hoses, and notes that onsite fire suppression systems and hydrants would meet regulatory requirements. DEIR pp. 3-25, 3-26, 4.10-12, 4.16-4, 4.17-24. However, the DEIR does not analyze the adequacy of onsite storage tanks and water wells for firefighting purposes. The DEIR must examine whether the onsite storage tanks and wells would provide sufficient water for firefighters to protect the Project site and nearby area in the event of a major wildfire. This analysis is especially important because the Project site is within a Very High Fire Hazard Severity zone and would not be adequately served by existing fire protection services (e.g. the Groveland CSD), which the DEIR acknowledges would not be able to reach the site within established response times. During a large wildfire, firefighting resources may need to be deployed elsewhere, and there may not be a water tanker truck available to serve the Project site. Analysis of onsite water storage and well capacity for firefighting purposes is essential. In the absence of a verifiable supply and storage system for firefighting water, the DEIR has no basis to	As stated on page 4.17-31, "Fire flow for the buildings would be provided by the potable water storage tanks. The quantity of water storage, pressure of water supply, and maintenance of the storage tanks would be designed to comply with State Responsibility Areas Fire Safe Regulations, CFC, Tuolumne County General Plan policies, and Tuolumne County Code of Ordinances, Chapter 15.20, Fire Safety Standards." The proposed project includes sprinklers, standpipes, and water storage tanks for fire protection water supply. Each of the three water storage tanks would have a capacity of approximately 150,000 gallons, with the final size dependent on final unit approval, plumbing

Comment #	Comment	Response
	conclude that the Project's impacts relating to wildfire risk and emergency response would be less than significant.	design, and firefighting requirements. The TCFD will provide further input on the detailed design of the project when the project proceeds to the building permit phase. Final water requirements for firefighting in terms of supply and delivery rate would be set by the County and the proposed project would not be able to obtain building permits without demonstrating an ability to meet these requirements. Two of the tanks would store potable water and one would hold rainwater for irrigation and firefighting.
ORG6-44	6. The DEIR Lacks Adequate Analysis in Support of its Conclusion that Cumulative Water Supply Impacts Are Less than Significant. The DEIR notes the existence of four nearby projects which will contribute to area water demand: the Under Canvas project across SR-120, the Berkeley Tuolumne Camp Restoration project, the Thousand Trails / Yosemite Lakes RV Expansion project, and the Mountain Sage Conditional Use Permit project. DEIR p. 4.16-9. The DEIR acknowledges that wells drilled for these projects may tap into groundwater reserves that are interconnected with those used by the Project's wells, and that cumulatively these projects may decrease groundwater supplies in the area. Id. However, the DEIR does not contain any analysis of these cumulative impacts, simply asserting with no evidence that cumulative impacts would be less than significant. Id.; see also CBEC report at 4,5. The DEIR asserts that because well pump testing at the Project site was conducted concurrently with well testing at the adjacent Under Canvas site, that analysis already addresses the cumulative water supply impacts of the Project together with the Under Canvas project. Id. However, as discussed above, well pump testing for both projects was conducted in 2019, a wet year, and does not reflect available water supply in a dry year or multi-year drought. Moreover, the DEIR makes no attempt to analyze the cumulative impact of water pumping from the Berkeley Tuolumne Camp Restoration project (which would install new on-site wells) or the Thousand Trails / Yosemite Lakes RV Expansion project, or increased water demand from the Mountain Sage Conditional use Permit Project (which would use Groveland CSD public water utilities). The DEIR therefore fails to support its conclusion that cumulative water supply impacts would be less than significant.	Cumulative groundwater supply impacts are addressed on page 4.10-16 of the Draft EIR. As stated on page 4.10-16, the Berkeley Tuolumne Camp Restoration project would not utilize groundwater, and the pump testing for the project was conducted at the same time as pump testing for the Yosemite Under Canvas project to account for the cumulative condition of both projects operating simultaneously. The Thousand Trails/Yosemite Lakes RV Expansion was a 2017 pre-application and no further information on that project is available. Please also see Master Responses 4, 5, and 6, and Responses ORG6-42, ORG6-88, and PUB28-04.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
ORG6-45	F. The DEIR's Analysis of and Mitigation for the Project's Noise and Vibration Impacts is Inadequate. We have reviewed the DEIR's noise analysis and commissioned an independent review by professional acoustic and vibration consultants. See Papadimos Group Report re: Terra Vi Lodge Project DEIR, July 28, 2020, attached as Exhibit J and incorporated by reference into this letter. As discussed below, and further explained in the Papadimos report, the DEIR does not identify all noise- and vibration-sensitive land uses adjacent to the Project site, fails to rely on appropriate significance criteria to evaluate the Project's impacts, does not accurately identify existing ambient noise and vibration levels at adjacent sensitive receptors, fails to adequately evaluate noise impacts, and lacks evidentiary support that mitigation measures would effectively reduce the Project's noise impacts.	The commenter states that the Draft EIR analysis of noise and vibration impacts is inadequate. Evidence for this claim is provided in Exhibit J of the comment letter. Please refer to Responses ORG6-46 through ORG6-62 for further discussion on noise and vibration as indicated in Exhibit J. Noise and vibration is further evaluated in Chapter 4.12, Noise, of the Draft EIR.
ORG6-46	1. The DEIR Fails to Identify the Location of All Nearby Sensitive Noise Receptors. An accurate depiction of existing environmental conditions is critical to a complete assessment of project impacts. "[T]o inform decision makers and the public of any significant adverse effects a project is likely to have on the physical environment . . ., an EIR must delineate environmental conditions prevailing absent the project, defining a baseline against which predicted effects can be described and quantified." Neighbors for Smart Rail v. Exposition Metro Line Construction Authority (2013) 57 Cal.4th 439, 447. Investigating and reporting existing conditions are "crucial function[s] of the EIR." Save Our Peninsula Comm. v. Monterey County (2001) 87 Cal.App.4th 99, 122 ("SOPC"). "[W]without such a description, analysis of impacts, mitigation measures and project alternatives becomes impossible." County of Amador v. El Dorado County Water Agency (1999) 76 Cal.App.4th 931, 953. Decisionmakers must be able to weigh the project's effects against "real conditions on the ground." City of Carmel-by-the-Sea v. Bd. of Supervisors (1986) 183 Cal.App.3d 229, 246. Here, the DEIR fails to meet CEQA's clear requirements because it fails to identify all of the noise-sensitive land uses that would be impacted by the Project's increase in noise. The DEIR's noise analysis specifically identifies only a single sensitive noise receptor, a residence located immediately north of the Project. Figure 4.12-1, DEIR p.4.12-9. The DEIR states that this residence is located approximately 250 feet from the Project site. DEIR p. 4.12-20. The DEIR also generally acknowledges that "noise sensitive land uses which would potentially be affected by the project" include existing "single-family residential land uses located to the north of the [P]project site." DEIR p. 4.12-8. The DEIR elsewhere notes that the site is "surrounded by rural residential homes on Sawmill Mountain Road [to the] north and northeast," DEIR p. 4.1-4,	Please see Appendix L, Supplemental Noise Analysis, of this EIR, for a more detailed response including analyses of a total of 15 noise-sensitive receptors near the project site. These receptors includes 12 homes to the immediate north of the project site and three homes south of the site, on Hardin Flat Road. Because sound decreases with distance, it can normally be concluded that, if the nearest sensitive receptor is not impacted, impacts at more distant receptors are unlikely. Nevertheless, additional locations were analyzed, and the potential noise impacts in the Supplemental Noise Analysis continue to be determined to be potentially significant because (1) the generator noise level exposure could exceed the General Plan daytime and nighttime hourly average noise level standards at a portion of the nearest receivers, and (2) increases in ambient noise levels are predicted to exceed the applicable Tuolumne County General Plan cumulative noise level increase criterion of 5 dB at a portion of the

Comment #	Comment	Response
	including homes "immediately north of the [P]project site." DEIR p. 4.1-29. However, the DEIR fails to specify the number of homes in this area or identify the specific location of these sensitive receptors or their distance from the Project. Although the DEIR also acknowledges that places where people recreate "are generally considered to be sensitive to noise," the DEIR's noise section downplays the possibility of nearby noise receptors by asserting that the public forest lands and commercial recreation uses adjoining the Project site "are typically not considered to be noise sensitive." DEIR p. 4.12-8. The DEIR provides no support for this assertion. Elsewhere, however (in the air quality section), the DEIR concedes that "[s]sensitive receptors to the proposed [P]project include . . . recreational land users in the area a nearby campsites, trails, or other recreational sites." DEIR pp. 4.2-8, 4.2-11. As discussed above, there are at least 15 residences and at least two campgrounds in the immediate Project vicinity. Until the DEIR identifies all of the nearby sensitive receptors in the area, it is not possible to identify existing ambient noise levels at each receptor location or to determine the appropriate significance criteria. See Table 4.12-6 (identifying significance thresholds based on existing ambient noise levels). Moreover, without identifying the location of all sensitive receptors in the area, it is not possible to evaluate how noise from construction and operation of the Project will impact those sensitive receptors. Once the DEIR is revised to provide this information, it will then be able to identify appropriate significance thresholds, quantify and analyze the Project's noise impacts on each receptor location, and identify appropriate mitigation for the Project's significant noise impacts. The DEIR's failure to identify the location of sensitive noise receptors also makes it impossible to determine compliance with the Tuolumne County General Plan. The General Plan's Noise Element requires that "the exterior noise level standard[s] shall be applied to the property line of the receiving land uses." However, the DEIR does not delineate the receiving land uses' property lines. Until the EIR identifies these property boundaries, it is not possible to evaluate the Project's noise impacts or determine the Project's consistency with the General Plan.	receivers. These continue to be reduced to less than significant for all surrounding sensitive noise receptors with implementation of Mitigation Measures NOI-1.1, NOI-1.2a, and NOI-1.2b, as described in Appendix L, Supplemental Noise Analysis. The adjacent parcels to the east and west of the project parcel are zoned Public District (P). According to Table 5.C of the General Plan Noise Element, these land uses are not considered to be noise-sensitive. The adjacent parcels to the north of the project are zoned Residential Estate 2-Acre Minimum and 5-Acre Minimum Districts (RE-2 and RE-5). Section 17.26.010 of the Tuolumne County Zoning Code identifies RE-2 zoning as "rural residential living." In addition, Section 17.28.010 of the Zoning Code identifies RE-5 as "country-estate type living conditions while maintaining large areas of open space dedicated to agricultural pursuits, grazing, or left undisturbed." Pursuant to the above code sections, the Zoning Code does not define RE-2 and RE-5 as urban residential uses. Based on the General Plan's definition and associated assessment location of noise level standards for noise-sensitive uses, and pursuant to the Zoning Code's description of the residential uses adjacent to the project site (RE-2 and RE-5), the General Plan's non-transportation noise level standards were appropriately applied at the nearest existing

Comment #	Comment	Response
		residential structures to the project (where the sensitivity exists), rather than at the property lines of the parcels containing those residences. Regarding land uses that are considered to be noise sensitive, according to Table 5.C of the Tuolumne County General Plan Noise Element, "Noise-sensitive land uses include urban residential land uses, libraries, churches, and hospitals, in addition to nursing homes or schools which have over six beds or students, respectively. Transient lodging establishments which are considered noise sensitive land uses include hotels, motels, or homeless shelters, but not bed and breakfast establishments located in rural areas, campgrounds, or guest ranches." Therefore, public forest lands and commercial recreation are not considered noise sensitive. A revision to the discussion of types of noise-sensitive land uses on page 4.12-8 of the Draft EIR is included in Chapter 3, Revisions to the Draft EIR, in order to correct this contradiction and adhere to the Tuolumne County noise-sensitive land uses for consistency. Regarding the differences between sensitive receptors described between the Air Quality and Noise chapters (Chapters 4.2 and 4.12 of the Draft EIR, respectively), the definition for what is a sensitive land use can differ when considering air quality versus noise impacts. For example, recreational uses may be considered sensitive land uses in terms of

Comment #	Comment	Response
		factors affecting air quality. However, in regards to noise impacts, recreational users may be the ones creating noise. Air quality and noise are two different environmental issue areas that may be caused by different sources, and result in different types of impacts, thus the sensitive receptors for each may be different.
ORG6-47	2. The DEIR Does Not Adequately Analyze Existing Noise or Vibration Conditions in the Project Vicinity. In addition to failing to identify the location of sensitive noise receptors near the Project site, the DEIR also fails to adequately characterize or measure existing baseline ambient noise conditions in the vicinity. In addition to the long-term noise measurements (LT-1 & LT-2) documented near Forest Route 1S03, the DEIR should have monitored existing ambient noise at all sensitive receptor locations that could potentially be affected by the Project's noise. In particular, locations set back further from existing roads in the project vicinity would be expected to have lower ambient noise than monitoring locations LT-1 & LT-2. See Papadimos report, pp 4,5. DEIR Table 4.12-8 includes the highest reported noise level at each monitoring location. This could be an appropriate metric for evaluating noise impacts within the Project (such as the ability of lodge construction materials to control interior noise levels attributable to outside noise). However, it is not appropriate for measuring existing ambient noise conditions at surrounding receptors that would be affected by Project-generated noise. See Papadimos report, pp 4,5. The DEIR should be revised to include existing background ambient noise levels at each monitoring location in order to properly evaluate the Project's impacts on adjacent noise-sensitive receptors. The DEIR also fails to adequately disclose existing vibration levels in the Project vicinity. Papadimos report, pp 2, 3. The DEIR asserts that because "vibration levels were below the threshold of perception at the [P]project site and in the immediate project vicinity" during a site visit in May 2019, "the existing vibration environment in the immediate project vicinity is considered to be negligible." DEIR p. 4.12-11. The DEIR does not include any evidence to support this claim. Furthermore, DEIR Appendix H notes that baseline vibration levels were "below 0.1 inches per second if converted to peak particle velocity." DEIR Appendix H, p.35. Again, the DEIR fails to provide any supporting documentation regarding vibration measurement methodology	Please see Appendix L, Supplemental Noise Analysis, of this EIR, for a more detailed response. Table 1 on page 2 of the Supplemental Noise Analysis includes ambient hourly noise levels at a total of 15 noise-sensitive receivers. These receptors includes 12 homes to the immediate north of the project site and three homes south of the site, on Hardin Flat Road. As detailed beginning on page 26 of the Supplemental Noise Analysis, vibration measurements were included in the analysis of the 15 sensitive receptors within the project vicinity. Vibration levels at the project site and in the immediate project vicinity have been noted as below the Caltrans Vibration Annoyance Potential Criteria threshold of perception of 0.30 in/sec PPV. As indicated in the Supplemental Noise Analysis (see Appendix L of this Final EIR), vibration levels generated from on-site construction activities at the nearest existing sensitive uses (residences) are predicted to be well below the strictest Caltrans thresholds for damage to residential structures of 0.30 in/sec PPV. Further away,

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
	(e.g. location, duration, postprocessing, etc.) or reported results. If ambient vibration levels in the immediate Project vicinity are below the threshold of perception, this suggests that adjacent receptors would be especially sensitive to increased vibration that may result from Project construction and operation, given the low existing baseline.	the predicted vibration levels are below the strictest Caltrans threshold of human response of 0.01 in/sec PPV (barely perceptible). Because baseline levels at the project site and immediate project vicinity are imperceptible, and project vibration levels are projected as being imperceptible (an order of magnitude below applicable criteria), there is no need for baseline vibration measurements at all sensitive receptors within the project vicinity. Vibration levels due to project on-site operations are expected to satisfy the Caltrans' ground borne impact vibration criteria at the closest existing sensitive uses. Impacts from project operations will also be less than significant.
ORG6-48	3. The DEIR Relies on Inadequate Significance Criteria to Evaluate Project Impacts. The DEIR relies on flawed significance thresholds that do not sufficiently protect the environment. CEQA Guidelines § 15064.7 (d) (2). According to the Papadimos report, the ambient noise standard ((Ldn/CNEL) + 5 dB) presented in Table 4.12.5 to evaluate cumulative noise exposure from the Project is too permissive. See Papadimos report at 3. The ambient noise level is often defined as the L90 or L99 statistical level using a time interval between 15 minutes and one hour. Increases on the ambient (L90 or L99) statistical noise level on an hourly basis would be more appropriate for this analysis. The DEIR states that L90 hourly levels at the Project site were measured to be about 30 dBA on average, and as low as 21 dBA (DEIR Appendix H, 'Noise Study' – Appendix D & E). Typically, an increase as low as 3 dB in the ambient noise due to a project is used as a threshold to identify significant impacts. See Papadimos report at 3. Moreover, as noted above, the DEIR's failure to identify the location of all sensitive noise receptors near the Project site also makes it impossible to determine appropriate significance criteria or meaningfully evaluate Project impacts.	The noise analysis in the Draft EIR appropriately utilizes standards established in the Tuolumne County General Plan. There are multiple metrics that can be used to describe sound, including Ldn, Leq, Lmax, Ln (i.e. L50 or L90). The Tuolumne County General Plan noise level standards are expressed in terms of hourly average (Leq). In order to compare project noise impacts with County hourly average noise level standards with consistency (or an "apples to apples" comparison), project-generated Leq noise levels were appropriately compared to County established Leq noise levels. Just as the quietest project-generated sound levels are not compared against the loudest measured ambient conditions, neither are the quietest ambient conditions compared

Comment #	Comment	Response
		against the loudest period of project noise generation. As noted in the ambient noise survey results, background noise conditions vary. This is also true of project noise generation. As a result, baseline average and maximum noise levels were compared against the predicted average and maximum noise levels that would be generated by the project. Because sound decreases with distance, it can normally be concluded that, if the nearest sensitive receptor is not impacted, impacts at more distant receptors are unlikely. Nevertheless, additional locations were analyzed, and are contained in Appendix L, Supplemental Noise Analysis (see Appendix E-2 of the Supplemental Noise Analysis for a map of the locations). The potential noise impacts taking into consideration this additional data continue to be determined to be less than significant or less than significant with mitigation. Please see Appendix L, Supplemental Noise Analysis, for a detailed analysis.
ORG6-49	4. The DEIR Lacks Evidentiary Support for its Conclusion that the Project's Operational Noise Impacts Would Be Less Than Significant. The DEIR concludes that unmitigated noise levels associated with the Project's operations would be significant. DEIR p. 4.12-18. The sources of noise identified in the DEIR include vehicle traffic, parking, truck circulation, use of the loading dock, HVAC systems, garbage trucks, and the Project's maintenance yard, which will include a generator. DEIR p. 4.12-19. However, as the Papadimos report explains, this is not a complete list of the Project's significant noise-generating components. Notably, although the Project would allow events and would include a 3,000 square-foot ballroom/event space as well as an outdoor swimming pool, barbecue area and outdoor dining area (DEIR p. 3.16), the DEIR fails to disclose or analyze the potential for	Additional noise analyses for the pool area and BBQ area at the nearest receivers have been conducted and the results of those analyses are provided in Response ORG6-46 and Appendix L, Supplemental Noise Analysis. The project does not propose outdoor events. Further, events occurring within the ballroom would be contained within the indoor space itself, and would receive a significant degree of shielding

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
	amplified music or other noise resulting from these uses. See Papadimos report at 8. The DEIR must identify the noise associated with each of these Project components and analyze its impact on nearby sensitive receptors, with reference to appropriate significance criteria.	provided by the building construction (at least 25 dB of noise level reduction). Based on this information, noise levels associated with amplified music within the proposed indoor ballroom are not expected to exceed applicable County standards, or result in a significant increase in ambient noise level at nearby receivers.
ORG6-50	The DEIR also lacks support for its conclusion that noise impacts resulting from Project-generated traffic or cumulative traffic would be less than significant. DEIR pp. 4.12-12, 4.12-13. The DEIR finds that “cumulative traffic increase is predicted to exceed the [Tuolumne County] General Plan cumulative noise increase significance criteria along Sawmill Mountain Road north of the SR 120.” DEIR p. 4.12-13. However, instead of proposing and evaluating mitigation measures to address this Project impact, the DEIR merely offers unsupported assumptions and reasons for its claim that this impact should be interpreted as less than significant. Id. The DEIR’s conclusion that increased ambient noise levels in the Project vicinity due to cumulative traffic increases are less than significant ignores the Tuolumne County General Plan interior noise level standard of 45 dB Ldn, which is applicable to transportation noise exposures at receiving land uses. The revised EIR must identify this as a significant impact of the Project.	As indicated in the Draft EIR in impact discussion NOI-1 under the heading "Project Operation Noise -Traffic," impact analysis), the proposed project’s contribution to traffic noise level increases were predicted to exceed the General Plan cumulative noise increase significance criteria along one roadway segment evaluated in the existing and cumulative conditions analysis. Specifically, the roadway segment of Sawmill Mountain Road north of the Highway 120 was predicted to have an existing and cumulative plus project traffic noise level of approximately 50 (49.8) dB Ldn at a distance of 100 feet from the roadway centerline. However, additional analysis of the above-mentioned roadway segment revealed that the first 1,200 feet of this segment is located within the project area and contains the primary access point to the development, which is located approximately 600 feet from Highway 120. Thus, it was reasonably assumed that a significant portion of the project-generated traffic would exit Sawmill Mountain Road onto the project site at the primary access point. In addition, the predicted existing and cumulative plus

Comment #	Comment	Response
		project traffic noise level of 50 dB Ldn at 100 feet along this roadway segment is below the Tuolumne County General Plan exterior noise level standard of 60 dB Ldn, which is applicable to traffic noise affecting residential uses. Even if all project generated traffic would go past the project site and continue north on Sawmill Mountain Road (which it will not), the predicted Ldn at the nearest residence to Sawmill Mountain Road, located approximately 110 feet from the centerline of the roadway (receiver 3), would be 49 dB Ldn. Standard residential construction results in an exterior to interior noise level reduction of approximately 15 dB with the windows open and 25 dB with windows in the closed position. Based on this information, interior noise levels are calculated to range from 34 to 24 dB Ldn, depending on positioning of windows. The calculated interior noise levels above would be well below the Tuolumne County General Plan 45 dB Ldn interior noise level standard for residential uses. Based on the above information, off-site traffic noise impacts related to increases in traffic resulting from the implementation of the project (existing vs. existing plus project and cumulative vs. cumulative plus project conditions) continue to be identified as being less than significant.
ORG6-51	The DEIR also fails to provide adequate support for its conclusion that noise impacts from on-site traffic circulation, vehicle parking or loading docks would be less than significant. DEIR pp. 4.12-14, 4.12-15. The DEIR purports to calculate “worst-case” on-site traffic circulation noise based on the assumption that “all of the on-site vehicle trips would occur at one location, when realistically it would likely be more spread out throughout the development”. Id. However, the	Please see Response ORG6-46 and Appendix L, Supplemental Noise Analysis, of this EIR, which includes an analysis of "worst-case" on-site traffic noise level exposure at the nearest existing noise-sensitive receivers

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
	DEIR does not explain which "one location" has been assumed for all on-site traffic circulation, making it difficult to evaluate the claim that the DEIR's noise impact predictions are worst-case and conservative. See Papadimos Report at 6. Also, the DEIR's assessment of on-site traffic circulation uses Leq predictions to evaluate Project impacts against Tuolumne County General Plan noise standards for exposure from stationary noise sources, which is not appropriate for an evaluation of mobile noise sources such as vehicle circulation. Id. In addition, the DEIR's conclusion that noise impacts from the Project's loading dock would be less than significant (DEIR p. 4.12-15) relies on an underestimate of predicted loading dock noise. Based on comparable projects, predicted loading dock noise levels could be reasonably expected to be 10 dB higher than the DEIR assumes. Papadimos Report at 7.	(rural residences), identified as receivers 1 through 15. This analysis includes the identification of the locations utilized in predictions of on-site traffic circulation noise levels at the receivers, which were the nearest interior roadways to those receivers. Because project on-site traffic circulation would occur on the project site, which is private property rather than a public roadway, the General Plan's noise level standards applicable to non-transportation noise would be applicable. Finally, the commenter states that loading dock noise levels could be expected to 10 dB higher than the Draft EIR assumes. However, the commenter does not provide data to support this claim and, therefore, it cannot be verified. The noise analysis of project loading dock noise exposure at existing noise-sensitive uses utilizes noise level data obtained from Bollard Acoustical Consultants noise level measurements from commercial loading docks at various locations in recent years (see Appendix E-2 of Appendix L, Supplemental Noise Analysis, of this Final EIR). This reference noise level data has been included in numerous peer-reviewed and certified EIRs in recent years.
ORG6-52	The DEIR also lacks evidence to support its conclusion that HVAC and other mechanical equipment at the Project site would have less than significant noise impacts. DEIR p. 4.12-15. The DEIR describes noise impacts typically associated with only one particular type of rooftop air conditioning system which might be used on the Project's guest cabins, but does not address the noise and vibration impacts associated with the larger HVAC equipment that would be used on the Project's main hotel building or the public market. The DEIR must analyze the noise impacts of all HVAC equipment on the Project site, considering the equipment location and	Section 4.12, Noise, of the Draft EIR focused on assessing mechanical equipment noise at the nearest sensitive receptor (R1) (located north of the project site) relative to the nearest proposed HVAC equipment to that receptor (cabins) (at a distance of 500 feet). At that distance, the HVAC system sound

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
	specific noise output based on manufacturer sound data, the noise content and existing ambient noise environment.	levels were predicted to be 31 dB Leq prior to even considering the noise attenuation which would result from rooftop parapets or other shielding. This level is well below the County's 45 dB Leq nighttime noise level standard and also below measured existing ambient noise levels currently experienced at the nearest residences. The proposed market and lodge restaurant buildings are approximately 1,000 feet from the nearest residences (R1 and R2). Although specific mechanical equipment plans had not been developed at the time of this writing, the air heating and cooling requirements for both the market and restaurant/lodge would likely be accomplished using either packaged rooftop units or equipment located within isolated mechanical equipment rooms. Bollard Acoustical Consultants field measurements from similarly sized commercial uses, where rooftop systems are utilized, indicate that noise levels of approximately 45 dB Leq or less can be expected at a reference distance of 100 feet from both the market and restaurant building. When projected to the 1,000 foot distance to the nearest residences, the rooftop HVAC levels for the market and restaurant/lodge buildings are predicted to be 20 dB Leq. As a result, rooftop HVAC system noise generation associated with the market and restaurant operations would be well within compliance with the County's 45 dB Leq nighttime noise standard and also

Comment #	Comment	Response
		well below measured existing ambient noise conditions at those nearest receptors. For food cold storage at the market and restaurant use, additional mechanical equipment beyond air heating and cooling will be required. If that equipment is housed within a dedicated equipment room, that room would contain the noise and no exterior audibility would occur at the nearest receptors. To conservatively quantify the noise emissions from food cold storage refrigeration equipment, noise level measurements, conducted by Bollard Acoustical Consultants, at a large grocery store were utilized. At a distance of 50 feet from the food cold storage units, a noise level of 66 dB Leq was recorded, but this level does not include shielding by the building roofline or parapets. After projecting those noise levels to 1,000 feet and accounting for shielding by rooftop parapets (approximately 5 dB), the predicted food cold storage equipment noise levels at the nearest residences computes to less than 35 dB Leq. This level is also well below the County's 45 dB Leq nighttime noise standard and below measured existing ambient conditions at the nearest residences. As a result, no noise impacts are identified for the mechanical equipment which will be utilized at the market and restaurant/lodge areas. Regarding HVAC system vibration, mechanical equipment plans specifically

Comment #	Comment	Response
		isolate vibration-generating equipment using resilient mounts (springs, neoprene mounts, etc.), to prevent the equipment from causing unwanted vibration within the structures in which that equipment is required. Given imperceptible mechanical equipment vibration levels within the sensitive areas of the structures, in which that equipment will be located, mechanical equipment vibration levels at locations 1,000+ feet from those structures would be orders of magnitude below the threshold of perception. As a result, no adverse vibration impacts would result from mechanical equipment related to either the market or restaurant/lodge areas of the project.
ORG6-53	5. The DEIR Lacks Evidentiary Support for its Conclusion that the Proposed Mitigation Measures for Operational Noise Would be Effective. The DEIR proposes a few mitigation measures to reduce operational noise produced by the Project. However, the DEIR fails to provide evidence to support its conclusion that these measures will be sufficient to reduce impacts to a less than significant level. As we explained, a DEIR's conclusions regarding the effectiveness of measures to mitigate project impacts must be supported by substantial evidence. Mitigation Measure NOI-1.1, for example, calls for the construction of an 8-foot wood or masonry noise barrier around the maintenance yard and asserts that the Project's generator would produce noise no louder than 70 dB at a distance of 50 feet. DEIR p. 4.12-16. The DEIR provides no evidence that that the barrier wall would be sufficient to noise reduce impacts below the General Plan limits. Nor does it provide any indication that the Project will be able to obtain a generator that will produce noise less than 70 dB at 50 feet. A 50kW diesel generator can typically produce around 85 dB(A), as loud as city traffic. A 1500kW engine can be as loud as, if not louder than a jet engine 1000 feet overhead (105 dB(A)). See Generator Basics: Sound Attenuation, Woodstock Power, attached as Exhibit K. The DEIR must provide supporting documentation showing that each of these proposed mitigation measures would be feasible and would effectively reduce the Project's noise impacts to a less than significant level. To support a conclusion that a project would have less-than-significant impacts, an EIR "must provide a quantitative or qualitative determination or estimate	Please see Response ORG6-46 and Appendix L, Supplemental Noise Analysis (Appendix L) of this Final EIR, which includes an analysis of noise exposure associated with equipment typically used in a maintenance yard, including a generator, as proposed by the project. The generator model proposed for installation at the proposed maintenance area is currently unknown. In order to quantify project generator noise level exposure at the nearest receivers, Bollard Acoustical Consultants utilized reference noise level data published by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA Roadway Construction Noise Model User's Guide). As discussed in the "Maintenance Landscaping/Yard" impact analysis contained in the Draft EIR under impact discussion NOI-1, maintenance yard equipment noise levels

Comment #	Comment	Response
	of the mitigation measures' effect" on project impacts. Friends of Oroville v. City of Oroville (2013) 219 Cal.App.4th 832, 845. Here, the EIR neither actually calculates nor otherwise analyzes the amount of the alleged noise reduction.	were predicted to exceed the General Plan daytime and nighttime hourly average noise level standards at the nearest receiver thus, the impact was identified as being potentially significant. The associated mitigation measure contained in the Draft EIR (Mitigation Measure NOI-1.1) required the construction of an 8-foot-tall solid noise barrier along the north, east, and west sides of the maintenance yard boundary, as well as for the requirement for the selected generator to have a reference noise level not to exceed 70 dB at 50 feet. In response to comments, an additional impact analysis of maintenance yard equipment noise levels at the nearest noise sensitive uses (rural residential uses, receivers 1-15) was conducted and presented in Appendix L, Supplemental Noise Analysis. Similar to the results contained in the Draft EIR, the results from the analysis contained in this supplemental analysis concluded that maintenance yard equipment noise levels were predicted to exceed the General Plan daytime and nighttime hourly average noise level standards at a portion of the nearest receivers thus, the impact were identified as being potentially significant. Based on the Supplemental Noise Analysis, and the updated combined on-site noise analysis, Mitigation Measure NOI-1.1 has been revised to require the construction of an 11-foot-tall (rather than 8-foot-tall) solid noise barrier along the north, east, and west sides of the maintenance yard boundary. The measure

Comment #	Comment	Response
		would still require the selected generator to have an overall reference noise level not to exceed 70 dB at 50 feet. As noted in Appendix L, Supplemental Noise Analysis, since publishing the Draft EIR, the EIR preparer has been informed that the project applicant proposes to house the generator within the maintenance/storage building in the proposed maintenance yard; therefore, the noise analysis provides a conservative analysis by assuming that the generator is unhoused, and proposed mitigation is likewise overly conservative. Nevertheless, Mitigation Measure NOI-1.1 has been revised, as shown in Table 1-1 and Chapter 3, Revisions to the Draft EIR, of this Final EIR. Revisions to the mitigation measure are shown with strikethrough and underline formatting, as follows: Mitigation Measure NOI-1.1: In order to satisfy applicable Tuolumne County General Plan daytime and nighttime noise level limits at the nearest existing sensitive use to the project, and subsequently result in maintenance yard noise levels at or below ambient noise conditions at that use, the following noise mitigation measures shall be implemented: ▪ Construct a solid noise barrier measuring ~~8 feet~~ 11 feet in height along the north, east and west sides of the maintenance yard boundary,

Comment #	Comment	Response
		as depicted in Figure 4.12-2. The barrier could be constructed of either masonry or precast concrete panels. A noise barrier constructed of wood (or wood composite) fence material with overlapping slat construction would also be sufficient. The purpose of overlapping slats and using screws rather than nails is to ensure that prolonged exposure to the elements does not result in visible gaps through the slats which would result in reduced noise barrier effectiveness. ▪ Ensure that the generator selected for the maintenance yard have a reference noise level not to exceed 70 dB at a distance of 50 feet. Depending on the power requirements of the equipment, the implementation of a custom engineered generator enclosure may be required in order to achieve an overall equipment noise level of 70 dB at 50 feet. The construction of an 11-foot tall noise barrier is calculated to provide approximately 10 dB of noise level reduction at the nearest receivers (see noise calculations in Appendix L of this Final EIR). While it is true that reference noise levels for generators vary

Comment #	Comment	Response
		widely (as stated by the commenter), this mitigation measure identifies the possibility that the design and implementation of a custom-engineered generator enclosure may be required in order to achieve an overall equipment noise level of 70 dB at 50 feet. Following implementation of this mitigation measure, the residual impact would be less than significant.
ORG6-54	Mitigation Measure NOI-1.2a fares no better, as it calls for limiting on-site truck deliveries and refuse collection to daytime hours. DEIR p. 4.12-19. The DEIR asserts that limiting truck deliveries will reduce noise to insignificant levels, but it does not provide any analytical support for this conclusion. Id. Moreover, truck noise is just one of the noise sources identified in the DEIR. The DEIR does not explain how the Project will mitigate noise produced by other sources, including vehicle traffic, parking, HVAC equipment and from amplified music or any public announcement system. Because the DEIR fails to demonstrate the effectiveness of the proposed mitigation measures, the document lacks support for its conclusion that the Project's noise impacts would be less than significant.	Please see Response ORG6-46 and the Supplemental Noise Analysis (see Appendix L of this Final EIR), which includes analyses of noise exposure associated with on-site operations at the nearest noise-sensitive receivers. As indicated in the project Draft EIR noise chapter under impact discussion NOI-1, the results from impact analyses related to project on-site vehicle circulation, parking, and HVAC equipment concluded in a less-than-significant finding or each of the components and, therefore, mitigation was not required. However, the Draft EIR does include mitigation to address combined on-site noise. Further, the project does not propose to have outdoor amplified music or a public announcement system. Appendix L of this Final EIR contains a Supplemental Noise Analysis that includes an updated analysis in response to comments received on the Draft EIR. (see "Combined Noise Levels from Normal On-Site Operations at Existing Noise-Sensitive Uses" in Appendix L). Tables 14 and 15 in Appendix L show that the combined unmitigated noise levels from normal on-site operations are predicted to

Comment #	Comment	Response
		satisfy the Tuolumne County General Plan daytime and nighttime maximum noise level standards at the nearest existing noise-sensitive uses (receivers 1-15), but exceed the General Plan daytime and nighttime hourly average noise level standards at a portion of the receivers. The impact analysis contained in the Supplemental Noise Analysis, specifically Mitigation Measure NOI-1a, the limitation on truck deliveries and refuse collection activities to daytime hours only (in combination with Mitigation Measure NOI-1b) would result in combined project noise levels from normal on-site operations to a state of compliance with the applicable Tuolumne County General Plan cumulative noise level increase criterion, and therefore result in an impact finding of less than significant.
ORG6-55	6. The DEIR Fails to Adequately Analyze the Project's Construction-related Noise Impacts. The DEIR determines that during Project construction, noise generated by construction equipment could be as loud as 76 dB. DEIR p. 4.12-20. Despite this, the DEIR concludes that construction noise impacts would be less than significant because construction noise would be short-term in duration and would have only intermittent frequency. DEIR p. 4.12-20. The DEIR provides no support for this conclusion. The DEIR cannot rely on the alleged short term or intermittent nature of construction noise to support a finding of a less than significant impact. Project construction would span a two-year period. See DEIR p. 4.2-10, Table 4.2-4; DEIR p. 4.8-10 (noting that construction is planned to occur on a "two-year timeline"). Construction-related noise that is projected to span a two-year period would likely have substantial impacts on nearby sensitive land uses. Moreover, CEQA does not distinguish between short-and long-term impacts, and short-term impacts are not exempt from analysis. See CEQA Guidelines § 15126.2(a) (agency must analyze both short- and long-term impacts).	Chapter 4.12, Noise, of the Draft EIR analyzes project construction noise levels at the nearest sensitive receiver under impact discussion NOI-1. Appendix L, Supplemental Noise Analysis, of this Final EIR, provides an analysis of project construction noise levels at the nearest 15 noise-sensitive receivers. As indicated in the Draft EIR under the "Construction Noise" heading of impact discussion NOI-1, and Response ORG6-46, construction equipment noise levels are predicted to range from 62 to 76 dB at the nearest receiver. According to the ambient measurement data at site LT-2, located at the northern boundary of the project site, ambient maximum noise levels were

Comment #	Comment	Response
		measured to be as high as 72 dB within the vicinity of the nearest receiver. Therefore, predicted construction noise levels at the nearest receiver are not expected to be substantially higher than those already occurring at that location. In addition, while the construction phase of the project may extend to two years, it is a temporary phase that will end prior to project operation, and is considered to be a short-term condition due to the intermittent frequency of construction noise. In addition, construction noise is required to comply with the construction-related noise criteria and implementation measures established in Policy 5.A.5 of the Tuolumne County General Plan (which establishes specific noise abatement measures), construction activities are not anticipated to result in a substantial temporary, permanent, or periodic increases in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity. Based on the information above, the impact is identified as being less than significant. Specific techniques required by Policy 5.A.5 and implementing programs include restrictions on construction timing, use of sound blankets on construction equipment, and the use of temporary walls and noise barriers to block and deflect noise.
ORG6-56	In addition, as the Papadimos report explains, the DEIR ignores noise impacts resulting from the full range of construction activities that would occur at the Project site, such as grading, excavation, foundation work, erection of structures, paving, and use of heavy equipment in staging areas. See Papadimos Report at 9.	The analysis of construction noise and vibration exposure presented in the Draft EIR takes into consideration noise and vibration levels from a wide range of equipment typically used in construction projects, including heavy earth moving equipment

Comment #	Comment	Response
		such as graders and pavers. (See Table 16 in Appendix H, Noise Study, of the Draft EIR.) The analysis conservatively assumed the heavy earth-moving construction equipment activities would occur at the point within the project area closest to the nearest sensitive receiver. The Draft EIR inadvertently omitted analysis of potential impacts from excavators, foundation work, and erection of structures. According to published data from the Federal Highway Administration, excavators have a maximum noise level of 85 dB at a distance of 50 feet. The Draft EIR assumed the project would use construction equipment with noise levels higher than 85 dB (including jack hammers and rail saws). Because the Draft EIR analysis took into consideration a wide range of construction equipment noise levels, which included equipment having higher reference noise levels than excavators, the inclusion of excavator noise exposure would not affect the predicted construction noise exposure at the nearest receiver or the associated impact determination. To be sure, the Supplemental Noise Analysis contained in Appendix L analyzed potential noise level exposure from excavators on the project site. That analysis confirmed that impacts associated with project construction noise exposure at the nearest receiver(s) would be less than significant.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
		It is not anticipated that pile driving activities would occur during project construction. Nonetheless, in response to this comment, an analysis of vibration levels from potential pile driving activities during project construction (during foundation work/erection of structures) was conducted. According to published data from the Federal Highway Administration, pile drivers (sonic/vibratory) have a maximum vibration level of 0.734 PPV at a distance of 25 feet. The closest sensitive receptor (existing residence) is located approximately 550 feet from where pile driving could potentially occur on the project site (cabins). At this distance, vibration levels associated with pile driving activities are projected to be approximately 0.007 PPV, which would be well below the strictest Caltrans thresholds for damage to residential structures of 0.30 in/sec PPV. Furthermore, the predicted vibration level of 0.007 PPV is below the strictest Caltrans thresholds for human annoyance of 0.01 PPV (barely perceptible). The vibration level exposure from potential pile driving at the project site was included in the vibration analysis contained in Appendix L, Supplemental Noise Analysis, of this Final EIR (under Response ORG6-46 – Vibration Construction). Both the Draft EIR and the Supplemental Noise Analysis concluded that impacts associated with project construction vibration exposure at the nearest receiver(s) would be less than significant.

Comment #	Comment	Response
		Finally, Policy 5.A.5 of the General Plan requires construction-related noise sources to be located as far from sensitive receptors as possible, which includes the location of staging areas. Compliance with Policy 5.A.5, required by the County, would further ensure that impacts associated with project construction noise exposure at the project site (including staging areas) are less than significant. General Plan Policy 5.A.5 requires that all new construction activities implement all feasible noise-reducing measures as necessary to limit construction noise exposure at receiving occupied land uses to within acceptable County noise levels as identified in General Plan Table 5.C. This policy includes implementation measures consisting of various methods of noise control such as construction timing, use of walls/barriers, use of best available equipment noise control technology, and the locating of equipment away from residences as feasible – which would include consideration of equipment staging area locations. In addition, Policy 5.A.5 requires that construction-related exterior noise levels shall not exceed 65 dB Lmax at an occupied land use (i.e., rural residential receiver). The Supplemental Noise Analysis in Appendix L of this Final EIR provides a worst-case analysis of project on-site construction noise

Comment #	Comment	Response
		(and vibration) by evaluating exposure from the nearest point in the project area where heavy equipment would be operated to the nearest receivers. Because the analysis does not take into consideration the location of the staging area relative to Policy 5.A.5, or consideration of the noise control methods identified in Policy 5.A.5 implementation programs, the analysis of construction noise (and vibration) exposure at the nearest receivers is considered to be even more conservative.
ORG6-57	The DEIR also inappropriately asserts that construction noise impacts would be less than significant because construction would comply with the construction-related noise criteria and implementation measures established in Policy 5.A.5 of the Tuolumne County General Plan. DEIR p. 4.12-20. However, a mere promise to comply with County policies does not mean impacts would be insignificant. See Communities for a Better Environment v. Cal. Resources Agency (2002) 103 Cal.App.4th 98, 111-14 (compliance with regulations cannot displace an agency's separate obligation to consider whether a project's environmental impacts are significant); Californians for Alternatives to Toxics v. Department of Food & Agriculture (2005) 136 Cal.App.4th 1, 15-17 (same); Protect the Historic Amador Waterways v. Amador Water Agency (2004) 116 Cal.App.4th 1099, 1108–09 (environmental effect may be significant despite compliance with regulatory requirements). General Plan Policy 5.A-5 calls for implementation of all feasible noise reducing measures. DEIR p.4.12-7. To comply with this Policy (and to reduce the Project's significant construction-related noise impacts), the DEIR must actually identify specific noise reducing measures, commit to implementing those measures, and evaluate whether they would be effective. The DEIR does none of this and is therefore legally deficient. Moreover, because the DEIR provides no evidence that these noise reducing measures would be implemented, the Project is inconsistent with the General Plan.	As described in Response ORG6-56, Policy 5.A.5 of the Tuolumne County General Plan establishes specific noise abatement measures through its associated implementation programs (Implementation Programs 5.A.e through 5.a.i, listed on pages 4.12-7 to 4.12-8 of the Draft EIR), and the project would be required to comply with those mandatory measures. In addition, as discussed in Response ORG6-55, predicted construction noise levels at the nearest receiver are not expected to be substantially higher than those already occurring at that location. Therefore, this impact is identified as being less than significant.
ORG6-58	7. The DEIR Fails to Adequately Analyze and Mitigate Impacts Relating to Helicopter Noise. The DEIR acknowledges that helicopter takeoff and landing from the Project's helipad would produce "substantial temporary increases in ambient daytime and/or nighttime noise levels at nearby existing sensitive uses," including a residence located about 430 feet from the proposed helipad, and concludes that this impact would be significant and unavoidable. DEIR pp. 4.12-23, 4.12-24. The DEIR also mentions that "noise exposure associated with the [helicopter's] selected	As discussed in the Draft EIR under impact discussion NOI-3, helicopter noise exposure is highly dependent upon operational information such as aircraft model, number of flights per day, time of day of flights, and flight path. As the helipad would only be

Comment #	Comment	Response
	flight path could impact other sensitive uses along the route," but does not identify those other receptors or analyze their exposure to Project impacts. DEIR p. 4.12-23. (emphasis added). A conclusion that an impact is significant and unavoidable does not excuse the lead agency from its responsibility to analyze that impact. Berkeley Keep Jets Over the Bay, 91 Cal.App.4th at 1371; accord, Cleveland National Forest Foundation v. San Diego Assn. of Governments (2017) 3 Cal.5th 497, 514-15. A lead agency may not, as the County attempts to do here, "travel the legally impermissible easy road to CEQA compliance . . . [by] simply labeling the effect 'significant' without accompanying analysis . . . ." Berkeley Jets, 91 Cal.App.4th at 1371. Rather, "a more detailed analysis of how adverse the impact will be is required." Galante Vineyards, 60 Cal.App.4th at 1123. The public and decisionmakers have a right to know whether noise impacts from helicopter use will merely cause a nuisance, or if they will lead to more serious consequences for Project neighbors. The DEIR's failure to provide this information violates CEQA. In addition, the DEIR provides no support for its assertion that "[i]t is reasonable to assume that noise levels associated with emergency services, such as those proposed at the project emergency helipad, would likely be exempt from Tuolumne County noise level criteria." DEIR p. 4.12-23. The DEIR must explain why helicopter-related noise would be exempt from the County's noise standards.	used by emergency responders, the origin and specific make and model of any arriving helicopter would vary based on the incident. As a result, it is difficult to accurately quantify with certainty the future noise exposure associated with the proposed emergency helipad at the nearest existing sensitive uses. Nevertheless, page 38 of the project noise study (see Appendix H, Noise Study, of the Draft EIR) provides the reference sound exposure level (SEL) associated with a Bell 407 helicopter, which is a model commonly used for emergency services, and determines that noise exposure could exceed the applicable standard pf 40 dB for interior noise levels. Based on the Fire Impact Analysis contained in Appendix I of the Draft EIR, the project can be expected to make approximately 11 annual calls for service based on the call volume of nearby lodges. Assuming that only a small percentage of emergency response incidents would require a helicopter, use of the helipad for the hotel would be very rare. However, the project proposes to make the helipad available to the greater community for emergency response for non-project incidents and, therefore, it could be used for non-project service calls as well. As noted on page 4.12-23 of the Draft EIR, noise levels associated with helipad operations would likely result in substantial temporary increases in ambient daytime and/or nighttime noise levels at nearby

Comment #	Comment	Response
		existing sensitive receptors. While mitigation measures related to flight path design and helipad location could potentially reduce noise levels at the existing residences nearest to the project helipad, as stated on page 4.12-23 of the Draft EIR, it is also possible that noise exposure associated with the selected flight path could impact other sensitive receptors along the route. Due to the nature of the operations associated with the proposed helipad (emergency situations), mitigation measures such as limitations on aircraft models and frequency of flights per day (i.e., number per day and time of day) are generally infeasible in application as area responders would respond to incidents based on various incident-specific, unpredictable factors. For all of these reasons, the EIR conservatively concluded this impact would be significant and unavoidable. Mitigation Measure NOI-3.1 has been revised, as shown in Table 1-1 and Chapter 3, Revisions to the Draft EIR, of this Final EIR, to require the project applicant to relocate the helipad to another area of the project site that is further from residential properties (such as the alternate location shown in Figure 5-1), if feasible. Please also see Master Response 3, which further describes the revisions to the mitigation measure.
ORG6-59	In addition, as discussed above, the DEIR must identify the location of all potentially affected sensitive receptors near the Project, not only the closest receptor to the helipad site. The DEIR must then identify the helicopters' expected flight paths and then evaluate how these flights will	Please see Response ORG6-58.

Comment #	Comment	Response
	impact all sensitive receptors. This analysis must describe how helicopters could disrupt the existing tranquil, rural environment near the Project site. It is particularly concerning that helicopters are expected to fly at night. DEIR p. 4.12-23. Nighttime flights could have severe impacts on people living in residences adjacent to the Project, yet the DEIR does not analyze these impacts. Moreover, single-event noise levels such as those associated with helicopters have been shown to be likely to result in negative health outcomes, sleep disruption, speech interference, and heightened levels of stress and annoyance. See Mathias Basner and Sarah McGuire, WHO Environmental Noise Guidelines for the European Region: A Systematic Review on Environmental Noise and Effects on Sleep, 15 Intl. J. of Environmental Research & Public Health 519 (March 2018), attached as Exhibit L.	
ORG6-60	The DEIR asserts that "mitigation measures related to flight path design and helipad location could potentially be effective in reducing noise levels at the existing residences nearest to the project emergency helipad." DEIR p. 4.12-23. However, the DEIR makes no attempt to identify any such measures. Instead, it simply asserts that such measures would be infeasible, "due to the nature of the operations associated with the proposed helipad (emergency situations)." Id. The DEIR therefore concludes that significant noise impacts on nearby existing sensitive receptors is unavoidable. DEIR p.4.12-24. The DEIR's approach is contrary to CEQA. Again, a lead agency cannot simply conclude that an impact is significant and unavoidable without further analysis. The DEIR should have made some attempt to identify feasible mitigation measures to reduce helicopter noise impacts on nearby receptors. For example, the DEIR could have evaluated the feasibility of alternative flight paths, a prohibition on nighttime flights except during dire emergencies, and alternative locations for the helipad, including other locations on the Project site and alternative off-site locations.	Please see Response ORG6-58. Mitigation measures based on specific flight paths or time of day would not be reasonable, as the helipad is only to be used during emergency incidents.
ORG6-61	Notably, the DEIR does identify project features and mitigation measures to reduce noise impacts (including helicopter noise) on guests in the Project's hotel rooms, DEIR pp. 4.12-24, 4.12-25, but does not explain why these mitigation measures could not also be applied to reduce noise experienced by existing nearby residents. To reduce helicopter (and likely other Project-related noise) noise impacts on Project guests, the DEIR calls for mechanical ventilation (air conditioning) to be provided for all of the Project's hotel rooms so that windows can be closed to reduce noise. DEIR p. 4.12-24. The DEIR should evaluate a mitigation measure in which nearby residents' homes are retrofitted with air conditioning for the same reason. To address helicopter noise experienced by Project guests, Mitigation Measure NOI-3.2a calls for window and door assemblies of all lodging within the Project development to be upgraded to a minimum STC rating of 32. DEIR p. 4.12-25; see also DEIR Volume 2, Technical Appendix, Environmental	Please see Response ORG6-58.

Comment #	Comment	Response
	Noise & Vibration Assessment, p. 39. The DEIR should evaluate a similar noise mitigation measure to upgrade windows and doors in neighboring residences to the same standard.	
ORG6-62	8. The DEIR Does Not Adequately Evaluate How the Project's Increase in Noise and Vibration Would Impact Special-Status Animal Species. The DEIR lists many "Special-Status" animal species present on the Project site but only identifies one species, the Olive-sided flycatcher, as noise- and vibration sensitive. DEIR p. 4.3-38 (noting that "[c]construction could adversely impact nesting species through noise and vibrations, and this would be a significant impact on the species' population.") As the Papadimos report explains, the DEIR ignores the effect that the Project's noise and vibration would have on other species, including other bird species, consistent with relevant guidelines. See Papadimos report at 2 and Effects of Traffic Noise and Road Construction on Birds, Caltrans, June 2016, attached to the Papadimos report. The revised EIR should comprehensively evaluate how noise and vibration would impact wildlife and propose effective mitigation for impacts that are determined to be significant.	The impacts of noise and vibration on wildlife is an emerging field of study. Studies reveal that the effects of noise and vibrations on wildlife species may vary by species; species location; how surrounding vegetation and topography alters noise; the nature, direction, and extent of the noise being produced; noise frequency; the species life cycle stage when noise and/or vibration is being produced (e.g., nesting, foraging, breeding, roosting); whether or not the animal can control the direction from which it hears noise (e.g., owls); and other factors. Please see Appendix O, Supplemental Biological Resources Information, for a detailed response to this comment. Appendix O, prepared by the biological resource consultant for the project, provides a thorough discussion of the potential noise and vibration effects on the special-status species with potential to occur on or within the project's biological study area. As discussed in Appendix O, significant impacts to biological resources as a result of noise and vibration from the project are not anticipated. Appendix O recommends a revision to Mitigation Measure BIO-1.8 to ensure that no nesting spotted owls have located within 345 feet of the project site prior to project construction. This revision is shown in Table

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
		1-1 and Chapter 3, Revisions to the Draft EIR, of this Final EIR.
ORG6-63	G. The DEIR's Transportation Analysis Fails To Adequately Analyze Or Mitigate Impacts Relating to Roadway Hazards. 1. The DEIR Fails to Identify the Deficiency of the SR-120 Eastbound Receiving Lane as a Significant Roadway Hazard. The increased traffic generated by the Project would require several roadway improvements in order to mitigate a substantial increase in roadway hazards resulting from the Project. These roadway improvements include the development of an eastbound receiving lane on SR-120 for cars turning left off of Forest Route1S03 onto SR-120. DEIR p. 4.15-19; see also DEIR p. 3-30, Figure 3-14. During busy times, the receiving lane would permit motorists to make a two-step left turn by first turning into the lane and subsequently merging with eastbound through traffic. The proposed receiving lane would be about 150 feet long and followed by a 75-foot bay taper. Id. However, the DEIR acknowledges that "full acceleration from a stop to 55 mph by a passenger vehicle would require 1,000 feet on level ground, and full acceleration is not accommodated with the proposed receiving lane." DEIR p. 4.15-19 (emphasis added). Rather than identify potential solutions for this public safety hazard, the DEIR defers this problem for Caltrans to resolve concluding that the receiving lane will not be provided if Caltrans requirements exceed the proposed design. See id. If left unresolved, the inadequate length of the proposed receiving lane on SR-120 would result in a significant public safety risk. The County must recognize this as a significant impact and identify appropriate mitigation measures to protect public safety.	The proposed project includes a receiving lane for traffic turning left from Sawmill Mountain Road. The lane is not a part of a standard intersection design but provides refuge for motorists turning left. The Draft EIR acknowledges that the lane would not be long enough to create full deceleration to 55 miles per hour (mph) prior to fully merging with eastbound traffic. The Draft EIR notes on page 4.15-19 that the lane at the proposed length would be adequate for the purpose of providing refuge at that length, but notes that Caltrans may determine that the refuge-receiving lane is not appropriate, and if so, it will not be provided in the final design. The absence of the receiving lane from final improvement plans based on Caltrans instruction would not result in a safety impact as it is not required for standard intersection design. Draft EIR comments received from Caltrans District 10 did not offer an opinion on this issue, but noted that a final determination on the design of improvements to Highway 120 will be made as part of the Caltrans encroachment permit process (see Response GOV8-09). As shown in Table 1-1 and Chapter 3, Revisions to the Draft EIR, of this Final EIR, encroachment permit approval for these intersection improvements would be required prior to the start of construction of the Terra Vi project.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
ORG6-64	2. The DEIR Fails to Identify Feasible Mitigation For the Project's Significant Impact Relating to Available Sight Distance. The DEIR acknowledges that there would not be adequate sight distance along SR-120 for Project-generated traffic turning right (westbound) from Forest Route1S03 onto SR-120. DEIR pp. 4.15-20, 4.15-21. The document notes that looking right (west) from Forest Route1S03 (which it refers to as Sawmill Mountain Road), SR-120 curves to the north, and as a result the view is limited by a hillside and trees. DEIR p. 4.15-20. However, the DEIR fails to acknowledge that in addition to the curve, visibility along SR-120 at the intersection with Forest Route1S03 is also impaired by a slope and hill crest on SR-120. Travelling east to west, SR-120 slopes steeply upwards towards a hill crest near the western edge of the Project site, just before the intersection with Forest Route1S03. The hill crest creates a dangerous blind spot, so that high-speed eastbound traffic driving up SR-120 cannot see vehicles entering or exiting the highway at the intersection with Forest Route1S03, and vice versa, posing a significant collision hazard for Project-generated traffic. From the intersection with Forest Route1S03, the DEIR states that roughly 400 feet of sight distance is available to the west along SR-120, which does not meet the minimum sight distance standard of 500 feet for a 55-mph highway. DEIR pp. 4.15-20. Thus, despite ignoring the dangers posed by the hill crest on SR-120, the DEIR concludes that without mitigation, the inadequate sight distance along the highway constitutes a significant impact. DEIR p. 4.15-21 (Impact TRANS-3).	The Draft EIR notes on page 3-28 that improvements will be made to the Highway 120/Sawmill Mountain Road intersection to increase sight distance. Project plan sheet C3 of the project application package, dated October 7, 2019 (see Appendix B of the Draft EIR) identifies the line of sight to be developed and indicates the anticipated sight distance looking west. The exhibit notes that 660 feet of sight distance can be made available, which meets Caltrans minimum stopping sight distance and corner sight distance requirements. As stated on page 4.15-20 of the Draft EIR, for the 55-mph speed limit on Highway 120, 500 feet is needed to satisfy the minimum sight distance requirement, and 605 feet is needed for corner sight distance when turning left onto the highway. The line of sight determination accounts for the vertical alignment (i.e., taking into account the grade and the distance at which an object 3.5 feet above the roadway can be seen from a point 3.5 feet above the roadway) of Highway 120 in this area. As shown in Table 1-1 and Chapter 3, Revisions to the Draft EIR, of this Final EIR, encroachment permit approval for these intersection improvements would be required prior to the start of construction of the Terra Vi project.
ORG6-65	Mitigation Measure TRANS-3 asserts that construction of a proposed new eastbound left turn lane from SR-120 onto Forest Route1S03 would "require cutting the hillside and vegetation removal [along the north side of SR-120] in conformance with Caltrans standards, which will open the line of [sight] to an acceptable distance, as determined by Caltrans." DEIR p. 4.15-21. The DEIR concludes that this mitigation measure would reduce the Project's impacts on sight	Project plan Sheet C3 submitted with the project application package, dated October 7, 2019 (see Appendix B of the Draft EIR) identifies the line of sight looking west along Highway 120, as well as the limit of work

Comment #	Comment	Response
	distance from Forest Route1S03 to a less than significant level. Id. However, the DEIR fails to provide any analysis demonstrating that construction of the proposed left turn lane is feasible, or that hillside cutting and vegetation removal along SR-120 to accommodate the left turn lane would adequately mitigate the sight distance hazard along the highway curve. Moreover, construction of the proposed eastbound left turn lane would do nothing to mitigate the additional visibility impairment and resulting traffic hazard caused by the slope and hill crest on SR-120, which the DEIR ignores. The DEIR states that the eastbound left turn lane "would be about 390 feet long and be proceeded by a 50-footlong bay taper." DEIR p. 4.15-19. However, the DEIR does not include any engineering details or preliminary schematics for this left turn lane.2 The DEIR states that the adjoining hillside would need to be cut back (i.e. regraded) to satisfy Caltrans standards, DEIR p. 4.15-21, but it does not describe what this seemingly major infrastructure project would entail. The DEIR acknowledges that roadway improvements along SR-120 at the intersection with Forest Route1S03 (including the left turn lane west of the intersection as well as the receiving and right turn lanes east of the intersection) would require changes to the existing drainage along SR-120 and would collectively involve removal of 29 trees, but does not include any more specific information about the left turn lane. DEIR pp. 3-28; 4.15-15. The DEIR notes that "[t]hese improvements are outside of the project site within the Caltrans right-of-way and would require an encroachment permit." Id. However, the DEIR does not identify the relevant Caltrans standards which would apply, discuss whether it will be feasible to meet them, or indicate whether Caltrans has approved the proposed design for the left turn lane. Moreover, the DEIR does not evaluate whether this roadway improvement will result in new significant impacts (e.g., loss of habitat, slope stability, erosion, aesthetic impacts, or cultural resources impacts). When a lead agency relies on mitigation measures to find that project impacts will be less than significant, the DEIR must include substantial evidence demonstrating that the mitigation measures are feasible and will be effective in reducing impacts to a less than significant level. Sacramento Old City Assn. v. City Council of Sacramento (1991) 229 Cal.App.3d 1011, 1027; Kings County Farm Bureau, 221 Cal.App.3d at 726-29. Substantial evidence consists of "facts, a reasonable presumption predicated on fact, or expert opinion supported by fact," not "argument, speculation, unsubstantiated opinion or narrative." Pub. Res. Code § 21080(e)(1)-(2). Here, the DEIR falls far short of this threshold. The DEIR's conclusion that construction of the left turn lane would reduce sight distance hazards to a less than significant level is premised on unsupported assumptions, not supported by substantial evidence as required by CEQA. The	needed to satisfy Caltrans requirements. The construction of the left-turn lane is part of the project application and project site plan that is evaluated throughout the EIR, and construction impacts are part of the analysis of air quality, noise, GHG, and transportation impacts. The proposed left-turn lane is discussed in impact discussion TRANS-3 of the Draft EIR. As stated on page 4.15-19 of the Draft EIR, the proposed lane meets Caltrans design standards and will also be reviewed as part of the encroachment permit review process. Please also see Response ORG6-64.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
	DEIR's failure to discuss impacts resulting from construction of the left turn lane also violates CEQA. If a mitigation measure would cause one or more significant effects in addition to those that would be caused by the project as proposed, the effects of the mitigation measure must be discussed, although in less detail than the significant effects caused directly by the project. Stevens v. City of Glendale (1981) 125 Cal.App.3d 986. The EIR should be revised to include sufficient information to allow the public and decisionmakers to determine whether this mitigation is feasible and whether it would effectively reduce the Project's significant sight distance impacts.	
ORG6-66	3. The DEIR Fails to Analyze Roadway Safety Hazards that Would Occur During Project Construction. The DEIR finds that construction of the Project will cause traffic generated by trucks and other vehicles driving to and from the site during the two-year construction period. DEIR p. 4.15-15; DEIR p. 4.8-10 (construction planned to occur on a "two-year timeline"). Construction will also require lane closures along SR-120, and the DEIR acknowledges that construction may result in "occasional one-way controlled traffic." DEIR p. 4.15-15. Construction trucks and equipment attempting to make turns out of Forest Route1S03 when leaving the project site will experience the same sight distance constraints discussed above. At the same time, motorists on SR-120, some of whom will be traveling at speeds of 55 mph or more, will encounter these slow-moving construction trucks and equipment. The DEIR fails to evaluate the potential for accidents caused by these construction-related activities. The EIR identifies the disruption of background traffic flow as a significant impact, DEIR p. 4.15-15, but it does not analyze the issue of roadway safety hazards during Project construction. The DEIR's failure to analyze roadway safety hazards during construction further violates CEQA.	Draft EIR Mitigation Measure TRANS-1.2a requires the project applicant to prepare a Construction Traffic Control Plan as part to the Caltrans encroachment permit application for all work within the State right of way. This is a standard Caltrans requirement. That plan may identify temporary traffic control measures to address sight distance availability at the Highway 120/Sawmill Mountain Road intersection for construction trucks and equipment, including temporary controls by flagmen or time of day restrictions on truck travel. The extent to which control measures are needed on a day-to-day basis will be determined by the construction schedule. With this measure, the effects of construction trucks and equipment prior to completion of Highway 120/Sawmill Mountain Road improvements will be addressed, and no further mitigation is required. It is speculative to assume how vehicles and construction equipment would be spaced on Highway 120, and what speeds vehicles would be traveling at when then encounter construction equipment. As shown in Table 1-1 and Chapter 3, Revisions

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
		to the Draft EIR, of this Final EIR, encroachment permit approval for the project's proposed intersection improvements would be required prior to the start of construction of the Terra Vi project. With the implementation of planned improvements to Highway 120/Sawmill Mountain Road, sight distance will be adequate and turn lanes will be available. While the acceleration requirements of construction trucks are greater than for automobiles, the higher cab height provides greater sight stance, and the proposed improvements are adequate for trucks. Construction traffic impacts would not cause a safety impact after the improvements are made.
ORG6-67	4. The DEIR Fails to Adequately Analyze Safety Risks to Bicyclists and Pedestrians. The DEIR concludes, without evidentiary support, that the Project would not substantially increase safety hazards for bicyclists or pedestrians. DEIR pp. 4.15-21 (Impact TRANS-3). The document acknowledges that development of the proposed Project could result in an increase in bicyclists and pedestrians between the Project site, adjoining residences along Forest Route1S03, and developments along Hardin Flat Road. DEIR p. 4.15-14. The DEIR asserts that access to the Project site by bicycle will be adequate and safe because cyclists and pedestrians would need to travel only the segment of SR-120 between Forest Route1S03 and Hardin Flat Road, and because SR-120 has a 4-foot wide paved shoulder along that segment. DEIR p. 4.15-15. (The DEIR notes that travel along SR-120 outside the paved 4-foot shoulder is often impossible due to roadway cut or fill slopes, including the area between Forest Route1S03 and Hardin Flat Road. DEIR p. 4.15-8.) The DEIR asserts that the Project's impacts are insignificant because "the distance that . . . bicyclists and pedestrians may have to travel along SR 120 is relatively short." Id. There is no basis for the DEIR's assumption that cyclists or pedestrians would only travel between the Project, residences on Forest Route1S03, and developments along Hardin Flat Road, or that bike or pedestrian traffic would be limited to the short segment of SR-120 between Forest Route1S03 and Hardin Flat Road. The DEIR ignores the likelihood of bicycle and pedestrian traffic between the Project and other points, such as Yosemite National Park, which could require much more	The Caltrans Highway 120 Transportation Concept Report provides guidance as to Caltrans' long term plans for the state highway. The TCR notes: *The bicycle corridor affiliated with Highway 120 remains underdeveloped. Bicycles have restricted access to the freeway portion in Lathrop and Manteca (Segments SJ 1 and SJ 2); and throughout the route east of SR 99 the bicycle facility is a shared travel lane facility. No parallel bicycle facilities exist near the freeway corridor, and the local planning in the cities that Highway 120 traverses elected to locate local bicycle routes more than a quarter mile away from the state highway with the exception of the City of*

Comment #	Comment	Response
	extensive bicycle travel along SR-120. The DEIR also fails to take into account that pedestrians from the Under Canvas Project may cross SR-120 to access the Terra Vi store or restaurant. The DEIR also ignores the Project's possible safety impacts on recreational cyclists, potentially including Project guests, who may elect to ride along SR-120 for recreational purposes, rather than as a means of transportation between Point A and Point B. The DEIR's failure to analyze bicycle and pedestrian safety hazards violates CEQA. See CEQA Guidelines § 15151; Environmental Planning & Information Council v. County of El Dorado (1982)131 Cal.App.3d 350, 357. As discussed above, the Project will have roadway safety impacts along SR-120, including an inadequate receiving lane which may impede merging of eastbound traffic, insufficient sight distance at the Forest Route1S03 intersection, and safety hazards due to Project construction. In light of these safety impacts, the DEIR must thoroughly analyze how the increase in vehicle traffic generated by the Project would impact bicycle and pedestrian safety along SR-120. The DEIR must first disclose and evaluate existing bicycle and pedestrian activity in the vicinity of the Project, then analyze how the increase in both vehicle and bicycle traffic generated by the Project, combined with the insufficient sight distance and other roadway safety hazards noted above, could cause an increase in collisions between bicycles, pedestrians and vehicles.	*Escalon. Upgrading the corridor to a Class Ill shared lane facility would require widening shoulders to eight feet, but the bicycle facility would remain deficient. The minimal recommended future facility is a Class IV bicycle lane. The DSMP outlined planned bicycle facilities parallel but outside the Highway 120 corridor as a potential interregional bicycle route connecting the Bay Area to The Park. Abandoned railroad grad grades, logging railroads, and highway segments may provide future right of way for bicycle and pedestrian paths.* Typically, bicyclists traveling on Highway 120 make use of the paved shoulders of varying width that are available along the highway. This would remain the case with the proposed project. The plans submitted with the project application identify planned improvements to Highway 120, and shoulders will be provided as required by Caltrans. Thus, the project will not reduce any current bicycle facility, nor would the project interfere with the implementation of any future bicycle facility. The project could result in guests who might elect to ride a bicycle in this area of Tuolumne County. However, as the route to the YNP Valley floor is not easily accessible for bicycles, such activity would likely occur on Highway 120 between the site and Groveland or on Hardin Flat Road. However,

Comment #	Comment	Response
		bikes are permitted to be stored on YARTS buses, space permitting. The number of potential cyclists is unknown. Hypothetically, if 10 percent of the guests elected to ride a bicycle locally then 26 riders might be added over the course of the day. This level of bicycle activity could be accommodated by the existing circulation system and would not cause a safety impact. Impact discussion TRANS-3 on page 4.15-21 of the Draft EIR considers that the project could result in an increase in pedestrians and cyclists crossing Highway 120, either to access Hardin Flat Road or the Yosemite Under Canvas project. As stated on page 4.15-21, "the distance that pedestrians or bicyclists may have to travel along SR 120 is relatively short and the path of travel along SR 120 includes a 4-foot-wide paved shoulder which could accommodate pedestrians. Furthermore, approximately 650 feet of sight distance is available from Hardin Flat Road looking east on SR 120 and approximately 1,400 feet of sight distance is available from Hardin Flat Road looking west on SR 120. As shown in 4.13-4, these sight distances satisfy HDM requirements for travel at more than 60 mph." Because the project will not interfere with existing or planned bicycle facilities nor create a safety problem as a result of new bicyclists, the project's impact on safety is

Comment #	Comment	Response
		not significant, and mitigation is not required.
ORG6-68	5. The DEIR Ignores Cumulative Roadway Safety Impacts. The DEIR concludes that the Project would not result in significant cumulative impacts on transportation and traffic. DEIR p. 4.15-22 (Impact TRANS-5). The DEIR identifies four other projects in the vicinity that would contribute to the Project's cumulative traffic impacts, including the proposed Yosemite Under Canvas development located to the south of the Project site across SR-120, the Thousand Trails/Yosemite Lakes RV Expansion, the Berkeley Tuolumne Camp Restoration project southeast of the Project site, and the Mountain Sage Conditional Use Permit project west of the site. Id. However, in clear violation of CEQA, the DEIR makes no attempt to analyze how traffic rom *[sic]* the proposed Project, together with traffic from the four other projects, would umulatively *[sic]* affect the roadway safety issues created by the Project. CEQA Guidelines § 15355(b). The DEIR therefore lacks factual support for its conclusion that the project's cumulative transportation impacts would be less than significant. As noted above, the latest plans for the Yosemite Under Canvas project, located immediately south of the Project site across SR-120, indicate that the development will include an access road providing a second means of egress to SR-120, in addition to the main entrance on Hardin Flat Road. See Yosemite Under Canvas Draft EnvironmentalImpact *[sic]* Report (June 2020), p. 2-5, Fig. 3; excerpts attached as Exhibit H. The Under Canvas project's second access road would connect to SR-120 via Forest Service Road 1S09, which intersects SR-120 approximately 100 feet west of SR-120's intersection with Forest Route1S03. Id. pp. 2-5, 2-10. The close proximity of these two intersections could create dangerous roadway conditions, creating an increased risk of collisions between traffic on SR-120, Terra Vi Project traffic entering and exiting SR-120 via Forest Route1S03, and Under Canvas traffic entering and exiting SR-120 via Forest Service Road 1S09. During a wildfire emergency, hazardous conditions at these two intersections could impede evacuation traffic and emergency vehicle access to and from both developments. The DEIR must analyze the cumulative effects of Project traffic and Under Canvas traffic and the resulting roadway safety hazards at these intersections.	A traffic study prepared for the proposed project (see Appendix J of the Draft EIR) evaluated the overall traffic volume contribution of background traffic growth on Highway 120 as well as the trips associated with the identified approved projects. Overall, this background traffic growth would increase the peak Saturday traffic volume on Highway 120 in this area by about 21 percent. Because the combined traffic volume on Highway 120 caused by Terra Vi and background traffic growth remains well within the capacity of Highway 120, no additional new vehicular safety impacts are anticipated. Locally, the Under Canvas site plan identifies an emergency access connection to a minor existing road that connects to Highway 120 immediately west of the Sawmill Mountain Road intersection. Because Under Canvas would not have regular access to Highway 120 at this location no conflicts between traffic at the two locations would be anticipated.
ORG6-69	H. The DEIR Must Be Revised and Recirculated. Under California law, the present DEIR cannot properly form the basis of a final EIR. CEQA and the Guidelines describe the circumstances that require recirculation of a draft EIR. Such circumstances include: (1) the addition of significant new information to the EIR after public notice is given of the availability of the DEIR but before certification, or (2) the draft EIR is so	The comment expresses concern that the Draft EIR is inadequate and must be revised and recirculated. CEQA requires that an EIR be recirculated when "significant new information" is added after the Draft EIR is circulated but before certification. (Pub.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
	"fundamentally and basically inadequate and conclusory in nature that meaningful public review and comment were precluded." Guidelines § 15088.5. Here, both circumstances apply. Decisionmakers and the public cannot possibly assess the Project's impacts or even its feasibility through the present DEIR, which is riddled with errors. Among other fundamental deficiencies, the DEIR repeatedly understates the Project's significant environmental impacts and assumes that unformulated or clearly useless mitigation measures will effectively reduce these impacts. In order to resolve these issues, the County must prepare a revised EIR that would necessarily include substantial new information. This revised EIR must then be recirculated for public review and comment.	Resources Code Section 21092.1; CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5 (a).) New information is not significant unless the "EIR is changed in a way that deprives the public of a meaningful opportunity to comment upon a substantial adverse environmental effect of the project or a feasible way to mitigate or avoid such an effect." The Final EIR, including these responses to comments, does not include any "significant new information," as defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5, and recirculation is therefore not required. The comment serves as a summary of the comments above and therefore does not cite specific information to support the claim. Please see Responses ORG6-01 through ORG6-68 above.
ORG6-70	II. APPROVAL OF THE PROJECT WOULD VIOLATE CALIFORNIA PLANNING AND ZONING LAW. The State Planning and Zoning Law (Gov. Code § 65000 et seq.) requires that development decisions be consistent with the jurisdiction's general plan. As reiterated by the courts, "[u]nder state law, the propriety of virtually any local decision affecting land use and development depends upon consistency with the applicable general plan and its elements." Resource Defense Fund v. County of Santa Cruz (1982) 133 Cal.App.3d 800, 806. Accordingly, "[t]he consistency doctrine [is] the linchpin of California's land use and development laws; it is the principle which infuses the concept of planned growth with the force of law." Families Unafraid to Uphold Rural El Dorado County v. Bd. of Supervisors (1998) 62 Cal.App.4th 1332, 1336 (citations and internal quotations omitted). General plans establish long-term goals and policies to guide future land use decisions, thus acting as a "constitution" for future development. Lesher Communications, Inc. v. City of Walnut Creek (1990) 52 Cal.3d 531, 540. The policies in the General Plan must be internally consistent. Gov. Code § 65300.5. To promote coordinated land use policies and practices, state law requires local governments not just to formulate theoretical land use plans, but also to conform their	The comment states that the proposed project is inconsistent with the Tuolumne County General Plan but does not address the adequacy of the Draft EIR. Applicability with existing plans and regulations are discussed in Chapter 4.11, Land Use Planning, of the Draft EIR. The project is consistent with the County's General Plan.

Comment #	Comment	Response
	development and land use projects and approvals with those duly certified plans. Citizens of Goleta Valley v. Bd. of Supervisors (1990) 52 Cal.3d 553, 570; see also Gov. Code § 65860 (requiring consistency of zoning to general plan); id. §§ 65359 & 65454 (requiring consistency of specific plan and other development plan and amendments thereto to general plan). It is an abuse of discretion to approve a project that "frustrate[s] the General Plan's goals and policies." Napa Citizens for Honest Government v. Napa County Bd. of Supervisors (2001) 91 Cal.App.4th 342, 357, 378-379. The project need not present an "outright conflict" with a general plan provision to be considered inconsistent; the determining question is instead whether the project "is compatible with and will not frustrate the General Plan's goals and policies." Id. at 379. Here, for the reasons described above, the proposed Project is inconsistent with Tuolumne County's General Plan. Because of these inconsistencies, approval of this Project would violate State Planning and Zoning Law.	
ORG6-71	III. CONCLUSION As set forth above, the DEIR for the Terra Vi Lodge Yosemite Project suffers from numerous deficiencies, many of which would independently render it inadequate under CEQA. Taken as a whole, the deficiencies of the DEIR necessitate extensive revision of the document and recirculation for public comment. Moreover, as currently designed, the Project conflicts with the Tuolumne County General Plan. Save Sawmill Mountain respectfully requests that the County reevaluate the Project in light of its inconsistencies with these plans and ordinances and make changes to the Project to reduce its serious environmental impacts.	The comment serves as a summary of the preceding comments. Please see Responses ORG6-01 to ORG6-70.
ORG6-72	*Exhibit A: Los Angeles Times, Alarming failures left many in path of California wildfires vulnerable and without warning, Dec. 29, 2017*	The comment provides an attachment with a Los Angeles Times article regarding wildfires, dated December 29, 2017. No response is required.
ORG6-73	*Exhibit B: Tahoe Daily Tribune, Rim Fire cause determined by investigators, Sept. 6, 2013*	The comment provides an attachment with a Tahoe Daily Tribune article regarding the Rim Fire, dated September 6, 2013. No response is required.
ORG6-74	*Exhibit C: Headwaters Economics, Rim Fire - California, 2013, Spring 2018 issue*	The comment provides a Headwater Economics report addressing the Rim Fire, dated in 2013. No response is required.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
ORG6-75	*Exhibit D: Voice of San Diego, Stop Dismissing Concerns About the Risks of New Homes in Wildfire Zones, June 5, 2019*	The comment provides an attachment with a Voice of San Diego article regarding wildfires, dated June 5, 2019. No response is required.
ORG6-76	*Exhibit D: Voice of San Diego, Stop Dismissing Concerns About the Risks of New Homes in Wildfire Zones, June 5, 2019 (Page 2 & 3)*	The comment provides an attachment with a Voice of San Diego article regarding wildfires, dated June 5, 2019. No response is required.
ORG6-77	*Exhibit E: Los Angeles Times, Rim fire: New road closure, long detours for some Yosemite visitors, Aug. 28, 2013*	The comment provides an attachment with a Los Angeles Times article regarding the Rim Fire, dated August 28, 2013. No response is required.
ORG6-78	*Exhibit F: The Modesto Bee, Highway 120 to reopen after Rim fire closure, Sept. 6, 2013*	The comment provides an attachment of a Modesto Bee article regarding the Rim Fire, dated September 6, 2013. No response is required.
ORG6-79	*Exhibit G: Excerpt from Safari Highlands Ranch and Citywide SOI Update EIR, Sept. 11, 2015*	The comment provides an excerpt of the Safari Highlands Ranch and Citywide SOI Update EIR, dated September 11, 2015. No response is required.
ORG6-80	*Exhibit H: Excerpt from Under Canvas Yosemite Draft EIR, June 2020*	The comment provides an excerpt of the Yosemite Under Canvas EIR, dated June 2020. No response is required.
ORG6-81	*Exhibit I: Comment Letter from cbec eco engineering, July 27, 2020* Dear Ms. Impett: I am a state licensed Professional Geologist and Certified Hydrogeologist with over thirty years of technical and consulting experience in the fields of geology, hydrology, and hydrogeology. I have been providing professional hydrology and hydrogeology services throughout California since 1989 and routinely manage and lead projects in the areas of surface- and groundwater hydrology, water supply, water quality assessments, water resources management, and geomorphology. A copy of my resume is attached. I have been retained by Shute, Mihaly & Weinberger LLP (SMW) to review and evaluate the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the Terra VI Lodge Project, Tuolumne County, California. Based on my review of this document, it is my professional opinion that the DEIR is inadequate in evaluating and mitigating the potential significant impacts of Project actions on	The comment provides the resume of the commenter along with the commenter's opinion that the Draft EIR does not adequately evaluate and mitigate impacts on hydrology, groundwater supply, and biological resources. Hydrology and groundwater supply were evaluated in Chapter 4.10, Hydrology and Water Quality, and Chapter 4.16, Utilities and Service Systems, of the Draft EIR. For further information on hydrology and groundwater supply impacts, please refer to Responses ORG6-29 through ORG6-37. Biological resources were addressed in Chapter 4.3,

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
	hydrology, groundwater supply and biological resources. The rationale for these opinions is based on multiple findings presented below.	Biological Resources, of the Draft EIR. Chapter 4.3 determined that all impacts to biological resources on the project site are less than significant with best management practices incorporated as mitigation measures in the Draft EIR. The mitigation measures are listed in Chapter 1, Executive Summary, of the Draft EIR.
ORG6-82	1. Deferred Mitigation The DEIR states that "[t]he proposed project would affect drainage patterns and increase the overall amount of impervious surfaces, thus creating changes to stormwater flows and water quality." DEIR p. 4.10-8. The DEIR contains no assessment of this impact. It is my experience that EIRs typically include detailed hydrologic analyses to quantify the magnitude of project runoff in order to evaluate if it would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems/structures (e.g., the existing drainage culvert under Highway 120) or otherwise degrade water quality. The DEIR fails to disclose that increased runoff within and leaving the site will increase erosion potential and water quality impacts to on-site and receiving channels. In addition, the DEIR contains no Drainage Plan to indicate how the stated increases in runoff volume from the project site will be mitigated. The DEIR defers development of Hydrology and Water Quality mitigation measures, necessary to address the stated change in conditions. Mitigation Measure HYD-1a states that "[a] Drainage Plan for the site shall be prepared that specifies how runoff on the site will be managed in order to protect water quality." DEIR p. 4.10-10. Similarly, Mitigation Measure HYD-1b defers the design and analysis of detention and/or retention facilities intended to mitigate for known and stated increases in the rate of surface runoff from the site. Id. The DEIR states that "[w]without mitigation the proposed project could modify the timing and volume of runoff and expansion of existing stormwater facilities or the construction of new facilities by the County may be required. Therefore, the project would result in a significant impact with respect to storm drain facilities." DEIR p. 4.10-14. The DEIR clearly indicates development of mitigation measures to address this impact will be deferred to a later time. However, design of effective runoff and erosion control best management practices (BMPs) requires a hydrologic analysis to quantify the potential changes and impacts associated with project runoff. Thus, in addition to presenting vague and unproven mitigation measures, the DEIR should be deemed incomplete as it does not provide (or defers) a hydrologic analysis necessary to identify and quantify project induced impacts on hydrology and water quality.	The comment does not provide any evidence that the project site is incapable of supporting adequate BMPs to handle stormwater flows. The Draft EIR includes Mitigation Measure HYD-1a and HYD-1b to ensure that such a detailed drainage study is prepared and that the proposed project is not allowed to proceed without the completion of a drainage plan. The drainage plan will quantify the amount of runoff and, if the increase in runoff is found to be in exceedance of the storm water drainage system, BMPs will be included in the project design. If BMPs are required, their ability to manage impacts to the local drainage system would also be included in the drainage plan. Please also see Response ORG6-30.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
ORG6-83	2. Unaddressed Potential Impacts to Groundwater Quality Appendix G of the DEIR indicates that the site groundwater storage contained in the underlying bedrock is associated with interconnected fractures. DEIR Appendix G, p. 6-7. The appendix indicates that the water levels in many Project production wells, monitoring wells and adjacent residential wells are hydraulically connected by these fractures. DEIR Appendix G, p. 16. Review of project plans (Sheets T0.03 and T0.04, DEIR Appendix B) and fracture maps (Figures 5 and 6, DEIR Appendix G) indicate that the proposed wastewater systems are located within the interconnected fracture zone that supplies groundwater to the project, monitoring and off-site wells. The DEIR does not address or evaluate how infiltration from the leach fields will interact with the fractures and associated groundwater system. Based on the magnitude of observed changes in groundwater levels recorded during the SWRCB 10-day pumping test and water quality sampling (Figures 10-22, DEIR Appendix G), the project production wells would clearly cause drawdown of fracture water levels. This will result in induced recharge of leach field water into the fracture aquifer and preferentially draw leach field infiltration into the fractured bedrock aquifer potentially causing adverse impacts to aquifer water quality. Because many on- and off-site wells share the groundwater supply of the interconnected fracture system, groundwater recharge from the Project leach fields could be drawn to surrounding off-site residential wells. This process and potential impacts to both on- and off-site wells are not acknowledged, let alone addressed in the DEIR. Therefore, the DEIR does not adequately address potential impacts to groundwater quality.	Please see Response ORG6-32.
ORG6-84	3. Unaddressed Potential Reduction in Groundwater Recharge The DEIR states, “The Project site and Tuolumne County are not within a designated groundwater basin or recharge area.” DEIR pg. 4.10-13. It is not clear what authority or jurisdictional designation of groundwater basin and recharge area is being referred to in this statement. Regardless, the Project is located on a watershed divide and is an area of groundwater recharge to the underlying fractured bedrock aquifer. The authors of the DEIR’s Hydrogeology Study state that greywater irrigation, septic systems along with “natural recharge” from the project site are sources of recharge to the underlying groundwater “basin”. DEIR Appendix G, pg. 16. The DEIR states that captured roof drainage and surface runoff will be redirected. DEIR pg. 4.10-9. There is no analysis in the DEIR of how this change will affect the volume and timing of water available for infiltration and groundwater recharge. The DEIR states that minimizing consumption; use of grey water systems for landscape irrigation and use of low flow plumbing fixtures; capture of rainwater to be used for other non-potable uses; and return flow from the	Please see Response ORG6-40.

Comment #	Comment	Response
	grey water irrigation system and from the on-site septic systems will provide additional recharge to the groundwater aquifer. DEIR p. 4.10-13. However, no water balance analysis is presented to demonstrate how these reallocations will balance out against the losses in recharge due to project-induced changes in surface water runoff. The DEIR conclusion that there will be no change in the volume of groundwater recharge is unsubstantiated as the DEIR presents no technical or quantitative analysis of how changes in surface water hydrology will impact groundwater supply. In short, the DEIR fails to demonstrate or quantify how the project changes in surface water conditions will affect groundwater recharge and existing groundwater supplies.	
ORG6-85	4. Incomplete Estimate of Water Demands The derivation of the project water demand estimate (16,636 gallons per day) is presented in the report prepared by Shamim Engineering Consultants, Inc. (dated March 30, 2020). Attachment E to DEIR Appendix G. The water demands in this study are based solely on domestic visitor use associated with guest rooms, cabins and employee housing. There are no estimates of the following water uses included into the project water demand estimate, including but not limited to: food preparation and dining; cleaning/maintenance activities of facilities; swimming pool; and fire water storage. Therefore, it is my opinion that the water demand estimate does not account for all water demands provided in the Project Description and the DEIR is in adequate in characterizing and quantifying potential adverse impacts to groundwater supply.	Revised water demand estimates have been prepared for the proposed project and are included in Appendix M, Supplemental Hydrogeology Information, of this Final EIR. Please see Response ORG6-39.
ORG6-86	5. No analysis of Groundwater Pumping impacts during Dry years and Drought Periods The groundwater pump test completed to determine the available groundwater supply to the Project was completed in October of 2019. Per Figure 9 of the Geoscience Hydrogeology Study, 2019 was a wet year-type occurring within a 4-year period of average to predominantly above normal precipitation (i.e., multi-year wet period). DEIR Appendix G, Fig. 9. The DEIR provides no quantitative assessment of how Project well pumping will impact groundwater supplies during dry or multi-year dry periods (i.e., drought). It is my experience that excess stress and adverse impacts to California water resources commonly occur during dry years or drought, but typically do not occur during wet years or multi-year wet periods. The DEIR claims that applying a 50 percent capacity pumping rate to project wells based on the 10-day capacity test per SWRCB standards will provide an adequate safety factor to overcome supply deficiencies during dry and multiple dry year periods. DEIR p. 4.16-7. However, beyond this SWRCB-accepted rule of thumb, the DEIR offers no analysis or evidence that the proposed project groundwater withdrawals will not have an adverse impact on groundwater supply during dry year or multi-year drought periods. As described in the next section of my comments, the groundwater supply beneath the project site has already been depleted and the SWRCB standards are inadequate as they are	SWRCB methodology is a State regulation adopted by Tuolumne County. The appropriate technical studies have been applied. In addition, please see Responses to ORG5-03 and ORG6-42.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
	likely intended for application to groundwater systems in a natural or unimpacted condition. Given the groundwater supplies beneath the project site are already in a state of depletion, the DEIR has provided no analysis of whether groundwater pumping associated with project actions will or will not have an adverse impact on groundwater supply during dry year or drought periods. This is further compounded by the lack of analysis as to whether the project will increase or decrease the amount of groundwater recharge to the depleted aquifer.	
ORG6-87	6. Project will Contribute to Existing Impact on Groundwater Supply and Reduced Spring Supply and Associated Ecological Habitat The DEIR's hydrogeology analysis found that springs within the project influence area shown in 1992 topographic maps are no longer active or producing. DEIR Appendix G, p. 7. The report finds that "[t]his is likely because wells in the area have drawn the groundwater surface below the surface elevation of the former springs." Id. at 7. The report concludes that these springs "are no longer flowing, which suggests groundwater levels are currently lower than they have been historically." Id. at 8. Although not acknowledged and discussed in the DEIR, these statements indicate that groundwater supply within the project area is currently in a state of depletion and any further groundwater extractions will lead to further depletions. This will not only further deplete groundwater supply, but further exacerbate the ecological impacts associated with lost spring flow, assuming the springs are valuable contributions to ecological and aquatic habitat to sensitive species, whether seasonal or year-round.	The comment incorrectly states that groundwater is in a state of depletion at the project site. The Draft EIR does not state or conclude that the springs are no longer active or producing, but only that they were not shown on the current USGS topographic map. Please see Response ORG6-41 for further discussion.
ORG6-88	7. DEIR Does Not Account for the Project's Cumulative Impacts on Groundwater Supply The DEIR cumulative water supply impact assessment identified four projects within the vicinity that, in combination with the Project, could potentially decrease groundwater supplies. DEIR pg. 4.16-9. Two of the off-site projects will not draw upon groundwater to satisfy water demands. However, the DEIR fails to analyze the impacts associated with the remaining two off-site projects that will draw upon the common groundwater supply. In fact, instead of making a reasonable assumption for Thousand Trails/Yosemite Lakes RV Expansion groundwater demands, the DEIR simply disregards the project from analysis completely. In addition, the DEIR fails to include the cumulative impact associated with pumping from surrounding residential domestic wells, some of which are known to be drawing upon the same groundwater supply as the Project. Another deficiency in the cumulative water supply impact assessment is the failure to acknowledge or address the existing cumulative adverse impact of depleted water storage as discussed under item 6 above. Pumping and groundwater depletions associated with the project will only perpetuate and add to adverse impacts that are already occurring. Nor does the DEIR	The comment misrepresents the Hydrogeology Study prepared for the Draft EIR (included as Appendix G of the Draft EIR). The Study included the pumping of both extraction wells at the same time to simulate worst case conditions for the proposed project since only the production from one well is needed to meet project demand. The production capacity of either well individually is more than double the project demand. In addition, the 10-day pumping test was conducted when the Yosemite Under Canvas project to the south was also conducting its pumping test of the well closest to the Terra Vi project. Therefore, the water supply analysis not only addresses a

Comment #	Comment	Response
	evaluate cumulative, let alone individual, impacts during dry year or drought periods (i.e., a reasonable worst-case scenario in identifying impacts). Given all these deficiencies in impact analyses, the DEIR conclusions that both individual and cumulative impacts will be less than significant are unsubstantiated. Therefore, it is my opinion that the DEIR has not addressed, let along acknowledged the existing and potential adverse impacts on groundwater supplies and associated beneficial uses. Please feel free to contact me with any questions regarding the material and conclusions contained in this letter.	cumulative water supply analysis, it represents worst case scenario, since both Terra Vi wells were pumping simultaneously and only one well is required to meet project demand. Regarding the drought year supply, please see Responses ORG6-42 and ORG6-44.
ORG6-89	*Exhibit I: Resume, Greg Kamman, PG, PHG, Senior Ecohydrologist*	The comment provides the resume of the commenter. No response is required.
ORG6-90	Dear Laurel: As requested, I have carried out an acoustic review for Terra Vi Lodge Project. This review is based on information made available by Tuolumne County. The Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR), dated June 2020 (State Clearinghouse Number: 2019110286), is intended to address the environmental effects associated with approval and implementation of the proposed project. This letter provides a brief review of the DEIR, especially section 4.12 for Noise—based on the project noise study report, attached to the DEIR as Appendix H, 'Noise Study'—in addition to our comments regarding the DEIR's evaluation of the project's potential noise & vibration impacts. SUMMARY In summary, the DEIR requires more technical documentation to support its following conclusions: • the efficacy of proposed measures (NOI-1.1, NOI-1.2a, NOI-1.2b, NOI-3.2a, & NOI-3.2b) to result in less-than-significant impacts • the project would not result in generation of excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels (NOI-2) • the project would result in a less-than-significant cumulative impact with respect to noise (NOI-4) The DEIR has not identified all noise- and vibration-sensitive land uses adjacent to the project property, has not properly assessed existing ambient noise and vibration levels at adjacent land	Please see Response ORG6-46 and Appendix L, Supplemental Noise Analysis, of this EIR.

Comment #	Comment	Response
	uses, and has not identified appropriate significance criteria to evaluate project impacts The DEIR is also incomplete because it fails to (1) analyze noise from each project element on all of the adjacent noise-sensitive land uses, (2) assess the project's impacts against applicable criteria (California Environmental Quality Act or CEQA, California Building Code or CBC, Tuolumne County General Plan), and (3) evaluate the effectiveness of the proposed mitigation measures.	
ORG6-91	PROJECT BACKGROUND DEIR, Section 3.3 'Project Components', page 3-7 to 3-8 states: The proposed project is designed as a hotel lodge comprised of various single, two-, and three-story elements. The building design accommodates a setback, maximizing the distance between taller structures and adjacent residential properties to minimize visibility from both public and private views. Elements of the project include a public market, general lodge with 100 guestrooms and multi-purpose uses, indoor and outdoor areas, and 26 cabin guestrooms in seven buildings, as well as 5 employee apartments with four rooms in each unit, for a total of 20 employee rooms... The proposed project would develop 18 percent (11.5 acres) of the project site with buildings, roads, and parking. An additional 1.4 acres would be used for the primary septic system.	The comment does not address the adequacy of the Draft EIR
ORG6-92	BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES This section of the DEIR identifies many "Special-Status" animal species present on the proposed project site but only identifies one species (Olive-sided flycatcher, Section 4.3 'Biological Resources', page 4.3-38) as noise- and vibration-sensitive – "Construction could adversely impact nesting species through noise and vibrations, and this would be a significant impact on the species' population." The DEIR fails to consider noise and vibration impacts to other species. The DEIR should have evaluated impacts to all other bird species, consistent with relevant guidelines and documents such as Caltrans (Effects of Traffic Noise and Road Construction on Birds, June 2016). Noise and vibration impacts on existing wildlife should be assessed as part of an appropriate study (see following section) that clearly establishes thresholds of significance for different species and proposes mitigation measures for identified significant impacts.	Please see Response ORG6-62.
ORG6-93	CRITERIA The DEIR has not identified all noise- and vibration-sensitive land uses adjacent to the project property, has not properly assessed existing ambient noise and vibration levels at adjacent land uses, and has not identified appropriate significance criteria to evaluate project impacts. Standards of Significance The DEIR references CEQA in its discussion of the legal precedence and interpretation (DEIR,	Please see Response ORG6-46 and Appendix L, Supplemental Noise Analysis, of this EIR.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
	Section 4.12.2.1, 'Regulatory Framework', page 4.12-2),affirming "that CEQA is concerned with the impacts of a Project on the environment, and not the effects the existing environment may have on a Project, with certain exceptions" (DEIR, Section 4.12 'Noise', 'State Regulations', page 4.12-2). The DEIR addresses criteria required by CEQA (see attached Noise checklist in Appendix B, items XI.a-f) in DEIR, Section 4.12.3, 'Standards of Significance', page 4.12-11; DEIR, Section 4.12.4, 'Impact Discussion', page 4.12-12 to 25; & DEIR, Appendix H, 'Noise Study', pages 8-9. The DEIR states that Tuolumne County does not have standards for ground borne vibration, and that Caltrans vibration impact criteria have been applied to evaluate the generation of excessive ground borne vibration levels (page 4.12-2 and Tables 4.12-1 and 4.12-2). Tables 4.12-3 to 4.12-6 list project noise standards adopted from the 2018 Tuolumne County General Plan Noise Element.	
ORG6-94	Table 4.12-4, 'Maximum Allowable Noise Exposure for Aircraft Noise Sources', does not include the Lmax criteria listed in Tuolumne County General Plan, Noise Element, Table 5.2 (also duplicated in DEIR, Vol. II, Appendix H, 'Noise Study' – Table 6) for the various adjacent land uses during daytime and nighttime periods.	Table 4.12-4 from the Draft EIR has been revised to include the Lmax criteria, as shown in Chapter 3, Revisions to the Draft EIR, of this Final EIR.
ORG6-95	The DEIR relies on an ambient (Ldn/CNEL) + 5 dB standard (presented in Table 4.12.5) to evaluate cumulative noise exposure from the project that is too permissive. The ambient noise level is often defined as the L90 or L99 statistical level (see Appendix A of this review for definitions of common acoustical terms), using a time interval between 15 minutes and one hour. The DEIR should have relied on increases on the ambient (L90 or L99) statistical level on an hourly basis. L90 hourly levels were measured on site to be about 30 dBA on average, and as low as 21 dBA (DEIR, Vol. II, Appendix H, 'Noise Study' – Appendix D & E). Typically, EIRs rely on a threshold of significance of 3 dB (rather than 5 dB).	Please see Response ORG6-48.
ORG6-96	Also, Table 4.12-6 erroneously duplicates notes included in table 4.12-5—see 2018 Tuolumne County General Plan, Noise Element, Table 5.4 (also duplicated in DEIR, Vol. II, Appendix H, 'Noise Study' – Table 8).	The notes for Table 4.12-6 from the Draft EIR have been revised, as shown in Chapter 3, Revisions to the Draft EIR, of this Final EIR.
ORG6-97	The 2018 Tuolumne County General Plan Noise Element states that "the exterior noise level standard[s] shall be applied to the property line of the receiving land uses." The DEIR does not identify property lines. As such, it is unclear whether the DEIR's assessment of project impacts assume the adjacent land use receptor location at the closest point along the property line, or elsewhere.	Please see Response ORG6-46 and Appendix L, Supplemental Noise Analysis, of this EIR.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
ORG6-98	The DEIR should also have addressed impacts on existing wildlife on and immediately adjacent to the project site (see comments on Biological Resources section above), based on clear noise and vibration thresholds of significance to different species in the project area and vicinity.	Please see Response ORG6-62.
ORG6-99	Existing Conditions - Noise DEIR, Section 4.12.2.2 'Existing Conditions', page 4.12-8: The noise-sensitive land uses which would potentially be affected by the project consist of the single-family residential land uses located to the north of the project site. Existing public forest lands and commercial recreation uses are located to the east, west, and south of the project site, which are typically not considered to be noise sensitive, with the exception of wildlife, which could be noise sensitive [emphasis added] . The project area and surrounding land uses are shown on Figure 4.12-1. DEIR Figure 4.12-1 identifies a single residence as the "Nearest Existing Sensitive Receiver (Residence)", but it does not clearly identify or describe the presence of any other noise sensitive land uses (such as all described in DEIR, Section 3.1.4 'Land Use Designation and Zoning' and depicted in Figures 3-2 'General Plan Land Use' & 3-3 'Zoning', partially copied below, pages 3-3 to 3-5) that could be impacted by the Project. 	Please see Response ORG6-46 and Appendix L, Supplemental Noise Analysis, of this EIR.
ORG6-100	The DEIR fails to provide any justification for its assertion that "existing public forest lands and commercial recreation uses are… typically not considered to be noise sensitive".	Please see Response ORG6-46.
ORG6-101	In addition to the long-term noise survey locations (LT-1 & LT-2) documented near Sawmill Mountain Road, the DEIR should have included measurements set back further from existing roads in the project vicinity. These additional locations, where ambient noise levels would be	Please see Response ORG6-46 and Appendix L, Supplemental Noise Analysis, of this EIR.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
	expected to be even lower, would represent a broader range of noise-sensitive receptors at adjacent land uses.	
ORG6-102	Also, Table 4.12-8 includes the highest reported Ldn level at each monitoring location. This may be an appropriate metric for evaluating noise impacts within the project, such as the performance of the exterior construction of the lodge to control interior noise levels attributable to exterior sources (California Building Code).However, the DEIR should also have included existing background noise levels (included in the attached DEIR, Vol. II, Appendix H, 'Noise Study') at each noise sensitive land use location in order to evaluate project impacts to adjacent noise-sensitive receptors.	Please see Response ORG6-46 and Appendix L, Supplemental Noise Analysis, of this EIR.
ORG6-103	Existing Conditions - Vibration DEIR, Section 4.12.2.2 'Existing Conditions - Existing Ambient Vibration Environment', page 4.12-11 (bold sections added for emphasis): During a site visit on May 9, 2019, it was noted that vibration levels were below the threshold of perception at the project site and in the immediate project vicinity [emphasis added]. Therefore, the existing vibration environment in the immediate project vicinity is considered to be negligible. Neither DEIR, Section 4.12 'Noise' nor the attached DEIR, Vol. II, Appendix H, 'Noise Study' include any measurements to support this claim.	Please see Response ORG6-47 and Appendix L, Supplemental Noise Analysis, of this EIR.
ORG6-104	Furthermore, DEIR, Vol. II, Appendix H, 'Noise Study' – 'Vibration Impacts Due to Project', on page 35 notes that baseline vibration levels were "below 0.1 inches per second if converted to peak particle velocity." Once again, the DEIR fails to provide any supporting documentation regarding vibration measurement methodology (location, duration, postprocessing, etc) or reported results. If ambient/baseline vibration levels in the immediate project vicinity are below the threshold of perception, this suggests that adjacent land use receptors are especially sensitive to project construction & operational sources that generate ground borne vibration.	Please see Response ORG6-47 and Appendix L, Supplemental Noise Analysis, of this EIR.
ORG6-105	PROJECT OPERATIONAL NOISE The DEIR is also incomplete because it fails to (1) analyze noise from each project element on all of the adjacent noise-sensitive land uses, (2) assess the project's impacts against applicable criteria (CEQA, CBC, Tuolumne County General Plan), and (3) evaluate the effectiveness of the proposed mitigation measures.	Please see Response ORG6-46 and Appendix L, Supplemental Noise Analysis, of this EIR.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
ORG6-106	Local Roadway Network This section of the DEIR discusses FHWA modeling, using the DEIR's transportation impact analysis as inputs for noon peak hour movements. It states that "cumulative traffic increase is predicted to exceed the [Tuolumne County] General Plan cumulative noise increase significance criteria along Sawmill Mountain Road north of the SR 120." Instead of proposing and evaluating mitigation measures for this exceedance of the project criteria, it lists reasons and assumptions why this exceedance should be interpreted as a less-than-significant impact. The conclusion that impacts from cumulative traffic noise increases, and the subsequent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project, are less-than-significant fails to take into account the Tuolumne County General Plan interior noise level standard of 45 dB Ldn, applicable to transportation (excluding aviation-related) noise exposures at receiving land uses.	Please see Response ORG6-50.
ORG6-107	On-Site Traffic Circulation The DEIR's assessment is based on the following assumptions: "the nearest existing sensitive use (receiver 1) is located approximately 400 feet from the centerline of the future interior roadway for the development", and that "all of the on-site vehicle trips would occur at one location, when realistically it would likely be more spread out throughout the development". The DEIR also makes the claim that "predicted noise levels at the nearest existing sensitive use are considered to be worst-case". It is unclear which "one location" has been assumed for all on-site traffic circulation, and as such it is difficult to evaluate the claim that predictions are worst-case and conservative given the Site Circulation Plan provided as Figure 3-12 (page 3-19) in the DEIR.	Please see Response ORG6-46 and Appendix L, Supplemental Noise Analysis, of this EIR.
ORG6-108	Also, the DEIR's assessment of on-site traffic circulation uses Leq predictions to evaluate project impacts against Tuolumne County General Plan noise standards for exposure from stationary noise sources. It is unclear why the DEIR relied on noise standards for stationary sources to evaluate traffic-related noise impacts.	Table 5.C of the Tuolumne County General Plan Noise Element contains noise level standards for stationary noise sources affecting noise-sensitive uses, which would be applicable to on-site operations and construction activities occurring on the project site (private property). Because on-site traffic circulation would occur on the project site, which is private land and not a public roadway, the County's non-transportation noise standards would be applicable.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
ORG6-109	Parking Noise The DEIR asserts that "[t]typical Sound Exposure Level (SEL) due to automobile arrivals/departures, including car doors slamming and people conversing is approximately 70 dB, at a distance of 50 feet" and that "the maximum noise level associated with parking lot activity typically did not exceed 65 dB Lmax at the same reference distance," yet it does not include any citation or other supporting documentation. In order to provide a conservative analysis, the DEIR should have assumed the shortest distance from adjacent sensitive land uses to the guest cabins' parking area. Instead, the DEIR relied on the assumed source location of the "effective noise center of cabins parking area…located approximately 500 feet from receiver 1" for this assessment.	The parking area movements noise analysis contained in the Draft EIR under impact discussion NOI-1 utilized noise level data samples collected at various parking lots over the years. Please see Appendix E of the Supplemental Noise Analysis (Appendix L of this EIR) for supporting documentation. In addition, the parking area noise analyses contained in the Draft EIR and Supplemental Noise Analysis did in fact take into consideration the shortest distance from the proposed parking areas to the nearest noise-sensitive receiver(s). Specifically, the distances were measured from the effective noise center of the nearest proposed parking area (near the cabins or lodge) to the closest receiver(s). The calculations took into consideration the parking area noise exposure associated with the nearest 50 to 100 parking spaces to the receivers depending on the proximity to the nearest development area (50-cabins, 100-lodge). As indicated in the Draft EIR and Supplemental Noise Analysis, this impact was identified as being less than significant.
ORG6-110	Delivery Trucks It is unclear how the key propagation distance assumed for this analysis is related to the Site Circulation Plan provided as Figure 3-12 (page 3-19) in the DEIR, or whether this distance would be appropriate to all other adjacent land use noise-sensitive receptors. Also, the DEIR's assessment of on-site traffic circulation uses Leq predictions to evaluate project impacts against Tuolumne County General Plan noise standards for exposure from stationary noise sources. It is unclear why the DEIR relied on noise standards for stationary sources to evaluate traffic-related noise impacts.	The on-site vehicle circulation route is illustrated in Figure 3-12 of the Draft EIR. As discussed in the Draft EIR in Chapter 3, Project Description, the project would receive deliveries from heavy trucks at the on-site market and lodge loading dock areas. Based on the location of these areas, delivery trucks would enter the project site from Sawmill Mountain Road and continue south on the interior roadway to those said

Comment #	Comment	Response
		locations. The delivery truck circulation noise analyses contained in the Draft EIR under impact discussion NOI-1 and Appendix L, Supplemental Noise Analysis, of this Final EIR, utilize distances measured from the nearest point of this circulation route to the closest receiver(s). Finally, Table 5.C of the Tuolumne County General Plan Noise Element contains noise level standards for stationary noise sources affecting noise-sensitive uses, which would be applicable to on-site operations and construction activities occurring on the project site (private property). Because on-site delivery truck circulation would occur on the project site, which is private land and not a private roadway, the County's non-transportation noise standards would be applicable.
ORG6-111	Loading Docks The DEIR's noise predictions from the project's loading dock—with primary loading dock noise sources listed as air brakes, back-up alarms, and revving truck engines—are based on noise data that cites relatively low source sound levels (63 dB Leq and 75 dB Lmax @ 50 ft, DEIR, Vol. II, Appendix H, 'Noise Study', page 23). It is our experience that loading dock noise levels would be reasonably expected to be 10 dB higher than what has been assumed in the DEIR. In addition, the DEIR asserts that the loading dock area would include a significant degree of shielding, yet it provides no information about the assumed source, barrier, and receptor heights for each noise-sensitive receptor at adjacent land uses. The estimated minus 15 dB shielding is generally understood to be the maximum mitigation offered by a noise barrier and may not be applicable to all noise transmission paths.	The loading dock noise analysis on page 4.12-15 of the Draft EIR, under impact discussion NOI-1, utilizes noise level data obtained from Bollard Acoustical Consultants field measurements of a commercial loading dock facility. Please see Appendix E of the Supplemental Noise Analysis (contained in Appendix L of this Final EIR) for supporting documentation. The loading dock noise analysis contained in the Draft EIR includes consideration of a standard spherical spreading of sound (6 dB decrease per each doubling of distance from source), an offset for atmospheric absorption of sound (1.5 dB decrease per thousand feet), and an adjustment to account for a significant degree of shielding of the loading dock area

Comment #	Comment	Response
		that would be provided by the intervening proposed building (lodge) at the basement level location. The loading dock noise analysis contained in the Draft EIR included predicted loading dock noise level exposure at the nearest receiver to the north of the lodge. Based on the location of the proposed loading dock area relative to this receiver, a shielding offset of -15 dB was applied. It is the professional opinion of Bollard Acoustical Consultants that the application of the 15 dB shielding offset would be appropriate at receiver locations north of the lodge, where receptors would receive shielding from the entire lodge structure. The loading dock noise analysis contained in the Supplemental Noise Analysis presents an analysis of loading dock noise levels at the nearest 15 receivers (under Response ORG6-46).
ORG6-112	Mechanical Equipment The DEIR's analysis does not address the potential noise and vibration impacts for the full range of heating, ventilating and air conditioning equipment to be expected at a project of this type. There is no information about specific types and locations of such equipment, and on that basis the finding that this equipment will not result in a significant impact cannot be supported. A proper study needs to include specific mitigation that identifies equipment location, and specific noise output based on manufacturer sound data, content of noise and existing ambient noise environment. Some mechanical equipment generate noise that stands out over the ambient in terms of quality and not loudness (i.e. whining, grinding, hissing, etc. referred to as equipment with tonal qualities). The DEIR should have included a detailed noise analysis that takes this into account in order to develop effective noise control options.	Please see Response ORG6-52.
ORG6-113	Maintenance Landscaping/Yard The DEIR's evaluation of the proposed mitigation measure NOI-1.1, which calls for an 8-foot	Please see Response ORG6-53.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
	solid noise barrier, requires supporting documentation including the assumed source, barrier, and receptor heights for each noise-sensitive receptor at adjacent land uses. There is no supporting documentation addressing the feasibility of adopting the performance standard for the maintenance yard generator to not exceed 70 dBA at a 50 foot distance. The DEIR cites a reference noise level of 82 dB Leq @ 50 ft (DEIR, Vol. II, Appendix H, 'Noise Study', page 26) for Generators.	
ORG6-114	Emergency Helipad The DEIR's assertion that "it is reasonable to assume that noise levels associated with emergency services, such as those proposed at the project emergency helipad, would likely be exempt from Tuolumne County noise level criteria" contains no citation or supporting documentation. The DEIR does not analyze impacts to adjacent noise-sensitive land use receptors from operations at the helipad. Nor does the DEIR propose any mitigation for this impact which is determined to be significant and "unavoidable." The DEIR should have included a comprehensive, project-specific analysis and supporting documentation. The DEIR also fails to acknowledge that emergency helicopter operations would have to follow Caltrans Department of Aeronautics Guidelines.	Regarding noise impacts associated with the proposed helipad, please see Response ORG6-58. Caltrans Division of Aeronautics requirements applicant to the proposed helipad are discussed in impact discussion HAZ-5 in Chapter 4.9, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, of the Draft EIR.
ORG6-115	Combined Normal On-Site Noise Operations The DEIR lacks sufficient supporting documentation for the assertion that limiting on-site truck deliveries and refuse collection activities to daytime hours, through Mitigation Measure NOI-1.2a & NOI-1.2b, would reduce the predicted combined noise level from normal on-site operations from 57 dB Leq and 59 dB Lmax (Table 4.12-12) to 41 dB Leq and 54 dB Lmax (Table 4.12-13). The ~15 dB reduction in Leq appears to be driven by the assumed mitigation at the maintenance yard, and not the proposed operation constraints.	Please see Response ORG6-46 and Appendix L, Supplemental Noise Analysis, of this Final EIR, which demonstrate that noise from delivery trucks and refuse collection trucks would not result in significant impacts.
ORG6-116	Other The study has not addressed other noise generating uses described for the project: event spaces including a 3,000 sq. ft. ballroom / event room or outdoor recreation areas (DEIR, Section 3.3, 'Project Components', page 3-16) where amplified music may be used.	Please see Response ORG6-49.
ORG6-117	PROJECT OPERATIONAL VIBRATION The DEIR fails to analyze the project's vibration-related impacts on nearby sensitive land uses, against all applicable criteria (CEQA, CBC, Tuolumne County General Plan). DEIR, Section 4.12.4 'Impact Discussion – Operational Vibration', page 4.12-22:	Please see Response ORG6-47 and in Appendix L, Supplemental Noise Analysis, of this Final EIR, which contains an analysis of project construction vibration levels at the nearest receivers. Similar to the impact

Comment #	Comment	Response
	The project proposes transient lodging and commercial uses within the development. Transient lodging and commercial operations do not typically have equipment that generates substantial vibration levels. In addition, the proposed lodging and commercial uses do not propose equipment that will produce appreciable vibration [emphasis added]. Operational vibration impacts would be less than significant. The emphasized claim is not accompanied by a project-specific analysis of expected building services equipment (heating, cooling, pumps, etc) that would be expected onsite. Nor does the DEIR include any supporting documentation.	determination identified in the Draft EIR under NOI-2, this also concludes that impacts associated with project construction vibration at the nearest receivers would be less than significant. In addition, it is the professional experience of Bollard Acoustical Consultants that transient lodging and commercial operations do not typically have equipment that generates substantial vibration levels (such as punch presses, pile driving, or other industrial equipment). Based on this information, vibration impacts associated with proposed on-site operations were identified as being less than significant.
ORG6-118	PROJECT CONSTRUCTION The DEIR's assessment of noise resulting from the project's construction is inadequate as it does not evaluate how this noise would impact adjacent noise-sensitive land uses. It also does not evaluate the project's impacts against all applicable criteria (CEQA, CBC, Tuolumne County General Plan), and documented evaluation of proposed mitigation measures.	Please see Response ORG6-56.
ORG6-119	Noise Impacts While the DEIR acknowledges project construction "would increase ambient noise levels when in use", it makes a determination that these impacts would not be significant because of the following: "the short-term nature of construction noise, the intermittent frequency of construction noise, and the required compliance with the construction-related noise criteria and implementation measures established in Policy 5.A.5 of the Tuolumne County General Plan" (DEIR, Section 4.12.4 'Impact Discussion – Construction Noise, page 4.12-20). This is not supported by any specific analysis and does not address the full range of construction activities such as site preparation, foundation work, erection of structures, staging areas, etc. The project's construction will include heavy equipment for grading, excavation, paving and other activities that will generate high levels of noise and vibration. A detailed noise control plan should be required based on the actual project schedule broken down by phase, duration and anticipated equipment and techniques used.	Please see Response ORG6-56.
ORG6-120	Vibration Impacts DEIR, Section 4.12.4 'Impact Discussion – Construction Vibration', page 4.12-22:	Please see Response ORG6-47 and ORG6-56.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
	During project construction heavy equipment would be used for grading excavation, paving, and building construction, which would generate localized vibration in the immediate vicinity of the construction. The nearest existing sensitive use to the project area (receiver 1, residence) is located approximately 250 feet from construction activities which would occur on the project site. Table 4.12-15 includes the range of vibration levels for equipment commonly used in general construction projects at a distance of 25 feet. The Table 4.12-15 data also include predicted equipment vibration levels at the nearest existing sensitive use to the project area located approximately 250 feet away. The claim highlighted in the selection above implies that vibration generated from heavy construction equipment would be "localized" and contained within "the immediate vicinity" of the project, but these assertions are not supported by any specific analysis.	
ORG6-121	Table 4.12-15 also does not address the full range of construction activities such as site preparation, foundation work, erection of structures, staging areas, etc. that would be expected to generate vibration. A detailed construction vibration control plan should be required, based on the actual project schedule broken down by phase, duration and anticipated equipment and techniques used.	Please see Response ORG6-47 and ORG6-56.
ORG6-122	The citation for the listed PPV levels at 25 feet is the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment Manual, 2018, Table 7-4, page 184. The FTA document provides the following caveat: Table 7-4 presents average source levels in terms of velocity for various types of construction equipment measured under a wide variety of construction activities. The approximate rms vibration velocity levels were calculated from the PPV limits using a crest factor of 4, representing a PPV-rms difference of 12 dB. Note that although the table gives one level for each piece of equipment, there is considerable variation in reported ground vibration levels from construction activities [emphasis added]. The data in Table 7-4 provide a reasonable estimate for a wide range of soil conditions. The predicted equipment vibration levels at the nearest existing sensitive, approximately 250 feet away, are not accompanied by a project-specific analysis or supporting documentation of prediction methodology (e.g. assumed soil characteristics for vibration propagation, contingencies to account for variability within vibration predictions, etc.)	The FTA formula was utilized to project the reference vibration levels to the distance of the nearest identified sensitive receptor location. As indicated in Draft EIR vibration impact analysis under impact discussion NOI-2, the vibration levels predicted using the FTA propagation formula at the 250 foot distance results in vibration levels of 0.003 inches/second. As noted in the Draft EIR significance criteria discussion, the threshold of perception for vibration is an order of magnitude above the predicted vibration levels. Even if there was some variability in the soil vibration propagation, predicted vibration levels would still remain well below the threshold of perception at the nearest

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
	# # # # # # # I trust you will find this information useful. Please do not hesitate to contact our office if you require any other information.	receptors. As a result, this impact remains less than significant. The commenters point that conversion of vibration levels from peak particle velocity (ppv) to root-mean-square (RMS) can introduce variation is correct. However, because no such conversion was necessary for the assessment of project vibration impacts contained in the Draft EIR, this point is not applicable and has no bearing on the conclusions of the Draft EIR vibration analysis.
ORG6-123	*Exhibit J: Appendix A: Definitions of Common Acoustical Terms*	The comment provides an attachment including definitions of common acoustical terms. No response is required.
ORG6-124	*Exhibit J: Appendix B: Noise Excerpt from CEQA Appendix G: Environmental Checklist Form*	The comment provides an excerpt from CEQA Appendix G. No response is required.
ORG6-125	*Exhibit J: Attachment to Papadimos Report: Technical Guidance for Assessment and Mitigation of the Effects of Traffic Noise and Road Construction Noise on Birds, Caltrans, June 2016*	The comment provides an attachment which includes an attachment of a Caltrans report regarding traffic noise, dated June 2016. No response is required.
ORG6-126	*Exhibit K: Article from Woodstock Power Company: Generator Noise: How loud is it, and How do we quite things down?*	The comment provides an attachment of an article from Woodstock Power Company regarding generator noise. No response is required.
ORG6-127	*Exhibit L: Excerpt from International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health: WHO Environmental Noise Guidelines for the European Region: A Systematic Review on Environmental Noise and Effects on Sleep*	The comment provides an excerpt from the International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health. No response is required.
ORG7	**Condor Earth, Dolly Babcock, July 30, 2020**	
ORG7-01	Good afternoon Quincy, I'm inquiring on finding out how to go about getting a copy of the draft EIR for the above projects, especially the Terra Vi Lodge project. Please advise how I can attain a copy of draft EIR's.	The comment asks a question not related to the adequacy of the Draft EIR. No response is required. The Draft EIR is available on the County's website at the following address: https://www.tuolumnecounty.ca.gov/1158/Terra-Vi-Lodge-Yosemite.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
ORG8	Central Sierra Environmental Resource Center, John Buckley, Executive Director, July 30, 2020	
ORG8-01	Background for these comments from CSERC It is with considerable frustration and concern that these comments are submitted on behalf of the members and staff of the Central Sierra Environmental Resource Center. First, the County unreasonably denied a request by CSERC and similar requests by other concerned citizens for a time extension for the submission of public comments for this massive DEIR and the associated Yosemite Under Canvas DEIR for the property directly adjacent to this site. Because the County chose to release both the Yosemite Under Canvas DEIR and the Terra Vi Lodge DEIR with overlapping public comment deadlines, CSERC and interested members of the community have been forced to attempt to simultaneously review, analyze, and assess the two extremely lengthy and detailed EIRs – including more than 1,800 pages overall for this DEIR. Combined with the 1,200 pages of associated project materials for the Yosemite Under Canvas project, the public has needed to scrutinize over 3,000 pages of documentation. Given the additional challenges for citizens caused by the COVID-19 situation, it is especially disrespectful for the County to rush through this phase of the planning process with what appears to be disinterest by County leaders in the ability of citizens to become well informed about the proposed action in order to comment most effectively.	The comment expresses concern that the extension of the public review period of the Draft EIR was not accepted. Please see Master Response 1, which explains the County's decision not to extend the public review period of the Draft EIR.
ORG8-02	Second, CSERC respects that different interests can certainly hold different perspectives. However, professional analysis done for the purpose of meeting CEQA requirements should be neutral, accurate, and without highly slanted bias. If this matter ends up in court, it is the hope of our staff that that the many instances described in our comments that point out misinformation and totally illogical judgments made by the DEIR consultants will underscore the failure of the Terra Vi Lodge DEIR to provide accurate information and unbiased conclusions -- as is legally required by CEQA.	The comment expresses concern that the Draft EIR does not provide an unbiased evaluation of the physical impacts the proposed project would have on the environment but does not cite specific information to support the claim. The Draft EIR and the technical reports relied upon in the EIR were prepared by third-party, independent consultants. Full lists of report preparers and their qualifications are included in Chapter 8 of the Draft EIR as well as in the appendices to the Draft EIR.
ORG8-03	Finally, CSERC respectfully requests that in addition to our formal comments, that all previous CSERC input, including pre-scoping written input submitted to Tuolumne County relative to the Terra Vi Lodge project, all be made a part of the legal record for this planning process.	The comment is noted. The comment does not address the adequacy of the Draft EIR. Please also see Response PUB61-01 and Appendix Q of this Final EIR.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
ORG9	Evergreen Lodge, Rush Creek Lodge, Yosemite, Lee Zimmerman, July 30, 2020	
ORG9-01	Attached are our comments on the Terra Vi Draft EIR. Thank you for the opportunity to share our concerns. Fire and related risks from the development threaten the existence of our lodges, and cumulative impacts of this and other projects in the immediate vicinity, which are not adequately studied or addressed in the draft EIR, need to be before considering review or approval of this project. This puts the burden on the County to determine the appropriateness of these projects and mediations and additional resources that would be needed to keep everyone safe and protected and without loss of quality of life and rights due to Terra Vi and the other developments. It also puts the burden on the County to hold them to the same standards as previous full-scale developments, and to not be able to skirt appropriate standards by downplaying what they are proposing and the significant impacts it will have on neighbors, businesses and the broader community.	Please see Master Response 5.
ORG9-02	This letter is in reply to your request for comments regarding the Terra Vi EIR related to Site Development Permit SDP18-003 on Assessor's Parcel Numbers: 068-120-060 and 068-120-061. While Hansji appears to have incorporated many thoughtful elements into their design, numerous core issues are glossed over by them in their EIR recommendations. We summarize below our key concerns regarding significant issues with and impacts of the project that are not adequately assessed, addressed and mitigated in the EIR, and which will require extensive planning, mitigation and additional county resources to resolve. All of these comments below apply to Terra Vi, and many key items, including fire safety, public services, traffic, infrastructure, neighbor impacts and employee housing, are exacerbated by the contemplated Yosemite Under Canvas (YUC) development across the highway. If the County is not extremely careful and doesn't make proper investment, create proper requirements, and address timing issues appropriately, it may be inadvertently complicit in our demise, and the goal of increasing the tax base may backfire by putting us and other existing players out of business along with the new developments.	The comment serves as an introduction to the comments that follow. Please see Responses ORG9-03 through ORG9-108.
ORG9-03	EXISTENTIAL THREAT The proposed development, in combination with that contemplated for Yosemite Under Canvas,	Please see Master Response 5.

Comment #	Comment	Response
	creates an unjust and existential threat to us and to the neighbors. • Given the economic and environmental devastation caused by the Rim and Ferguson fires, we are duly very concerned about the concentration of facilities and activities located just a few miles from our lodges and from Yosemite. Wildfire risk in our area will increase dramatically if these developments happen as proposed.	
ORG9-04	• HAZ-7: "The project would not expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires," and WF-5: "The project would not contribute to significant cumulative wildfire impacts," are both deemed to have Less Than Significant impact. This is absolutely untrue, speaks to the bias of the EIR and needs to be addressed head-on by the County.	The comment provides an opinion and does not provide supporting evidence, therefore no further response is required.
ORG9-05	• The proposed projects are directly upwind of Rush Creek, and a fire that escapes Terra Vi or YUC will head straight towards Rush Creek (and potentially Evergreen), quickly arriving at our property.	The comment does not address the analysis in the Draft EIR, therefore no further response is required.
ORG9-06	• There is no fire station or other quick firefighting response for 17 miles from the proposed properties to stop wildfires started there from burning us down.	Please see Master Response 5.
ORG9-07	• The project includes guest barbecue areas with hotel provided barbecues, which further heightens fire risk.	Please see Master Response 5.
ORG9-08	• Even if our lodges don't burn down, the resultant un-insurability from the fire could literally end our businesses given the current insurance marketplace – see next section below.	The commenter expresses concerns regarding wildfire but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. This topic is evaluated in Chapter 4.17, Wildfire, of the Draft EIR.
ORG9-09	INSURABILITY • Bank loans go into default if hospitality properties can't be insured. Due to recent local and other California fires, it has become almost impossible to obtain commercial property insurance coverage in our area. Regular carriers deny coverage, and we've been forced to go to secondary markets to piecemeal minimum bank-required insurance coverage.	The comment is noted. The comment does not address the adequacy of the Draft EIR.
ORG9-10	• As a result, our cost for property insurance alone (not liability, auto or other coverages) has in two years gone from $88,000 to $1,250,000 per year, a 14-fold increase.	The comment is noted. The comment does not address the adequacy of the Draft EIR.
ORG9-11	• If fire related risks are perceived to have increased due to these new developments, or if these developments cause any fire related incidents to occur in our area, it will likely become impossible or financially infeasible to secure property coverage, which could result in bank default and bankruptcy for us and other area hospitality operators.	The comment is noted. The comment does not address the adequacy of the Draft EIR.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
ORG9-12	• It is unclear if the developers of Terra Vi and YUC are aware of or have considered the challenging insurance environment faced by hospitality properties in wildfire areas.	The comment is noted. The comment does not address the adequacy of the Draft EIR.
ORG9-13	FIREFIGHTING CAPABILITIES • Given the above, any new development, should it be approved to move forward, must be held to the most stringent onsite fire control and prevention requirements for all concerned, including at minimum (some of which are referenced broadly in the EIR): o Fire sprinkler system for all structures o Central station alarm monitoring for all structures o Large water tank for firefighting water o Minimum required fire flow rate & duration o Adequate well water supply to quickly refill water tank – unclear how this recharge will be achieved through the mixed recycled, rain and well water system they envision o Hydrant and standpipe system to deliver firefighting water throughout the site o Construction period fire risk mitigation, including continuous fire watch	Please see Master Response 5.
ORG9-14	• We are glad to see Terra Vi will train staff in fire service standards. This does not solve the clear need for new, professional firefighting resources, which must be established in the immediate area of the development, to protect us and the neighbors of the developments. A manned station at the property itself seems the most robust and appropriate protection solution. Counting on firefighting resources from Groveland or Sonora to be onsite in time to stop a fire from spreading beyond the new proposed developments is not acceptable and puts us at unfair risk from the developments. The proposed helipad and fire training are red herrings and not substitutes for what's really needed at the new developments: the addition of true firefighting resources.	The proposed project would be required to comply with all applicable fire safety and prevention regulations in order for project approval, and would implement several project features and mitigation measures to reduce wildfire impacts as described in Chapter 4.17, Wildfire, of the Draft EIR. As described in Appendix I, Fire Impact Analysis, of the Draft EIR, the need for increased fire and EMS services is an existing County-wide issue, however the proposed project alone will not generate sufficient call volumes to justify establishment of a new fire station in the project vicinity. While the proposed project would include fire prevention features, and mitigation measures such as PS-1, which are intended to reduce the amount of calls placed from the proposed project to public service providers, the project itself would not be responsible in

Comment #	Comment	Response
		making up for existing public service conditions. For GCSD's comments on the Draft EIR, please see Comment Letter GOV4 from GCSD and the associated responses. Please see Master Response 5 for more detail on protections from wildfire and Master Response 6 regarding public services.
ORG9-15	• If the developments proceed, firefighting capabilities, including fire watch, should be in place throughout the construction period.	The proposed project would be required to comply with all applicable fire safety and prevention regulations during construction and operation.
ORG9-16	• WF-2 outlines numerous fire risk mitigation measures Terra Vi will perform, and it would be reassuring if there was a clear monitoring/enforcement mechanism around these items. Importantly, these mitigation measures do not lessen the fire risk impact of the development from significant to less than significant as Terra Vi suggests.	The Final EIR will contain the required Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Procedure. Regarding the level of impact, the comment does not provide supporting evidence, therefore no further response is required.
ORG9-17	• As you will no doubt hear from others as well, a fire caused by the developments would destroy trees and structures of neighboring parcels, forever unfairly harming the long-time residential neighbors, who should not have been exposed to extensive commercial development at their borders.	The comment provides a statement and does not address the analysis in the Draft EIR, therefore no further response is required.
ORG9-18	FIRE BUFFER • NFS Groveland Ranger District Supervisor, Jim Junette, recommends that YUC fund and maintain an extensive fire break (300-500 feet as determined by Cal Fire) in the National Forest perimeter surrounding the property in order to protect fire from escaping YUC's property and causing a wildfire in the national forest that threatens the forest, neighbors and us.	The comment is noted. The comment refers to the Yosemite Under Canvas project and does not address the adequacy of the Draft EIR.
ORG9-19	• We appreciate Jim's approach in trying to protect all concerned from unintended and disastrous fire consequences from the proposed YUC development, and we hope a similar extensive fire break approach and requirement will be put in place for the proposed Terra Vi development as well to maximize safety of the surrounding forest, community and businesses.	The proposed project would be required to comply with all applicable fire safety and prevention regulations in order for project approval, and would implement several project features and mitigation measures to reduce wildfire impacts as described in Chapter 4.17, Wildfire, of the Draft EIR.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
ORG9-20	• Has Cal Fire been contacted to provide comment on the fire risk associated with the project? The only letter we saw from them related to a CFIP cost share grant.	CAL FIRE has been notified through the CEQA noticing procedures of the proposed project. CAL FIRE's comment letter on the Notice of Preparation is included in the Draft EIR on page 65 of Appendix A.
ORG9-21	COUNTY PUBLIC SERVICES • A key consideration in evaluating and allowing the projects to move forward must be that they do not put undue burden on public services and facilities.	Please see Chapter 4.14, Public Services, Parks, and Recreation, of the Draft EIR for analysis of the proposed project's impacts on public services.
ORG9-22	• The limited county resources for fire, police & ambulance will not be able to accommodate these two huge projects (let alone when considered with the addition of Berkeley Camp and potential Yosemite Lakes expansion).	Please see Chapter 4.14, Public Services, Parks, and Recreation, of the Draft EIR for analysis of the proposed project's impacts on public services. Please also see Master Response 6.
ORG9-23	• We strongly disagree with the conclusion that cumulative impacts on public services, including fire protection, police & ambulance, with the mitigations proposed, would be less than significant. That conclusion is plainly flawed to anyone who understands our area and the limited existing access to services.	The comment does not provide supporting evidence, therefore no further response is required.
ORG9-24	• As mentioned previously, county firefighting infrastructure and services will definitely need to be expanded to be able to handle potential fire at the new facilities, which could escape and burn to our facility as well. The County has been instrumental in successfully supporting defense of our properties and advocating for resources to ensure our survival during previous fire events. With the contemplated Terra Vi & YUC developments, we have extreme concern about the additional firefighting resources and infrastructure that would need to be added, and need to be funded, to provide continued support at an appropriate level in this essential area to defend us and the new developments.	Please see Chapter 4.14, Public Services, Parks, and Recreation, and Chapter 4.17, Wildfire, of the Draft EIR for analysis of the proposed project's impacts on public services and wildfire impacts. Please also see Master Responses 5 and 6.
ORG9-25	• If Terra Vi and/or YUC are constructed, a rapid response plan and associated firefighting resources need to be in place to stop a fire from moving from these developments to Rush Creek. As mentioned previously, to mitigate fire risk and protect all neighbors, perhaps the County or the developments should help fund an onsite county fire station for quick response and in acknowledgement of the increased risk to neighbors and forest imposed by the new developments.	The comment does not address the analysis in the Draft EIR, therefore no further response is required.
ORG9-26	• Services infrastructure – ambulance and police response time to our lodges is already slow due to distances and limited resources. While Terra Vi will have onsite MOD's, which we have as well, more police resources, which are currently located a 45-mile drive from Terra Vi & YUC,	Please see Chapter 4.14, Public Services, Parks, and Recreation, of the Draft EIR for analysis of the proposed project's impacts on

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
	will need to be available in Groveland or nearer to the developments to respond to issues that arise at the resort, YUC and Berkeley Camp, as between the three, there will be well over 1000 new guests in the immediate vicinity each night.	public services. Please also see Master Response 6.
ORG9-27	• Bolstering these resources 'up the hill', and potentially at the project sites, will be key if these additional developments are contemplated, particularly given the cumulative visitor count increases and traffic risk impacts of the projects contemplated. We are glad that GCSD has importantly raised concerns in this regard as well.	The comment provides a statement and does not address the analysis in the Draft EIR, therefore no further response is required.
ORG9-28	EXISTING FORESTRY AGREEMENT • It appears development such as proposed by Terra Vi and YUC may not be allowed before 2026 given the obligations of the CFIP Agreement the Manly family signed with the CA Department of Forestry and Fire Protection in late 2015.	Page 4.6-5 of the Draft EIR describes the status of the CFIP agreement as follows: "The owner of the project site entered into a CFIP contract with CAL FIRE in 2015 that preserves the site for forest and timber land uses. [...] The proposed project would result in non-compliance with this CFIP contract. However, the agreement expired on December 31, 2019, and the project applicant would be required to refund State funds awarded for the project site, consistent with the request of CAL FIRE." Since publication of the Draft EIR, the County has learned that the contract has not yet expired. The text in the Draft EIR has been revised accordingly, as shown in Chapter 3 of this Final EIR. With the return of the State funds, the CFIP contract would no longer apply, consistent with the terms of the contract.
ORG9-29	• Section 13 of the agreement states "Participant certifies that the parcel of forestland to which the Forest Improvement Program applies will not be developed for uses incompatible with forest resources management within 10 years following recordation date".	The comment cites the CFIP contract and does not address the adequacy of the Draft EIR. Please see Response ORG9-28.
ORG9-30	• Extensive commercial development as proposed clearly conflicts with the forest resources management requirements of the agreement with the Department of Forestry and Fire Protection and has been called out as such by them.	As noted in Response ORG9-28, the Draft EIR acknowledges that implementation of the project would result in non-compliance with the CFIP contract.

Comment #	Comment	Response
ORG9-31	• The EIR discusses returning the money they received to void the expired contract. It is not clear that such action is legal given they are 5 years into the 10-year contract obligation, which they committed to for the 10 years stated in the contract, and for which they have already received financial benefit from Cal Fire.	As noted in Response ORG9-28, while the contract has not yet expired, the terms of the contract allow for the return of State funds in the event that the property owner does not implement the forest improvement within the contract timeline. Further, economic and contractual impacts are beyond the scope of CEQA.
ORG9-32	CUMULATIVE IMPACTS • GEO-7 "Project impacts are not cumulatively significant with other development projects in the vicinity," is concluded to have impacts Less Than Significant. This is absolutely not the case, as their analysis is not accurate, thorough or sound. We encourage the County to hire a truly independent party (at the expense of the developers if needed) to assess the cumulative impacts of the proposed developments.	The commenter does not explain how, in the opinion of the commenter, the conclusion regarding cumulative geology and soils impacts is inadequate. Therefore, a detailed response cannot be provided. The geology and soils analysis in the Draft EIR was prepared by a licensed geologist as an unbiased third party and is therefore an independent party as suggested by the commenter. Please see Chapter 4.7, Geology and Soils, of the Draft EIR for a detailed analysis of potential impacts related to geology.
ORG9-33	• As the County reviews the EIR and contemplates approval and conditions for this facility, please include in any impact analysis by the County and other agencies the real combined impact of the two contemplated additions, Terra Vi & YUC, rather than each project individually. Accepting the current downplayed/understated/unrealistic EIR assumptions of cumulative impacts will miss the true combined effects of the two developments contemplated at this location.	The EIRs for the proposed Terra Vi and Under Canvas projects evaluate the projects as proposed as well as the cumulative projects that could occur with the approval of both projects, consistent with CEQA. The commenter does not explain how, in the opinion of the commenter, the Draft EIR's conclusions regarding cumulative impacts are inadequate. Therefore, a more detailed response cannot be provided.
ORG9-34	• The impact of these two developments also needs to be analyzed in the context of the already approved development in the same area at Berkeley Family Camp and the planned expansion at Yosemite Lakes/NACO and the true scale of the extensive development beyond Terra Vi outlined in Table 4.1. The cumulative impacts of these large projects, nearly 500 lodging units, would be	Cumulative impacts are evaluated throughout the Draft EIR. For example, Mitigation Measure PS-2 acknowledges that

Comment #	Comment	Response
	substantial, would significantly increase public safety and environmental risks, and would significantly expand the need for infrastructure and key public services.	the project would create a significant cumulative impact to fire protection services.
ORG9-35	• The Terra Vi EIR discounts and does not appropriately account for these cumulative risks and needs. Given County economics, it is not clear how additional infrastructure, services and protections would be provided to avoid unfairly increasing exposure and risk for neighbors, existing businesses and local community, which need to be avoided at all cost.	Please see Response ORG9-34. Where significant cumulative impacts have been identified, it will be the project sponsor's responsibility to fund the recommended mitigation measures.
ORG9-36	PURPOSELY UNDERSTATING PROJECT • In section 2.1, Proposed Project, there is no mention of reception, kitchen, restaurant, bar, event hall gym/locker room or greenhouse facilities and thousands of square feet of other amenities.	The project summary in Chapter 2, Introduction, of the Draft EIR is a brief summary and does not include all aspects of the project. Please see Chapter 3, Project Description, for a more detailed description of the proposed project.
ORG9-37	• The same is done in 3.3, Project Components. These omissions understate the project and associated impacts and staffing needs. Only later under the 'amenities' section are these significant project components mentioned.	The project is described in the whole of Chapter 3, Project Description. Some project features are described in separate subsections, but the reader should consider the entire chapter to gain a full understanding of the proposed project.
ORG9-38	• Back-of-house and infrastructure needs are underestimated to minimize apparent project impact and staffing.	Please see Response ORG9-63.
ORG9-39	FULL SCALE OF PLANNED DEVELOPMENT • While Hansji has proposed and analyzed a 126-room development, it is clear that they are designing the property for additional future cabin buildings in a later phase to achieve the originally intended scale of 200+ guest rooms. They should be forthright about this plan so the full scale of development can be fairly assessed now.	The EIR analyzes the project as proposed. The project applicant has not indicated any intent to expand the project development. Any future expansion of the proposed project would be required to comply with CEQA and subject to County approval.
ORG9-40	• Their intent is evident, among other things, as follows: o All public facilities, such as the kitchen, dining room, bar, event space and reception area are all identically sized to the original 240 room development plan despite the new plan having about ½ of the original room count – a clear indication of future intended scale, particularly given they state that the restaurant and bar are for lodge guests only. o The number of parking spaces proposed, 286, remains exactly the same as the original plan,	Please see Response ORG9-39.

Comment #	Comment	Response
	with 74 originally designated for 'cabins' just moved to 'overflow'. o Originally planned Phase II cabin buildings were just removed from the site plan with the proposed pathways that weaved around the cabins left in place exactly as originally planned for future addition of the cabins exactly as originally proposed.	
ORG9-41	• With this future 2nd phase in mind and clearly being planned for in their design, should the true long-term goal, including the 2nd phase, also be considered when evaluating cumulative impacts and required mitigation and scaling of essential services?	Please see Response ORG9-39.
ORG9-42	APPROVAL TIMELINE & COVID • The Groveland hospitality community is facing unparalleled, historic economic impacts from COVID. For example, we will likely take in only 30-40% of budgeted revenue this year, which threatens our very survival. There is no certainty as to when recovery will occur.	The comment is noted. The comment does not address the adequacy of the Draft EIR.
ORG9-43	• We would hope that, at this time, the County would focus on supporting the survival of existing county businesses that comprise its core tax base rather than trying to push new developments that risk that very tax base.	The comment is noted. The comment does not address the adequacy of the Draft EIR.
ORG9-44	PROCESS • We and others question the decision to issue two massive EIR's of 2000+ pages for 45-day comment period (the shortest possible) with deadlines within 10 days of each other (YUC & Terra Vi). Given that a single project of this scale comes around perhaps every 10 years, we would have expected the County to appropriately stagger the comment periods.	The comment is noted. The comment does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. However, as described in Master Response 1, the County will consider all comments, including late comments, received on the proposed project.
ORG9-45	• Such action has raised the question among many in the community about whether the process was done in good faith or designed to limit the ability for thoughtful review and comments, particularly given the scale of the developments and documentation. All is of course exacerbated by current COVID restrictions and demands, which might alone be reason for greater timing flexibility and sensitivity.	The EIR timelines for the Terra Vi and Under Canvas projects began when the respective project applications and Notices of Preparation were filed, and the publication dates for the Draft EIRs were ultimately determined by EIR consultant time needs. Please see Master Response 1 which describes that the County will consider all comments, including late comments, received on the proposed project.
ORG9-46	POTABLE WATER • Total expected potable water usage is projected at 16,636 gallons/day. Based on our relevant	Please see Response ORG5-04.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
	experience actually running lodging facilities in the area, peak usage will be significantly more than that design volume. Our experience suggests actual daily water usage would be nearly double the projected amount.	
ORG9-47	• We encourage realistic estimates of water usage and sustained water production to ensure sufficient capacity and so appropriate firewater stores can be consistently maintained.	Please see Response ORG5-04.
ORG9-48	• The plan to be completely reliant on just 2 wells is naïve and not realistic long-term, especially given actual water usage may be double projected amounts. For comparison, Rush Creek currently has 6 wells and Evergreen has 9. With the Terra Vi design, the loss of a single well pump would halve water production and quickly result in a supply shortage requiring water hauling.	Based on the hydrogeology study prepared for the project and included in Appendix G of the Draft EIR, the two wells planned for the proposed project can provide more than four times the project daily demand, and are therefore sufficient to support the project's water needs.
ORG9-49	• In addition, Terra Vi's presumption that the wells will continue to produce in the long term at 50% of the 10-day test capacity is unrealistic. Our experience is that wells do not maintain near that level of performance over time, particularly given that tests occurred after record water levels the prior winter.	The commenter provides an opinion which is unsupported. Typically, wells will not decline in capacity even by 20 percent without triggering a maintenance cycle. The project wells include the use of an open bedrock boreholes to obtain groundwater. The normal loss of well efficiency does not apply to these wells since well screen and filter pack cannot become fouled or clogged. Therefore, it is extremely unlikely that well capacity will decrease significantly over the life of the proposed project that is not associated with a significant drop in groundwater levels. Please also see Response ORG6-42.
ORG9-50	• It is not clear that sufficient potable water flow has been identified based on realistic estimates and seasonal drought variability, and hauling water on an ongoing basis should not be allowed.	Please see Responses ORG5-03, ORG6-40, ORG6-41, and ORG6-42.
ORG9-51	• Given the understated water usage projections and likely overstated production volumes, it is unclear if the proposed domestic water tanks have adequate capacity if the tanks are to supply some of the required fire flow water storage (details of fire water storage are not provided).	Revised water demand estimates have been prepared for the proposed project and are included in Appendix M, Supplemental Hydrogeology Information, of this Final EIR. Water for firefighting would be provided in

Comment #	Comment	Response
		accordance with applicable regulations and standards. As stated on page 4.17-31, "Fire flow for the buildings would be provided by the potable water storage tanks. The quantity of water storage, pressure of water supply, and maintenance of the storage tanks would be designed to comply with State Responsibility Areas Fire Safe Regulations, CFC, Tuolumne County General Plan policies, and Tuolumne County Code of Ordinances, Chapter 15.20, Fire Safety Standards."
ORG9-52	• HYD-2 addresses if "the proposed project would not substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin."There is significant uncertainty around this question, as the 10-day pump test done after the wettest season in years does not speak to risks of groundwater recharge and sustainability.	Please see Response ORG6-42.
ORG9-53	• HYD-6 addresses if "the proposed project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects, would result in less-than-significant cumulative impacts with respect to hydrology and water quality," which they conclude as Less Than Significant. There remains much uncertainty about this, and they have clearly not made the case in this regard.	Please see Response ORG6-88 and PUB28-04.
ORG9-54	• Pump tests showed significant well draw downs of 25-50+ feet after just 10 days. This is a major concern, as it suggests significant associated risks to ongoing flow rates, water table, neighbors' wells and continuous sufficiency of potable water from ongoing use, especially during drought periods.	The commenter does not provide evidence to supports this opinion. These are not significant well drawdowns for hard rock wells. During the testing, water levels in all of the wells being monitored stabilized. Following the pumping, the wells showed full recovery as defined by County testing guidelines.
ORG9-55	• It is also not clear that in drought years (unlike when the wells were tested), that the wells at Terra Vi won't significantly impact the local water table and affect the viability of the neighbors' access to potable water via their own nearby wells. In this regard, note that all wells hit initial water at the same 100-foot level.	Please see Response ORG6-42.
ORG9-56	• Given that the projects are to assess cumulative impact, as stated in the YUC EIR, regarding having "sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable	Please see Response ORG5-03, ORG6-40, ORG6-41, and ORG6-42.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
	future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years", and that this can't be understood from a single short-term testing done after the wettest season in years, should tests be repeated this fall to understand drop in water table and flows in a more normal year to protect neighbors from negative consequences to their water supply?	
ORG9-57	• Since there will be onsite staff for over 6 months, this would make the water system a non-transient, non-community system, which is not addressed.	The water system is addressed as a non-transient system that supplies water year round to staff and visitors.
ORG9-58	WASTEWATER MANAGEMENT • Given the scale of development and its proximity to the Tuolumne River and associated watershed, a full waste treatment system should be required for the entire facility, as was the case with Rush Creek. While not totally clear, Terra Vi appears to be calling for a 1.4 acre septic system and to indicate that facilities other than those for the restaurant will be septic systems with leach fields rather than part of a full waste treatment system.	Please see Master Response 2. The project proposes an on-site package wastewater treatment system.
ORG9-59	• Design wastewater flows from the proposed development are unclear. What is known is that the projected flow of high strength waste from the restaurant is likely very small due to their stated plan to use recyclable flatware & utensils in the restaurant. Could this really be the case for the high-end resort that is contemplated, or are projected flows reduced inappropriately through this assumption?	Please see Master Response 2. The project proposes an on-site package wastewater treatment system that would treat up to 130 percent of the proposed project's water demand of 17,833 gpd.
ORG9-60	• GEO-5, "the project would not have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater", is called out as Less Than Significant, but it is not clear how this has been determined and if it is correct.	Please see Master Response 2. As described in Master Response 2, the project proposes an on-site wastewater treatment plant. Therefore, impact discussion GEO-5 in the Draft EIR is no longer relevant to the proposed project.
ORG9-61	• Terra Vi wells hit water at just 100 feet, with similar depth for neighbors' wells also. Neighbors are rightly very concerned about potential wastewater contamination from Terra Vi of well water and the basin at 100 feet that all appear to draw from. Knowing how wastewater flows may travel to confirm they won't migrate to the water basin would provide important reassurance and protection from disastrous consequences for neighbors and the developments.	County guidelines require 8 feet of overburden over bedrock to provide the needed soil treatment for direct disposal of sewage into a septic system of leach field. The project area has 54 to 104 feet of overburden, much more than is required for wastewater constituents to be attenuated and treated by the soil. In addition, project wastewater would be treated to tertiary standards (see Master Response 2), unlike

Comment #	Comment	Response
		the existing residential sites that dispose of raw sewage to treatment systems. The Draft EIR preparers are not aware of any complaints among neighbors of cross contaminating each other's wells.
ORG9-62	STAFF & HOUSING • Terra Vi's staffing estimates are unrealistically extremely low and appear targeted at skirting staff housing and other mitigation requirements that would be required were the true employee count known.	Please see Response ORG9-63.

ORG9-63	• Terra Vi calls out a laughable 40 jobs that would be created to run their varied and extensive front desk/reservations, housekeeping, maintenance, food and beverage, event, administrative and retail operations. For reference, our two lodges, of similar scale, each have 150-200 staff in peak season.	The project would have an employee population of 40 employees. As part of its environmental sustainability and wellness goals, the project proposes an operational model that would provide operational efficiencies and would result in a lower employee rate than that of other standard hotels. For example:[26]
		▪ All employees would be cross-trained for multiple roles/positions.
		▪ Housekeeping services would be offered every third day, by request, and at check out only.
		▪ Laundry services would be provided off-site or by a third party.
		▪ Corporate services, including the following, would be provided off-site:
		  ▪ Sales and marketing
		  ▪ Revenue management
		  ▪ Human resources and risk management
		  ▪ Centralized reservations
		▪ Food and beverage services would reflect the following:

[26] John Bissell, Hansji Corporation. Personal communication with Alexis Mena, PlaceWorks. September 4, 2020.

Comment #	Comment	Response
		▪ Limited to seasonal menus ▪ Easy-to-execute menu offerings ▪ No servers, counter service with the option of table technology ▪ Single-service plates and utensils; no busing, washing, placement ▪ Technology would include the following: ▪ Front desk-- check in/out, mobile key, guest requests utilizing AI apps ▪ Food and beverage-- pre-order meals, order using mobile/table devices ▪ Integration with property management system (PMS) and point of sale (POS) applications to process all accounting functions by corporate
ORG9-64	• The unrealistic staff counts are apparently the basis for their conclusion in POP-1 and POP-3, both of which would no doubt result in more significant impact if realistic staff numbers were used.	Please see Response ORG9-63, which explains that the employee population of 40 employees is a reasonable estimate for the project. Hypothetically, if the employee population were increased, the increase would be small, given the project's proposed cross-training strategy, and therefore would not affect the conclusions in the EIR. Even if the employee count were much higher, the findings in impact discussions POP-1 and POP-3 would not change. Page 4.13-4 of the Draft EIR states, "Although some of the jobs generated as a result of the proposed project can be potentially filled by existing residents of the county, there is a possibility that some future employees of the proposed project may relocate to the region in order to work at the hotel lodge. Generally, it is expected that the 40 jobs projected on-site can likely

Comment #	Comment	Response
		be filled by existing County residents. In the event that future employees relocate to the region for employment on the project site, the population increase would not exceed State growth projections for the County." This finding would hold true even with an incrementally increased employee population.
ORG9-65	• Underestimating staffing misrepresents the need for onsite housing given the limited labor pool and affordable housing stock in and around Groveland.	As noted in Response ORG9-63, the employee population of 40 employees is reasonable. On-site employee housing is a project component that the project voluntarily proposes, and would not increase even if the employee population were to increase without a change to the project site plan and application. Changes to the project application would be subject to additional CEQA review. In addition, it is unknown how many employees would opt to live on-site and it is expected that some of the employees will be existing county residents who already reside in the surrounding area.
ORG9-66	• It seems key to have year-round onsite employee housing at appropriate scale as a requirement of this project and of YUC, so the County can handle the demand to house employees 'up the hill' near the facilities, and so the developments appropriately bear the burden of the housing demand they are creating. Significant staff housing was required for our lodges and the same should be required for the Terra Vi & YUC developments as well.	Please see Responses ORG9-63 and ORG9-64.
ORG9-67	• With very limited apartment rental options and affordable housing stock in the Groveland area, not requiring the new developments to provide sufficient onsite housing for employees or requiring appropriate affordable housing offset costs will cause a local shortage and drive prices up, affecting the stability of all moderate wage earners in the area, including trade, hospitality, County, National Park and National Forest Service employees.	Please see Responses ORG9-63 and ORG9-64. Economic impacts are beyond the scope of CEQA.
ORG9-68	• Because our lodges constructed sufficient housing onsite, we can support staff through slow periods where they might otherwise be laid off and become a burden to county services –	The comment is noted. The comment does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR.

Comment #	Comment	Response
	another reason it's key to require the developments to provide appropriate staff housing and/or housing offsets.	
ORG9-69	• Separately, it is unclear how employee meals will be addressed in the current plan. Are there kitchens in each apartment and associated firefighting protections? How and where are staff who live off-site fed during their shifts?	Employee apartments will include kitchens. Employees will have access to an employee breakroom for meals.[27]
ORG9-70	TRAFFIC SAFETY & IMPACT • Trans-5 draws a key conclusion of Less Than Significant cumulative traffic impact without proper analysis or even suggestion of need for mitigation. Has there been a complete, objective traffic study performed for the Sawmill Mountain Road and Hardin Flat intersection area that takes into account the cumulative impact of the multiple developments proposed and in process? It seems essential that such a study be completed and mitigating measures be clarified so proper road design, safety and traffic planning occurs.	Traffic safety impacts for the Terra Vi and Under Canvas projects are evaluated in their respective EIRs at the project and cumulative levels. Please see Responses ORG6-67 and PUB28-06.
ORG9-71	• The cumulative effect of Terra Vi, YUC, Berkeley Camp & potential Yosemite Lakes expansion will be significant to traffic in the area. A coherent plan is essential to ensure that this section of scenic State Highway 120 does not become dangerous and/or congested.	The Transportation Impact Analysis report in Appendix J of the Draft EIR describes the cumulative effects on traffic from background traffic growth and other projects in the traffic study. Projected conditions satisfy the requirements of the Tuolumne County General Plan. Please see Response ORG6-68 for information regarding cumulative safety.
ORG9-72	• Turn and merge lanes should be required as appropriate to address highway exit/entrance safety and congestion. Turn areas with limited visibility must be addressed given the speeds of vehicles traveling the highway and Yosemite visitors' lack of knowledge of the local roadways and turnouts.	The Terra Vi project includes improvements to the Highway 120/Sawmill Mountain Road intersection to address safety and sight distance. As shown in Table 1-1 and Chapter 3, Revisions to the Draft EIR, of this Final EIR, encroachment permit approval for these intersection improvements would be required prior to the start of construction of the Terra Vi project. Please also see Response GOV3-06.

[27] John Bissell, Hansji Corporation. Personal communication with Alexis Mena, PlaceWorks. September 3, 2020.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
ORG9-73	• Between Terra Vi and YUC, 200+ cars will head to Yosemite between 8 and 10am each summer day. That's 100+ trips per hour, not 8.2 as called out in the flawed analysis in Table 4.15-2 that doesn't take traffic timing patterns into account.	The comment refers to the daily Saturday trip generation rate of 8.2 daily trips per hotel room. This is not the forecast for total amount of traffic entering or exiting the site. As noted in Table 4.14-3, the lodge and cabins are expected to generate 65 trips in the Saturday peak hour. The trip generation estimate for Under Canvas is presented in the Transportation Impact Analysis report in Appendix J of the Draft EIR and is based on information from the Under Canvas Draft EIR.
ORG9-74	• Between Terra Vi and YUC, 200+ cars will head to Yosemite between 8 and 10am each summer day. That's 100+ trips per hour, not 8.2 as called out in the flawed analysis in Table 4.15-2 that doesn't take traffic timing patterns into account.	The comment refers to Table 4.15-4, Weekday Project Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) Estimates. Weekday conditions are the applicable measure for regional VMT impacts, as established by Tuolumne County, rather than hourly traffic as noted in the comment. VMT is typically evaluated under annual average conditions in order to estimate effects on emissions over long periods of time, and because the Tuolumne County Regional Travel Demand Model (RTDM) and other VMT analysis tools were developed to analyze annual average typical weekday conditions
ORG9-75	• Section 4.15-4 significantly overstates the Yarts benefit and does not in any way adequately analyze the true cumulative impacts, particularly during peak periods, of the cars and guests at the various projects. Note that only about 2% percent of our guests take Yarts each day from Rush Creek, despite us having a Yarts stop onsite and promoting the opportunity aggressively.	The Draft EIR transportation analysis estimates YARTS ridership for the purpose of identifying potential impacts to the transit system based on ridership. This estimate is predicated on the Terra Vi goal identified as 10 percent guest use. However, neither the Transportation Impact Analysis nor the VMT estimates apply any discount to identified vehicle trip generation forecasts due to use

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
		of YARTS. Thus, neither the Transportation Impact Analysis results nor project VMT estimates are affected by the estimate of YARTS use.
ORG9-76	• The EIR doesn't resolve the dangerous issue that will arise of guests walking across State Highway 120 between the two proposed developments to access retail, F&B and other services, or to just check out the other facilities. It seems important to safely address this issue given highway speeds, hillside locations and guests naïve to the area unused to crossing roads with cars traveling at highway speeds. This is another reason a cumulative impact traffic study is essential.	Please see Response ORG6-67.
ORG9-77	• HAZ-6 relates to emergency evacuation. The aforementioned traffic study should address how emergency evacuation can be accomplished appropriately given the multiple developments at the same junction, and the analysis must include evacuation of the neighbors whose routes will be congested by the guests of the developments who are located nearer to the highway. The developments should not be approved without a safe and comprehensive evacuation plan that protects both guests and neighbors.	The Traffic Impact Analysis, incorporated as Appendix J of the Draft EIR, includes cumulative impact analysis, starting on page 41. Emergency evacuation impacts are analyzed in the Draft EIR in impact discussions HAZ-6 as well as TRANS-4 and WF-1. Please also see Master Response 4 regarding emergency evacuation.
ORG9-78	YOSEMITE IMPACT • The National Park Service is already limiting park entry due to COVID, and they are generally looking to manage visitation and reduce entry lines, wait times and traffic congestion. Terra Vi and YUC will exacerbate these issues.	The commenter's concern regarding operational effects at Yosemite National Park is noted. However, CEQA impacts are limited to physical impacts, such as impacts associated with the construction of new or expanded recreational facilities.
ORG9-79	• There appears no mention of impact on Yosemite visitation of these two large projects, including impact on wait time, the ability of guests to secure Yosemite day passes, etc.	Please see Response ORG9-78.
ORG9-80	• The EIR looks to Yarts as the salvation, which will just not be the case. As we have seen with our guests, due to capacity constraints, convenience, interest and service frequency, only about 2% of our guests use Yarts.	The comment is noted. The EIR evaluates the project's potential impacts to transit but takes a conservative approach by not applying any trip generation reductions to the overall project from transit usage.
ORG9-81	• Relying on expanding Yarts to address congestion issues is not a viable approach, as it can only have marginal impact versus the 100's of cars from Terra Vi that will enter and depart the facility and Yosemite each day.	The comment is noted. Following the passage of SB 743, CEQA no longer considers congestion to be a significant environmental impact, however the potential safety impacts

Comment #	Comment	Response
		related to vehicle circulation on- and off-site are addressed in Chapter 4.15 of the Draft EIR. Therefore, the EIR impact evaluation does not evaluate the congestion impacts of the project. The project's trip generation estimate does not apply any reductions due to transit usage.
ORG9-82	NEIGHBOR IMPACTS & LAND USE • A key consideration in evaluating/allowing the projects must be their compatibility with other neighboring uses. It seems abundantly clear that the neighbors would have the peaceful, rural, low density lifestyle they have enjoyed since acquiring their properties significantly and forever altered by the proposed developments.	The EIR evaluates several potential impacts related to compatibility and quality of life concerns, such as lighting, glare, noise, and air quality. A discussion on light and glare impacts can be found in Chapter 4.1, Aesthetics, Air quality impacts are discussed in Chapter 4.2, Air Quality, and noise impacts are provided in Chapter 4.12, Noise, of the Draft EIR.
ORG9-83	• The effects of a significant change in traffic flow, noise and light in the immediate vicinity of the Terra Vi & YUC neighbors will be extreme and a dramatic departure from the rustic feel that these homesteader families originally sought and have enjoyed through the years. Such a dramatic change is an unfair taking of quality of life and property values for these homeowners.	The Draft EIR evaluates potential noise and lighting effects in Chapters 4.12 and 4.1, respectively. As noted in Response ORG9-81, traffic congestion is no longer a CEQA area of impact.
ORG9-84	• Is this really an appropriate location for large scale development given the significant effects on and risks to the neighbors who settled the land? In the Overview of Project Alternatives, they mention the 'scar' parcel as an alternate that would allow basically the same development, but they don't highlight the significant benefit of the scar in avoiding dramatically affecting the properties and quality of life of neighbors.	Chapter 6, Alternatives, of the Draft EIR analyzes project alternatives in comparison to the impacts analysis of the proposed project. The purpose of the off-site alternative is to compare potential impacts of the project on the off-site location to those of the project at its proposed location (please see Section 6.5.2, Alternate Location Alternative, of the Draft EIR for a description of the alternative and the comparative analysis). As shown in Table 6-1 on page 6-3 of the Draft EIR, the Alternate Location Alternative would result in similar impacts to the proposed project for most environmental

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
		categories analyzed except for Noise, where it would result in substantially lessened impacts than the proposed project, and Public Services, Parks, and Recreation, and Utilities and Service Systems, where it would result in slightly lessened impacts than the proposed project. Section 6.7 of the Draft EIR further compares all of the alternatives analyzed and suggests that the Environmentally Superior Alternative would either be the No Project Alternative or the Reduced Footprint Alternative. However, the Reduced Footprint Alternative would not meet all of the project objectives and its financial feasibility is unknown.
ORG9-85	• Both construction noise during the multiple years of development and ongoing operational noise will be significant for neighbors, particularly given the elevated and exposed nature of the parcel.	The commenter expresses concerns regarding the project's noise generation but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. Noise is evaluated in Chapter 4.12, Noise, of the Draft EIR and a Supplemental Noise Analysis is provided in Appendix L of this Final EIR.
ORG9-86	• Noise levels from the proposed helipad (NOI-3.1) would have significant impact on neighbors. While stated as for emergency use only, a helipad may over time be used for non-emergency guest access, sightseeing and other activities that could further ruin the serenity of the area that neighboring landowners have always enjoyed, also further decreasing the value of their properties.	As stated on page 3-18 of the Draft EIR, the County will include a Condition of Approval which prohibits the use of the helipad for non-emergency uses.
ORG9-87	• If Terra Vi is developed as planned, the neighbors will have to drive through the resort along Sawmill Mountain Road to get to their homes. This is clearly a significant impact that changes the nature of their properties and experience as landowners.	Please see Response ORG9-81.
ORG9-88	• LU-1 speaks to “if a project would physically divide an established community”. It is clearly the case that the project itself is dividing the long-time established residential community, and the need to physically pass through the resort to enter neighboring properties is indeed a permanent physical divide created by the development.	As described in impact discussion LU-1, the proposed project would not create any physical barriers in the surrounding vicinity and therefore is not considered to create a significant impact.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
ORG9-89	• FOR-1 states that the project would not conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forestland (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g)), and states significance as "No Impact", which is disingenuous, as this is forest land (and has an existing Cal Fire agreement confirming so) that is to be specifically converted for this project.	The project site is not currently used or zoned for timber production, and tree density is diminished due to the previous Rim Fire; therefore, the project is not considered forestland or timberland. The project's non-compliance with the CFIP contract and intended cancellation of the contract is noted in impact discussion FOR-2. However, non-compliance with a contract is not a CEQA impact.
ORG9-90	• In LU-3, it is stated that the projects would not create land use conflicts within the county. Nothing seems farther from the truth given the dramatic impacts the cumulative projects will have on the residential neighbors and neighborhood.	The discussion in impact discussion LU-3 considers potential cumulative impacts. As described in Response ORG9-81, potential effects to surrounding neighbors are addressed throughout the EIR in other chapters. Each chapter also includes a consideration of potential cumulative impacts.
ORG9-91	• Did the zoning change pushed through years ago fairly take into account these negative consequences and loss of property value and quality of life to the neighbors who originally settled this land? There certainly seems significant land use inconsistency, not addressed in the EIR, in trying to place this development right in the heart of a well-established homesteader community consisting of over thirty multi-generational RE-2, RE-5 and A10/RR properties.	The comment pertains to a previous rezoning of the project site. This EIR considers the proposed project in the context of baseline conditions, under which the project site is zoned Commercial Recreation.
ORG9-92	• In the Land Use & Planning Chart, item 1.C.2, Terra Vi wrongly states that the project is consistent with the County's plan as it will not "necessitate additional housing elsewhere, as discussed in Chapter 4.13, Population and Housing." – this is simply false given the limited onsite housing specified vs. the true staffing level required to run a resort of this scale.	Page 4.13-4 of the Draft EIR addresses this concern and states: "Although some of the jobs generated as a result of the proposed project can be potentially filled by existing residents of the county, there is a possibility that some future employees of the proposed project may relocate to the region in order to work at the hotel lodge. Generally, it is expected that the 40 jobs projected on-site can likely be filled by existing County residents. In the event that future employees

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
		relocate to the region for employment on the project site, the population increase would not exceed State growth projections for the County. Additionally, this growth was included in growth projections in the General Plan and General Plan EIR. Further, on-site employee housing reduces the number of off-site housing required to accommodate the growth and would not induce a substantial number of unplanned new residents or housing needed in the county." Please also see Response ORG9-65.
ORG9-93	SCENIC HIGHWAY • Highway 120 in our area is an officially designated State Scenic Highway, which Cal Trans defines in part by "…the extent to which development intrudes upon the traveler's enjoyment of the view." The development as proposed, with its continuous, sprawling complex as shown in the architectural plans, will have an enormous, highly visible presence from Highway 120. This design does not seem in keeping with the nature of the scenic corridor and associated designation.	Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines identifies a scenic highway as a State-designated scenic highway. Highway 120 is not a designated scenic highway in the project site vicinity. Nevertheless, Chapter 4.1, Aesthetics, contains a detailed discussion of potential visual impacts of the proposed project when viewed from Highway 120.
ORG9-94	• AES-2 claims the project would not substantially degrade the view from a Scenic Highway – this is not the case. While the rendering on sheets T0.01 and T0.02 present an extensive array of large, mature trees separating the complex from the highway, there is in fact very little visual break from the highway, and none at all in many areas. The proximity of the development to the highway and the fact that the improvements are uphill from the highway will leave the extensive complex highly visible from the road in both directions. Such a large complex designed parallel to the highway with connected structures with such dramatic visibility from the road will be highly inconsistent with the rest of the scenic corridor.	Highway 120 is not a designated scenic highway in the project site vicinity. Nevertheless, Chapter 4.1, Aesthetics, contains a detailed discussion of potential visual impacts of the proposed project when viewed from Highway 120 and shows that existing and proposed vegetation would provide substantial screening of proposed structures.
ORG9-95	• The graphics created with thick, bushy trees dropped in on pages 102, 103 106 & 107 of the EIR PDF (Figure 4.1-6b & c & 7b & c) are deceptive, do not reflect the density of native conifers, which they state are to be planted, and significantly overstate the blockage newly planted native trees would create. Structures would remain in clear view from the highway well after 5 years.	The visual simulations in Chapter 4.1, Aesthetics, of the Draft EIR are based on the specific species growth characteristics, including size at planting and growth over 5- and 10-year periods, and placement shown on the proposed landscaping plan. However,

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
		as described on pages 4.1-26 to 4.1-27 of the Draft EIR, "With implementation of Mitigation Measure WF-2, the project landscaping plans would be revised for compliance with the Vegetation Management Plan. Therefore, the vegetation installed along Sawmill Mountain Road and Highway 120 would appear different than they appear in the visual simulations shown in Figures 4.1-6a through 4.1-9c. Compliance with Mitigation Measure WF-2 would involve installation of plantings in a way that strategically staggers placement and planting heights to provide effective screening of the proposed project from adjacent roadways. The mitigated condition plantings, although installed farther from Highway 120 and more widely spaced, would still fill the visual space and screen the proposed project from Highway 120 and Sawmill Mountain Road."
ORG9-96	• At Rush Creek Lodge, we were required to set all facilities back and out of direct view from the scenic highway. The same should be required of Terra Vi.	Highway 120 is not a designated scenic highway in the project site vicinity. Nevertheless, the project site plan has been designed to orient the proposed project along Sawmill Mountain Road rather than Highway 120 to reduce the visual impact of the project when viewed from Highway 120.
ORG9-97	• FOR-2 describes taking out 29 pines along Highway 120 for intersection improvements along with others internal to the site. Given the fire damage and the limited number of trees remaining along the frontage, taking out 29 established pines seems a mistake and counter to the goal of blocking views of the uphill facilities from the scenic highway.	The comment is noted. The comment does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. The visual simulations for Viewpoint #3 in Chapter 4.1, Aesthetics, of the Draft EIR illustrate that screening at this intersection would be provided by proposed on-site landscaping.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
ORG9-98	UTILITIES • UTIL-12, "The proposed project would not result in a substantial increase in electrical service demands and would not require new energy supply facilities and transmission infrastructure or capacity enhancing alterations to existing facilities." is described as Less Than Significant Impact. The UTIL-12 analysis speaks to broad PG&E distribution systems statewide, but doesn't speak to if there is enough capacity along the dead end lines feeding the Sawmill area. Given our directly relevant experience, we would be surprised if new transmission infrastructure would not be required for these two developments. Adding that new infrastructure may have meaningful impacts on neighbors as well.	Any impacts associated with the construction and installation of local infrastructure on-site are analyzed as part of the Draft EIR. An existing Pacific Gas & Electric overhead transmission line traverses the project site within an easement. The project seeks to underground the portion of the transmission line from Sawmill Mountain Road eastward to the lot line between the two project site parcels. Impacts associated with this work have been analyzed as part of the Draft EIR.
ORG9-99	• Whereas projected electrical consumption appears reasonable, proposed propane consumption is only a small fraction of what will likely be required.	The comment does not address the adequacy of the Draft EIR.
ORG9-100	OTHER A number of mitigating operational plans proposed don't feel genuine and appear to be included only as proposal marketing tools. It would be great to have formal assurances that what is outlined will be implemented and is not just being used to reduce approval obligations, then abandoned. • Will the market indeed be the only amenity open to the general public, with no outside patrons allowed in the restaurant? Or is this called out to minimize apparent onsite traffic and operating scale impacts and associated requirements?	The proposed restaurant would not be open to the public.
ORG9-101	• Is it really the case given the onsite restaurant that the developers plan to use all recyclable flatware & utensils? Or is this just stated to justify minimizing water and wastewater projections?	The project proposes to use recyclable, single-use flatware and utensils to reduce water usage and wastewater demand.
ORG9-102	• The developers use composting as part of their energy efficiency, GHG rationale. Aside from the challenges of managing commercial composting, given bears and associated closed trash container requirements, we can't fathom this is doable.	The comment does not address the adequacy of the Draft EIR. The County and project applicant are aware that any composting program would need to be designed so as not to attract wildlife.
ORG9-103	• Given the incredible volume of material provided in the EIR, it seems very strange that draft floor plans aren't included for any of the guest rooms. In seems important to know, in particular, if any type of cooking facilities are intended in units.	Cooking facilities are not proposed in guest rooms.

Comment #	Comment	Response
ORG9-104	DEVELOPMENT PACE • In considering the Hansji & Yosemite Under Canvas developments, in light of Berkeley Camp & Yosemite Lakes, the County should carefully assess pace of development and take into account that the additions of lodging to our corridor have happened incrementally over many years, which has served the County well, allowing each business to stabilize and generate the significant, reliable tax base that has become so important to the County.	The opinion of the commenter is noted. The comment does not address the adequacy of the Draft EIR.
ORG9-105	• For example, we bought the 18 cabin Evergreen Lodge in 2001 and added 48 new rooms there in 2004. We then added 24 more rooms in 2009. Then, 7 years later in 2016, we opened Rush Creek. These stepwise additions over time allowed new inventory to be successfully absorbed into the marketplace, and this disciplined approach has proven out well for the community overall.	The comment does not address the adequacy of the Draft EIR.
ORG9-106	• This disciplined approach to growth is especially relevant now, given the current economic and health crisis caused by the ongoing global pandemic. We and other businesses are struggling mightily to survive not only the long closure but also the travel restrictions and associated limited demand for travel to our area now that we have reopened. We are counting on a return of this demand when the pandemic subsides; however, the timeline for a 'return to normalcy' is unclear. International and domestic 'fly to' tourism may not fully come back for years. Given the historically challenging economic environment, is this the best time to push rapid approval of the addition of hundreds of lodging units on our corridor, nearly doubling the lodging supply?	The comment does not address the adequacy of the Draft EIR.
ORG9-107	• While we know the County is excited about expanding its tax base, which we support, such large scale, nearly simultaneous facilities approvals/additions put the existing tax base at risk, and we encourage the County to be thoughtful about the scale and pace of development along the corridor.	The comment does not address the adequacy of the Draft EIR.
ORG9-108	Given the number of immediate neighbors involved, the scale of what is being proposed and its impact on the Groveland housing, staffing and hospitality markets, along with the other hospitality additions planned in the immediate area which will exacerbate the impact of this development, we encourage discipline, thoughtfulness, and the sincere consideration of all voices in the approval process. Thank you for addressing our comments and those of other concerned parties as you assess the appropriateness and viability of the Terra Vi development. We appreciate your critical, methodical review of the significant impacts and risks of this project on the immediate and broader neighbors in the area.	The comment does not address the adequacy of the Draft EIR.
ORG10	**Tuolumne County Alliance for Resources & Environment, Inc., Melinda Fleming, Executive Director, July 30, 2020**	

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
ORG10-01	TuCARE is a community based non-profit organization founded in 1988. Our membership is made up of a cross-section of our community including local businesspersons, educators, and those actively engaged in working daily with our natural resources. TuCARE supports the wise use of the many resources on our federal lands. Multiple-use policies allow for everyone to benefit. TuCARE believes that man must play an active role to ensure our resources are available both now and in the future. After reviewing the Terra Vi Lodge Yosemite Project Draft Environmental Impact Report, TuCARE offers the following comments in order to assist you in making the appropriate decision that will benefit local stakeholders and at the same time provide for the long term health and vitality of forest resources.	The comment introduces the commenter, the TuCARE community based non-profit. No response is required.
ORG10-02	Property Rights: A discussion and decision regarding this proposed project must include acknowledgement of the value placed on the rights of property owners to pursue amenable use of their property. Based on the report, the property owners are attempting to follow the guidelines and instructions mandated by Tuolumne County ordinances and regulations. In addition, the property owners have attempted to take into consideration the adjacent properties' environmental values and accepted historical land uses in their project plans.	The comment is noted. Property values are outside the scope of CEQA.
ORG10-03	Wildfire, forest health: Increasing fire frequency in recent years has become the focal point in many land use decisions. As stated in the project report, should the No Project Alternative (#3) be chosen, the existing threat of wildfire will continue. The course of land management described in the project includes fuels reduction, and a Wildfire Mitigation Plan that will be subject to approval by CAL-FIRE and Tuolumne County Fire Department.	The commenter expresses support for the project due to project characteristics which slightly reduce the risk of wildfire such as fuel reduction and a Wildfire Mitigation Plan subject to CAL FIRE and TCFD approval.
ORG10-04	Project Objectives: The Project Objectives as outlined in the report (#'s 3-7) align with TuCARE's Mission Statement. Land use compatibility, sustainable land management, the wise use of natural resources, and the economic influx a project like this can have for our communities are addressed in this project. TuCARE is committed to the wise use of our natural resources. It is our intention to provide comments that will reflect wise use and reasonable solutions to problems shared by all. To that end, we hope you find our comments helpful in your determination of the most appropriate action.	The commenter expresses support for the project due to project characteristics that align with the commenter's organization goals of supporting land use compatibility, sustainable land management, sustainable use of natural resources, and economic benefits.
ORG11	**Shute, Mihaly & Weinberger LLP, Laurel Impett, Urban Planner, September 16, 2020**	

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
ORG11-01	Dear Ms. Yaley: On behalf of Save Sawmill Mountain, please find attached a report prepared by transportation engineer Neal Liddicoat with Griffin Cove Transportation Consultants, PLLC ("GCTC"), which provides supplemental comments on the Terra Vi Lodge Yosemite Project's Draft Environmental Impact Report ("DEIR"). Given the extensive flaws in the DEIR's transportation impact analysis and the potential for severe impacts pertaining to emergency evacuation and traffic hazards that would accompany the proposed Project, Save Sawmill Mountain believed that it was imperative to retain a transportation engineer to evaluate the DEIR's analysis. Please include the GCTC report in the record for the proposed Project. Very truly yours, SHUTE, MIHALY & WEINBERGER LLP. Dear Ms. Impett: As requested, Griffin Cove Transportation Consulting, PLLC (GCTC) has completed a review of the transportation analysis completed with respect to the proposed Terra Vi Lodge Yosemite project (Project) in Tuolumne County, California. The proposed project is the subject of a Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) prepared for the County. (Reference: Placeworks, Terra Vi Lodge Project Draft Environmental Impact Report, June 2020) The "Transportation" component of the DEIR is largely based on information presented in a traffic study presented in Appendix J1 to the DEIR. (Reference: KD Anderson & Associates, Inc., Transportation Impact Analysis for Terra Vi Resort, June 15, 2020) In addition, an analysis of Project-related vehicle-miles-traveled, which was performed by Wood-Rodgers, is included in DEIR Appendix J2. (Reference: Memorandum to Mr. Darin Grossi from Mario Tambellini, PE, TE, Terra Vi Lodge VMT Analysis, June 6, 2020.) Our review focused on the technical adequacy of the transportation analysis presented in the DEIR, including the detailed procedures and conclusions documented in the KD Anderson (KDA) and Wood-Rodgers reports. BACKGROUND The proposed Project would be located on the northeast corner of the intersection of State Route 120 (SR 120, also known locally as Big Oak Flat Road) and Forest Route 1S03 (known locally as Sawmill Mountain Road). Vehicular access is proposed via two driveways on Forest	The comment provides an introduction to the comments below. Please see Responses ORG11-01 through ORG11-24.

Comment #	Comment	Response
	Route 1S03. In addition, an emergency vehicle-only access is proposed on SR 120, a short distance east of the development. As described in the DEIR Project Description and illustrated on the project site plan, the proposed project would consist of the following components: • Lodge – 100 guest rooms, • Cabins – 26 guest rooms in seven buildings, • Managers' suites – Two units within the lodge to accommodate the Project's managers, • Public market – 2,800 square feet (SF), • Employee housing – 5 apartments accommodating 20 employees, and • Restaurant – 16,787 SF. For reference, the project site plan is presented as Attachment A. For reasons that are unclear, the proposed restaurant is illustrated on the site plan, but is not included in the Project Description and was not addressed in the transportation analyses. Similarly, the two managers' suites are included in the detailed description of the hotel lodge (DEIR, p. 3-8), but are otherwise ignored in the transportation analyses. Average lodge occupancy is projected to be 290 guests and the maximum projected occupancy is 400 guests. The 26 cabin guest rooms are expected to have an average of 104 guests, with maximum occupancy of 156 guests. Thus, on an average day, the Project would accommodate 394 guests; 556 guests would be present on a peak day with maximum occupancy. (DEIR, p. 3-8)	
ORG11-02	DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT REVIEW Our review of the DEIR revealed several issues affecting the validity of the transportation analysis results. These issues, which are presented below, must be addressed prior to certification of the environmental document and approval of the proposed Project by Tuolumne County. 1. Emergency Evacuation – The proposed Project is located in a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone and the Project site burned as recently as seven years ago in the 2013 Rim Fire. (DEIR, p. 3-23 & 4.9-19) Despite this, insufficient consideration was given in the DEIR to the feasibility of safely evacuating the Project site. This is a particularly critical issue, given that the vast majority	Please see Master Response 4 regarding emergency evacuation.

Comment #	Comment	Response
	of the individuals on the site will be unfamiliar with the area. A significant issue for evacuations from the Project is the relative lack of available routes. In short, only SR 120 is available to serve this role for the Project. This significant constraint in the Project-area road system reinforces the need to provide a comprehensive evacuation plan, including detailed analysis of the ability of that system to accommodate the surge of traffic that would occur in the event of a wildland fire. Two DEIR significance criteria apply to this critical safety issue. The first, which is designated as HAZ-6, addresses whether the project would "impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or an emergency evacuation plan." This is primarily judged relative to the project's compliance with applicable laws, regulations, and General Plan policies. The DEIR concludes that it does comply, so the impact is less than significant. Such compliance, however, has little bearing on whether the site can be evacuated safely. (DEIR, p. 4.9-18) The second criterion, HAZ-7, concerns whether the project would expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires. The DEIR acknowledges the project's location within a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone and the recent fire history, but the only mention of evacuation is a reference to a "project design feature" concerning "an early evacuation protocol." No evacuation plan is presented and no assessment is provided with regard to the feasibility of evacuating the site. This raises obvious questions regarding the validity of the "less than significant" impact finding. (DEIR, pp. 4.9-19)	
ORG11-03	Given the Project site's fire history, the DEIR must address the feasibility of safely implementing an emergency evacuation, including estimates of the amount of time needed to implement a full evacuation of the Project site and whether the evacuation time is acceptable, based on a reasonable standard of safety. Further, an analysis must be conducted to determine the adequacy of the sole vehicular evacuation route, SR 120. Specific issues that must be addressed include: • How many Project-related vehicles need to be accommodated during an evacuation? Such an estimate must account for up to 42 employees (including management) and 556 guests, as well as other patrons (at the convenience market, for example) and service people at the resort facilities.	Please see Master Response 4 regarding emergency evacuation.
ORG11-04	• How many non-Project vehicles will already be on SR 120 at the time of an evacuation, consuming badly-needed roadway capacity? SR 120 will be the primary evacuation route for	The comment cites the total number of vehicles that entered Yosemite National Park

Comment #	Comment	Response
	areas other than the proposed project, including (as an obvious example) the residents of the existing homes on Forest Service Road 1S03, as well as the residents of the homes on Hardin Flat Road and any service or delivery persons who might also be present in the area. Also, tourists, employees, vendors, and service people in a substantial portion of Yosemite National Park would depend upon SR 120 as their primary evacuation route. The national park is, of course, busiest during the peak fire season of July through October. (Source: www.frontlinewildfire.com/when-california-fire-season/) For example, according to statistics provided on the National Park Service website, in July 2019, the traffic count at the Big Oak Flat entrance on SR 120 at the west entrance to the park totaled 81,448 vehicles. August 2019 traffic counts at that location were a little lower (77,356), but still substantial. Attachment B presents traffic count data for that location from January 1985 through February 2020. In addition, a number of other projects are proposed in the vicinity of Terra Vi, which would also affect the feasibility of safely evacuating the area surrounding the proposed Project. Of particular concern is the proposed Yosemite Under Canvas project, which would be located directly across SR 120 from the Project site. In addition to its primary vehicular access point on Hardin Flat Road, that 99-tent campground facility proposes a second, emergency-only access point via Forest Service Road 1S09, which would intersect SR 120 less than 200 feet west of Sawmill Mountain Road (i.e., the Terra Vi access point). The relatively close proximity of these two access points creates the potential for traffic conflicts, particularly during an emergency evacuation when drivers are likely to be distracted and, therefore, careless or otherwise act in unpredictable or erratic ways.	during various months. A total of 81,448 were reported for July 2019. The Big Oak Flat count station is one of seven locations monitored by the National Parks Service. The sum of all July 2019 counts at these stations was 393,107, and Big Oak Flat traffic was 21 percent of the total. Traffic count data is available since 1985. Entrances have been closed at various times over the summer, and as a result the volume of traffic at each location has varied from month to month. The comment implies that some portion of Yosemite National Park's guests might use the Big Oak Flat gate in the event of an evacuation. However, the number of evacuating vehicles that might be added to that route would depend on the location of the event creating the need for evacuation and the availability of alternative routes. The County does not anticipate a scenario in which the project site area would be evacuated at the same time as another community. Please see Master Response 4 for more details on evacuation. The number of vehicles leaving the Yosemite Under Canvas project during an evacuation would likely mimic the number of camping spaces and employees. That project's Draft EIR notes that 130 parking spaces will be provided for guests and employees, and 130 vehicles might be evacuated if all spaces were full. The Yosemite Under Canvas project includes an emergency access to an existing minor unpaved road that intersects

Comment #	Comment	Response
		Highway 120 west of Sawmill Mountain Road. That road connects to the State highway within a broad gravel area and, with proposed improvements to the Highway 120/Sawmill Mountain Road intersection, motorists entering at each location would have a clear view of traffic entering Highway 120 on the other side of the street. While it is recognized that conditions during an evacuation may at times be chaotic, the distance between the two intersections provides adequate sight distance for the speed that those vehicles would each be entering Highway 120 (i.e., 20 to 25 mph).
ORG11-05	• What is the capacity of SR 120, and how much of that capacity would be available to accommodate evacuating vehicles? This analysis must assess whether the sole available evacuation route from the Project will be able to accommodate a sudden influx of vehicles associated with an emergency evacuation. This analysis must address the specific characteristics of the evacuation route, in this case SR 120. Those characteristics include various parameters reflecting the horizontal and vertical alignment of the road, including the presence of curves, sight distance restrictions, or significant uphill or downhill sections, such as on Priest Grade west of the Project site.	Please see Master Response 4.
ORG11-06	• How much "mobilization time" will be required in connection with an evacuation? Mobilization represents the pre-evacuation notification and preparation period. It is particularly critical with respect to fires that start in close proximity to the proposed project.	Please see Master Response 4 regarding emergency evacuation.
ORG11-07	• How long will the evacuation itself take, and what will be the travel time to a safe location?	The "safe" location during any particular incident would depend on the nature and location of the event that created the need for an evacuation. The required travel time would vary based on the distance from the "safe" location from Terra Vi.
ORG11-08	• What will be the effect of sudden surges in SR 120 traffic that would occur during an evacuation? It is extremely unlikely that traffic would be evenly distributed over time in the event of an evacuation. Instead, there will be variable pulses in traffic demand, just as there are in everyday traffic flows.	Please see Master Response 4 regarding emergency evacuation.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
ORG11-09	• How will traffic operations on SR 120 be affected by the following factors, which are likely to prevail during an emergency evacuation due to a wildland fire? o The possibility that the road will be obscured by smoke or other fire-related factors, such as visible flames or embers. o The effects of trucks, recreational vehicles, or vehicles towing trailers in the evacuating traffic stream. o The emotional state of the evacuees, who will largely be unfamiliar with the area, which could lead to irrational or unpredictable behavior by drivers.	Please see Master Response 4 regarding emergency evacuation.
ORG11-10	In summary, the DEIR completely fails to address the feasibility of safely evacuating the Project site in the event of a wildland fire. No attempt was made to establish whether SR 120, the only evacuation route serving the Project, would have adequate capacity to perform that role and, therefore, to provide a safe means of escape from an approaching wildfire. A comprehensive evacuation plan must be prepared and incorporated into a revised DEIR that must then be recirculated for public review and comment.	Please see Master Response 4 regarding emergency evacuation.
ORG11-11	2. Proposed SR 120 Improvements – The DEIR "Construction" section (DEIR, p. 4.15-15) references project-related improvements proposed along SR 120 near the site – an eastbound left-turn lane, a westbound right-turn lane, and an eastbound receiving lane on SR 120. As it notes: These improvements are outside of the project site within the Caltrans right-of-way. Those same improvements are included in the discussion of "TRANS-3 - Impacts to SR 120 Based on Access Design." (DEIR, p. 4.15-19) This impact is identified as "significant" based on sight distance deficiencies. Mitigation Measure TRANS-3 calls for construction of the proposed left-turn lane, which: . . . will require cutting the hillside and vegetation removal in conformance with Caltrans standards, which will open the line of site [sic] to an acceptable distance, as determined by Caltrans. This cutting of the hillside will occur in the Caltrans right-of-way, which is beyond the jurisdiction of the Lead Agency (Tuolumne County). Consequently, there is no certainty that the mitigation measure will be accomplished, and this impact should therefore be identified as Significant and Unavoidable. (DEIR, p. 4.15-21)	The improvements called for in Mitigation Measure TRANS-3 would be approved and implemented as part of the encroachment permit that is part of the Project Description, and would be required for conformance to Caltrans standards. The improvements would be implemented by the proposed project, not Caltrans. Nevertheless, Mitigation Measure TRANS-3 has been revised, as shown in Table 1-1 and Chapter 3, Revisions to the Draft EIR, to specify that the encroachment permit that would allow these improvements shall be approved prior to the initiation of project construction and that improvements to Highway 120 shall be completed prior to operation of the proposed project. This is consistent with typical procedures for construction projects in the county.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
ORG11-12	3. Sight Distance – As noted above, Impact TRANS-3 was designated as significant, due to sight distance deficiencies. Although Mitigation Measure TRANS-3 is purported to resolve this issue, the sight distance analysis on which this determination was based is flawed. Specifically, the sight distance analysis was performed relative to the 55 MPH speed limit. To account for vehicles that exceed the speed limit, it is customary to assume a speed that is at least 5 MPH greater than the posted speed limit (unless actual speed data are available, in which case that information should be used). In fact, the DEIR states: (p. 4.15-20): *Acceptable sight distances are determined by the speed of vehicles on the uncontrolled approaches to the intersection.* Note the reference to "the speed of vehicles," rather than to the speed limit. It is a commonly-accepted fact that some drivers exceed the posted speed limit. In fact, speed limits are often established based on the "85th-percentile speed," which is defined as the speed at or below which 85 percent of all vehicles are observed to travel; by definition, 15 percent of the observed vehicles exceed this speed. The stopping sight distance values employed in the DEIR traffic analysis were taken from "Table 201.1– Sight Distance Standards" in the Caltrans Highway Design Manual (p. 200-2). For ease of reference, that table is presented here as Attachment C. As shown there, the speed column in the table is clearly labeled "Design Speed" and not speed limit. The design speed is invariably higher than the speed limit; if it were equal to or less than the speed limit, then vehicles traveling at or even slightly above the speed limit would exceed the physical capabilities of the roadway. Moreover, a footnote references Topic 101 in the Highway Design Manual for more information regarding selection of design speed. Within "Topic 101 – Design Speed" in the Highway Design Manual, Index 101.1(2) specifically addresses the selection of an appropriate design speed for use in a sight distance analysis. As it states: *Generally the posted speed is a reliable indicator of operating speed although operating speeds frequently exceed posted speeds. . . . For existing limited access highways and conventional highways in rural areas other than Main Streets, the selected design speed for these higher-speed facilities typically is 15 to 20 mph higher than the observed motor vehicle speed (operating speed).*	Please see Responses ORG6-63, ORG6-64, and ORG6-65 regarding improvements to Highway 120. In addition, please refer to Sheet C3 of the project application contained in Appendix B of the Draft EIR, which indicates that with the proposed improvements, the available sight distance will be 660 feet, which matches the "advisable" distance suggested by the comment.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response

In other words, according to Caltrans, the appropriate design speed for a roadway such as SR 120 with a posted (or operating) speed of 55 MPH is 70 – 75 MPH. Table 1 below summarizes stopping sight distance information for design speeds ranging from 55 – 75 MPH, as presented in "Table 201.1 – Sight Distance Standards" in the Caltrans Highway Design Manual. This information is also presented in DEIR "Table 4.15-6 Sight Distance Standards" (except for the 75 MPH value).

Table 1
Stopping Sight Distance Standards[1]

Design Speed (MPH[2])	Minimum Stopping Sight Distance (Feet)
55	500
60	580
65	660
70	750
75	840

Notes:
1 Reference: Caltrans, *Highway Design Manual*, 7th Edition, July 1, 2020, "Table 201.1 – Sight Distance Standards," p. 200-1.
2 Miles per hour.

Mitigation Measure TRANS-3 does not specify the amount of stopping sight distance to be provided at the SR 120/Forest Route 1S03 intersection. To ensure safe operation, a minimum of 580 feet of stopping sight distance must be provided (i.e., the value for 60 MPH) and it would be advisable to provide 660 feet, which would allow safe operation at up to 65 MPH. These values represent the low end of the
range of likely design speeds for SR 120 at the Project site. To comply with Caltrans standards, though, as much as 840 feet might be necessary.

Further perspective on the sight distance issue can be gained by referring to the universally-accepted design resource, A Policy on Geometric Design of Highways and Streets (Sixth Edition, 2011). This document, which is published by the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO), is widely used as the primary source of roadway design parameters. It specifically calls for the use of the design speed, not the speed limit, in determining the required stopping sight distance.

According to the AASHTO document (p. 3-4), stopping sight distance (SSD) on a level roadway is calculated using the following formula:

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
	SSD = 1.47Vt + (1.075)(V2/a), where: SSD = Stopping sight distance (in feet) V = Design speed, MPH t = Brake reaction time (2.5 seconds) a = Deceleration rate (11.2 feet/second^2) The first portion of this equation computes the "brake reaction distance," which describes how far the vehicle travels while the driver recognizes a need to stop and actually hits the brake pedal. The second element of the equation provides the braking distance (i.e., how long it takes to stop the vehicle after the brakes are applied). Note the reference to "design speed" in the equation, rather than speed limit. Further support for our position is provided by referring to the research document that served as the basis for the establishment of the AASHTO stopping sight distance equation: National Cooperative Highway Research Program Report 400 – Determination of Stopping Sight Distances (Transportation Research Board, 1997). Particularly with regard to speed, the NCHRP document states (p. 73): *This research and other studies documented in the literature show that many drivers exceed the inferred design speed (design speed calculated using current criteria and existing geometry) of horizontal and vertical curves. The consistency of these results does not support the use of initial speeds less than the roadway's design speed for determining stopping sight distance requirements.* This strongly suggests that vehicles approaching the Project site will, at a minimum, exceed the 55 MPH speed limit and will likely even exceed the design speed. Further, it states that, at minimum, the design speed should be used to derive the safe stopping sight distance. As noted above, the stopping sight distance analysis presented in the DEIR fails to account for vehicle operation above the speed limit. The inappropriate use of the posted speed limit (instead of the design speed) in determining the required safe stopping sight distance is a substantial flaw in the DEIR. Mitigation Measure TRANS-3 "will require cutting the hillside and vegetation removal," but the quantity of such work is unspecified because it is unknown. This failure to specify the amount of stopping sight	

Comment #	Comment	Response
	distance to be required represents a further flaw in the mitigation measure. In short, no evidence is provided to support the feasibility of the proposed mitigation measure. If the measure is, in fact, infeasible, the Project would result in a significant safety impact and many drivers approaching the site on SR 120 will be unable to safely avoid any obstructions that might be present in the SR 120/Forest Route 1S03 intersection, as they will be unable to stop before entering the intersection. The result will be additional collisions within the intersection, which will be exacerbated by construction of the Project. Finally, we note that no assessment has been provided with regard to the secondary impacts that might be incurred in connection with hillside cutting and vegetation removal that are directly associated with implementation of Mitigation Measure TRANS-3. These impacts might be substantial, particularly if Caltrans determines that the appropriate design speed is 70 or 75 MPH.	
ORG11-13	4. Eastbound Left-Turn Lane – The Project proposes to construct an eastbound left-turn lane on SR 120 at Forest Route 1S03 (DEIR, p. 4.15-19), as follows: *. . . a new eastbound left turn lane is proposed on SR 120 as part of the proposed Project. The new lane would be about 390 feet long and be proceeded [sic] by a 50-foot-long bay taper. While the proposed lane meets Caltrans design standards for left turn lane storage (i.e., minimum 50 feet) and deceleration from 55 mph, the final confirmation of design requirements will be by Caltrans during the encroachment permit review process.* The design of the proposed left-turn lane is deficient, however. First, the proposed 50-foot-long bay taper on the approach to the lane is too short. The Caltrans Highway Design Manual says (p. 400-34): *On rural high-speed highways, a 120-foot length is considered appropriate.* Second, the 390-foot length of the lane itself is inadequate. Fifty feet of the 390 feet are for storage (i.e., to accommodate vehicles waiting to turn left), leaving 340 feet for deceleration. HDM Table 405.2B (p. 400-35), which is presented here as Attachment D shows the following deceleration lane lengths for various speeds: • 60 MPH (i.e., 55 MPH speed limit + 5 MPH): 530 feet,	Please see Responses ORG6-63, ORG6-64, and ORG6-65, and Sheet C3 of the project application contained in Appendix B of the Draft EIR. The final length of the bay taper would be determined in consultation with Caltrans as part of the encroachment permit process. As noted in Highway Design Manual Section 405.2 (2) D., the length of the bay taper is included in the deceleration lane determination. The sum of bay taper and the left turn lane is not illustrated in Sheet C3 but measures at roughly 460 feet. As noted in HDM Table 405.2b, this distance falls within the values that are applicable for entering the turn lane from 50 mph (435 feet) and from 60 mph (530 feet). The LOS calculations completed for this intersection indicate that the queue of vehicles at the end of the left turn lane on Saturdays would be one vehicle or less, but the HDM suggests that space for two waiting vehicles would be

Comment #	Comment	Response
	• 55 MPH: 483 feet, • 50 MPH: 435 feet, and • 45 MPH: 375 feet. Thus, the highest speed that be accommodated within the 390-foot left-turn lane (i.e., 50-ft. bay taper + 340 ft. deceleration lane, excluding the 50 ft. storage length) is about 47 MPH. The HDM does allow partial deceleration in the thru lane prior to entry into the turn lane, but we believe that substantial thru lane deceleration on a high-speed state highway is a bad, unsafe idea.	available. With this reduction, the deceleration distance is 410 feet, which would represent an entry speed just below 50 mph. Because the HDM allows for deceleration outside of the bay taper of up to 20 mph, the proposed design is adequate.
ORG11-14	5. Eastbound SR 120 Receiving Lane – The Project proposes to provide an eastbound receiving lane to offset the safety impacts associated with drivers making a left turn from the Project site onto high-speed SR 120. Specifically, the receiving lane is intended to allow drivers to accelerate to match the speed of traffic on SR 120. However, the DEIR acknowledges that the proposed receiving lane is inadequate. The proposed lane would be 150 feet long, when 1,000 feet would be required, according to the DEIR. Despite this significant shortcoming, the DEIR simply shrugs it off (DEIR, p. 4.15-19): *It may be that the receiving lane will not be provided if Caltrans requirements exceed the proposed design.* The failure to identify this as a significant impact suggests that the County is willing to accept an unsafe condition that would be considerably exacerbated by construction of the Project. Moreover, given (1) the uncertainty as to whether the Project will actually implement the proposed mitigating improvement and (2) the fact that, even if implemented, the receiving lane will be inadequate, the impact should have been identified as significant and unavoidable. The extent of this impact is magnified by the high speeds on SR 120, which will substantially increase the forces involved in any resulting collisions, thereby resulting in greater levels of property damage and injury to those involved. The DEIR needs to be revised to appropriately identify this safety impact and its significant and unavoidable status.	Please see Response ORG6- 63 regarding the Highway 120 receiving lane.
ORG11-15	6. Project Trip Generation Estimate – The Project's trip generation estimate is summarized in DEIR Table 4.15-3 (p. 4.15-13) and KDA Table 7 (p. 21). That estimate was developed using trip generation rates presented in DEIR Table 4.15-2 (p. 4.15-11) and KDA Table 6 (p. 18). We have	The Draft EIR traffic analysis carefully considered the nature of the proposed market in preparing the trip generation

Comment #	Comment	Response

several comments regarding the trip generation estimate.

Retail Trip Generation

While the general approach to estimating Project-related trips is straightforward, the trip generation estimate for the proposed on-site 2,800 sq. ft. market is unusual. The traffic estimate for that land use is based on the average of trip rates for three very different types of retail uses: variety store, supermarket, and convenience store. It may be noteworthy that in over 40 years of preparing and reviewing traffic impact analyses, we have never seen this averaging approach employed.

According to DEIR Table 4.15-2 and KDA Table 6, those three uses have Saturday daily trip rates ranging from 63.47 trips/1,000 sq. ft. (for a variety store) to 1,084.17 trips/1,000 sq. ft. (for a convenience store). The resulting average is 441.75 trips/1,000 sq. ft., which is well below the more appropriate convenience store rate. Table 2 summarizes a comparison of the trip generation estimates for the proposed retail store using each of the three individual retail types, as well as the average trip rate. The values presented there are gross trip estimates, which do not account for internal or pass-by trips.

Table 2
Trip Generation Comparison – Saturday[1]
Terra Vi Lodge Retail (2,800 Sq. Ft.)

Retail Type		Saturday Daily Trips	PM Peak Hour of Generator
Variety Store (ITE Land Use Code 814)	Trip Rate[2,3]	63.47	7.42
	Trips	178	21
Supermarket (ITE Land Use Code 850)	Trip Rate	177.62	10.34
	Trips	497	29
Convenience Market (ITE Land Use Code 851)	Trip Rate	1,084.17	79.12
	Trips	3,036	222
Average	Trip Rate	441.75	32.29
	Trips	1,237	90

Notes:
1 KD Anderson & Associates, Inc., *Transportation Impact Analysis for Terra Vi Resort*, June 15, 2020, "Table 6 – Project Trip Generation Rates," p. 18.
2 Trips per 1,000 sq. ft.
3 Reference: Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE), *Trip Generation Manual*, 10th edition.

As shown, the Saturday daily trip estimates range from 178 (Variety Store) to 3,036 (Convenience Market). In comparison, the average value used in the DEIR is 1,237 daily trips, about 40 percent

estimate and there are many factors that make this use different from a standard convenience market (i.e., 7-11, Circle K, etc.). Notably, as the proposed project has been designed to reduce its visual presence along Highway 120, the proposed market would not be highly visible to passing motorists on Highway 120, which is a contrast from standard convenience markets, which are often part of auto-oriented developments. The Draft EIR analysis considered the trip generation characteristics of other retail uses and based the estimate on the average of rates published for Variety Stores, Supermarkets, and Convenience Markets. As noted in the comment, the range of sizes of the alternative retail uses consider by ITE varies, and both Variety Stores and Supermarkets are larger than the proposed market. While ITE guidelines suggest that the independent variable for the study site (i.e., building square feet) must be within the range of data included in the data plot and would indicate that the rates for neither Variety Store or Supermarket be the sole trip generation indicator for the proposed market, ITE guidelines do not preclude the use of these rates in the development of a composite trip generation forecast. The trips generation estimate for the proposed market is a reasonable estimate based on the available data.

Comment #	Comment	Response
	of the convenience market value. In the peak hour, the values range from as low as 21 trips (Variety Store) to 222 trips (Convenience Market), with an average value of 90 trips. While it may seem on the surface that use of the Convenience Market trip rates would result in excessively high trip generation estimates, bear in mind that the estimate is substantially reduced to account for internal and pass-by trips. As shown in DEIR Table 4.15-3 and KDA Table 7, those adjustments result in reductions in the Saturday PM peak-hour value from 90 trips to 26 trips, over a 70 percent reduction. Applying that same reduction to the estimated 222 trips associated with use of the Convenience Market rate would result in a net trip estimate of 64 peak-hour trips, which is entirely reasonable, although substantially greater than the value employed in the DEIR traffic analysis On a daily basis, the DEIR and the KDA report indicate approximately a 69 percent reduction due to internal and pass-by trips. Applying that factor to the 3,036 daily trips estimated using the Convenience Market rate results in a net daily trip generation estimate for the retail land use of 938 trips, which is again completely reasonable for this type of land use in this location, although substantially higher than the 382 trips suggested by the DEIR analysis. Finally, it is important to understand that in establishing the appropriate ITE trip generation rate to use in any particular situation, a range of factors must be considered. One key consideration is the size of the project compared to the size of the locations included within the ITE trip generation database. In this regard, the ITE Trip Generation Handbook (Third Edition, August 2014) specifically says (p. 27): *The value of the independent variable [in this case, square footage] for the study site must be within the range of data included in the data plot;* The size of the proposed market is 2,800 sq. ft. In comparison, the average size of the variety stores in the ITE database (9th Edition) is 10,000 sq. ft. and the average size of the supermarkets ranges from 37,000 to 56,000 sq. ft., depending upon what time period is under consideration. The smallest variety store in the ITE database is about 6,800 sq. ft. and the smallest supermarket is about 14,000 sq. ft. These types of stores are obviously much larger than the proposed retail facility, and the Project's convenience market is smaller than any of the ITE data collection sites for the other two types of stores. In other words, the Project store is not included ". . . within the range of data included in the [ITE] data plot."	

Comment #	Comment	Response
	The average convenience market size for various time periods in the ITE database is 2,000 – 3,000 sq. ft., with individual locations in the database ranging from about 800 sq. ft. to 4,500 sq. ft., which correlates nicely with the proposed Project's retail store. Clearly, the trip generation estimate for this component of the Project should have been based on the convenience market rate.	
ORG11-16	<u>Pass-by Trip Rate</u> DEIR Table 4.15-3 includes adjustments for pass-by trips (i.e., vehicles that are already passing by the site on SR 120, so don't have to be considered as new, Project-generated traffic). Although the DEIR doesn't reveal this, the KDA traffic impact report says that the pass-by adjustment for the retail use was based on information presented in the ITE Trip Generation Handbook (Third Edition, August 2014). According to the KDA report (p. 20): *The average pass-by rate for convenience stores is 61%. While it is likely that the actual passby rate of the market could be higher due to the absence of other retail opportunities in the area along SR 120 between the national park and Groveland, this rate has been employed to produce a "worst case" assessment.* No support is provided for the purported worst case nature of the pass-by rate employed in the analysis or the likelihood that the actual pass-by rate will be higher than the assumed value. We would suggest that it is equally likely that this value will be lower than the assumed percentage. Although the retail trip generation rates used in the analysis were the average of rates for three very different types of retail uses, the pass-by trip rate is the rate for convenience markets. (Specifically, the analysis employed the pass-by rates for ITE Land Use Code 851 – Convenience Market; those markets do not have gasoline sales). The analysis claims that this rate is 61 percent. Attachment E presents the pertinent page from the 2014 ITE Trip Generation Handbook, which is identified as the source for this factor. As shown there, the actual pass-by rate for convenience markets is 51 percent. Further investigation reveals that the 61 percent value was taken from the Second Edition of the ITE Trip Generation Handbook (June 2004). Attachment F presents the pertinent page from that obsolete, superseded document.	"Pass-by" trips are those that would be made by persons already traveling along Highway 120, while "Primary" trips would be made by the customers making specific trip to and from the site. The comment notes that the 61 percent pass-by trip rate cited in the Draft EIR traffic study came from the 2nd Edition (2004) of the Trip Generation Handbook rather than the 3rd Edition (2014). Both include similar information, but the 2nd Edition included sample locations excluded from the 3rd Edition. The pass-by rate in the 3rd Edition is 51 percent. The Draft EIR reference to the 3rd Edition is an error, and a revised trip generation estimate is included in Appendix N of this Final EIR. The comment also cites the average pass-by trip rates for variety stores (34 percent) and for Supermarkets (36 percent). The comment suggests that based on this information the pass-by trip rate assumed for the Draft EIR analysis is excessive. The pass-by trip rate assumed for the proposed market in the Draft EIR was

Comment #	Comment	Response
	For comparison, according the Third Edition of the Trip Generation Handbook, the pass-by trip rate for variety stores is 34 percent and for supermarkets is 36 percent, so the analysis used the least conservative rate available. If the rates had been averaged (similar to what was done for the trip generation rates), the pass-by rate would have been 40 percent. In any event, it is clear that the assumed pass-by trip rate is excessive.	selected based on review of available ITE data for various types of retail uses and consideration of the location of both the proposed market and its non-project customers. With regards to "primary" trips made solely to visit the proposed market, Terra Vi is only close to the existing and proposed lodging along Hardin Flat Road but is distant from other locations such as Groveland and Big Oak Flat. A convenience store and gas station is located at the Highway 120/Hardin Flat Road (E) intersection near the Yosemite Lake RV resort, roughly 1.5 miles east of the project site. Thus, the proposed market does not appear to have a large base of potential customers who would be inclined to make a specific trip for the types of goods offered at the proposed market. Conversely, as Highway 120 carries considerable traffic on peak season traffic, it is much more reasonable to assume that a visitor to Yosemite National Park might elect to stop off at Terra Vi as part of a trip already along Highway 120. Based on these considerations, the Draft EIR traffic study assumption that at least 61 percent of the proposed market's external trips would be "pass-by" trips drawn from Highway 120 while 39 percent would be made by persons driving specially to visit the market was reasonable. The updated assumption of 51 percent pass-by trips and 49 percent primary trips is more conservative but similarly

Comment #	Comment	Response
		reasonable, and does not affect the conclusions of the Draft EIR.
ORG11-17	Internal Trip Adjustment The Project trip generation estimate presented in DEIR Table 4.15-3 (p. 4.15-13) and KDA Table 7 (p. 21) includes adjustments to represent internal trips within the Project site; that is, reductions in the estimated Project trip generation to reflect the fact that a certain volume of traffic occurs completely on-site and doesn't impact the off-site roads. Internal trips are projected to occur between the lodging facilities and the convenience market, for example. Other internal trips are associated with the on-site employee housing. The total number of estimated internal trips is substantial. Subtracting the number of daily "Total External Trips" (1,725) from the daily "Total Gross Trips" (2,309) indicates 584 internal trips on a daily basis. In reality, the table reflects an arithmetic error, in that the total number of gross trips is 2,319, not 2,309 (i.e., 1,032 + 50 + 1,237 = 2,319), so the estimated number of internal trips is 594 (i.e., 2,319 – 1,725 = 594). That number of internal trips represents 26 percent of the Project's estimated daily gross trip generation. No basis is provided for any of the internal trip adjustment percentages employed in developing the Project trip generation estimate, even though the adjustment is substantial. Of particular interest is the adjustment for trips between the lodging facilities and the convenience market. That adjustment is shown as 24 percent, which is equivalent to 252 daily trips according the DEIR, but the source of the 24 percent value is undocumented. Also, the adjustment value of 252 daily trips appears to be in error. Applying the 24 percent factor to the 1,032 gross lodging trips indicates that the adjustment should be 248 trips, not 252 trips. For 252 to be correct, the gross daily total would need to be 1,050, not 1,032. The DEIR also indicates a 14 percent adjustment for trips between the on-site employee housing and the market (5 daily trips), and a 2 percent internal trip adjustment for travel between the employee housing and the lodging facilities (40 daily trips). Again, the percentages and the trip numbers don't seem to correspond. For example, the two percent trip match between the employee housing and the lodging facilities is shown as 40 daily trips, but two percent of the lodging trips (1,032) is 21 daily trips, not 40. These differences (2,319 vs. 2,309, 248 vs. 252, 21 vs. 40) might not seem considerable, but the values derived here carry through the remainder of the analysis and, to the extent that they are	There is no published data as a reference for the relationship between lodging guests and on-site retail services, and the Draft EIR traffic study outlined its assumptions. The analysis assumed that each guest room and cabin would generate one visit to the market each day. For the total of 126 units, this represents 252 daily trips. These 252 daily trips represent 24.4 percent of the total gross daily trips identified for lodging, and the inconsistency cited in the comments (i.e., 252 versus 248 internal trips) results from rounding off 24.4 percent to 24 percent in the table. Although the project site would accommodate 22 employees in on-site housing (in 20 employee apartment rooms and two manager's suites), the trip generation estimate conservatively only includes 20 on-site employees (as increased on-site housing would increase the project's internal trip capture). It has been assumed that the 20 employees who will reside on-site will make a trip to the market once each week. This represents 40 trips per week, or 5 to 6 daily trips. The commute that would otherwise be made by each of 20 employees living on-site totals 40 trips. This represents 3.8 percent of the gross lodge trips, and the 2 percent indicated is in error. While the results presented in the Draft EIR analysis are accurate, to provide clarity the percentages have not been rounded in the

Comment #	Comment	Response
	incorrect, the results of the overall analysis are also wrong. In summary: • The sources of the individual internal trip adjustment factors must be revealed, • The methodology employed in applying the internal trip adjustment factors must be clarified, • The erroneous values presented in DEIR Table 4.15-3 must be corrected, and • The traffic analysis must be revised to correct errors in the trip generation calculations.	revised table included in Appendix N. No subsequent traffic operational analysis is required.
ORG11-18	Restaurant Trip Generation As noted earlier, the Project site plan is provided in Attachment A. Review of the site plan reveals a 16,787 sq. ft. restaurant. However, that Project element is completely ignored in the traffic analysis. Although the Project proponents may claim that the restaurant will serve only hotel guests, and therefore generate no traffic, that is simply not reasonable or realistic. After all, if the market will generate traffic, it certainly seems that a restaurant would also do so.	While the proposed market is intended to serve the general public, as well as hotel guests, the proposed restaurant would not be open to the public. The restaurant would not be a conventional restaurant, as it would utilize counter service with the option of table technology and would not have servers. The comment cites a restaurant building floor area presented in Draft EIR Figure 3-4. That total includes a variety of other uses, as noted in Draft EIR Figure 3-5, Site Plan for Hotel Restaurant, and the restaurant itself is only a portion of that area. Regarding the extent to which this ancillary use should be considered separately in the trip generation estimate, the supporting data accompanying ITE data for Hotels notes: *A hotel is a place of lodging that provides sleeping accommodations and supporting facilities such as restaurants, cocktail lounges, meeting and banquet rooms or convention facilities, limited recreational facilities (pool, fitness room), and/or other retail and service shops.*

Comment #	Comment	Response
		Thus, the trip generation associated with these ancillary uses is already included in the trip generation estimate made for the overall project. No revision to the trip generation estimate or traffic analysis is required.
ORG11-19	Summary The Project's trip generation estimate understates the volume of traffic that will result from its construction because: • The trip generation for the Project's market was substantially underestimated due to the use of an inappropriate retail trip rate, which was derived from an unusual and invalid methodology. • The number and percentage of pass-by trips associated with the market was overestimated, due to use of an obsolete, superseded technical reference. Because pass-by trips are deducted from the gross trip generation estimate, this has the effect of understating the number of Project related trips added to the road network. • The estimated number of internal trips that will occur solely within the site was flawed due to arithmetic errors, as well as the fact that the specific methodology and sources were not described. • The analysis completely ignored the trips associated with the Project's proposed restaurant. Therefore, the volume of Project-generated traffic will be considerably greater than the DEIR reveals, and the resulting traffic impacts will be substantially worse than the DEIR discloses.	The trip generation estimate for the market is reasonable based on the nature of the goods offered and the project's location. Please see Response ORG11-15. The pass-by rate assumptions are reasonable based on the project's location, the location of potential customers who might make a specific trip the site, and the volume of recreational traffic on Highway 120 adjoining the site. Please see Response ORG11-16. The internal trip generation assumptions are reasonable based on the nature of the uses provided and the calculation of internal trips is accurate. Please see Response ORG11-17. The trip generation associated with on-site ancillary uses, such as meeting space, is included in the overall ITE rates for Hotels, and no separate estimate is required for that use. Please also see Response ORG 11-18. The volume of traffic associated with this project as presented in the Draft EIR is therefore accurate, no revision to the analysis is needed and the impacts associated with the project are as noted in the Draft EIR.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
ORG11-20	7. Vehicle-Miles-Traveled (VMT) Analysis – The DEIR traffic impact analysis is based on consideration of vehicle-miles traveled (VMT), as documented in a memorandum prepared by Wood-Rodgers. (Reference: Memorandum to Mr. Darin Grossi from Mario Tambellini, PE, TE, Terra Vi Lodge VMT. Analysis, June 6, 2020.) The traditional level of service (LOS) analysis is presented for informational purposes only. This is consistent with the approach required under SB 743. Unfortunately, our review suggests that the DEIR's VMT analysis is significantly flawed. We should note the potential for confusion, given the fact that the LOS analysis (which constitutes the bulk of the DEIR Transportation section as well as the KDA traffic impact analysis report) addresses Saturday midday conditions, but the VMT analysis considers weekday conditions. We should also note that our earlier comments regarding flaws in the Project trip generation estimate apply to both analyses, as the weekday trip estimate used in the VMT analysis was developed by applying a factor to the KDA Saturday trip estimate. That "typical weekday vs. peak Saturday" factor, which is the ratio of SR 120 weekday traffic (May 2018) to SR 120 Saturday traffic (June/July 2018), is 0.52. In other words, the analysis is based on the assumption that the project will generate 52 percent as many trips on an average weekday as it does on a peak Saturday. Specifically, under this approach, the project would generate 586 weekday trips compared to 1,127 Saturday trips. However, this approach is substantially flawed, as there is no connection between Project trip generation and historical traffic volumes on SR 120. That is, just because Saturday background traffic on SR 120 represents 52 percent of the weekday volume, there is absolutely no reason to believe that the Project, or any land use for that matter, will have that same pattern of trip generation. Based on this flawed approach, the analysis concluded that the lodging portion of the project will generate 385 trips, representing a daily rate of 3.1 trips per room, which is claimed to be reasonable because the Tuolumne County model uses a daily rate of 3.2 trips per room. For comparison, the ITE Trip Generation Manual (10th Edition) says a hotel generates trips at a daily rate of 8.36 trips per room. (See DEIR Table 4.15-2 and KDA Table 6.) Clearly, the appropriate interpretation of this is not that the Project trip rate is accurate because it is consistent with the model's trip rate, it's that the model substantially underestimates hotel traffic.	The level of service (LOS) section of the transportation impact study (see Appendix J1 of the Draft EIR) evaluated traffic operations under peak summer Saturday conditions because that is when the highest traffic volumes were observed to occur on surrounding roadway systems, and when Terra Vi (project) trip generation is likely to be at its highest. In other words, peak summer Saturday represents conservative, worst-case traffic operations, when congestion will potentially be at its highest. The project VMT analysis (see Appendix J2 of the Draft EIR), evaluated project VMT under annual average typical weekday conditions because VMT is typically evaluated under annual average conditions in order to estimate effects on emissions over long periods of time, and because the Tuolumne County Regional Travel Demand Model (RTDM) and other VMT analysis tools were developed to analyze annual average typical weekday conditions. The time period used for each analysis is clearly indicated, and the values can be converted between different time periods if needed. The transportation impact analysis used the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation Manual, 10th Edition Saturday trip generation rates for the Hotel land use type (Code 310) to estimate project traffic under peak summer Saturday conditions. The Terra Vi transportation

Comment #	Comment	Response
	Moreover, the DEIR and the KDA report already show weekday trip rates for the project; those rates should be used to develop the trip generation estimate needed for the VMT analysis. Using the same basic approach as that employed in the DEIR analysis (including erroneously using the average retail rate), we derived a gross weekday trip generation estimate of 1,976 trips for the Project (excluding any adjustments for internal or pass-by trips). This estimate can be compared to the Saturday gross trip estimate of 2,309 in DEIR 4.15-3 and KDA Table 7. Obviously, use of the weekday trip rates presented in the DEIR results in substantially more than 586 trips, even using the faulty approach to convenience market trip generation. This, in turn, will result in a substantially higher estimate of project-related VMT, which would likely alter the conclusions regarding Project significance. We should note that the Wood-Rodgers VMT analysis memo specifically says that they obtained the KDA trip generation estimates, ". . . in order to maintain consistency between the VMT analysis and other Project traffic analyses." If consistency was truly a goal of the VMT analysis, then it certainly should have incorporated the weekday trip generation information documented in the KDA report.	impact analysis also provided weekday trip generation rates for the Hotel (Code 310) and Resort Hotel (Code 330) land uses in transportation impact analysis Table 6 for informational purposes, but did not provide project weekday trip generation estimates. The ITE Hotel (Code 310) trip generation rates can be used to estimate a worst-case project trip generation that may temporarily occur under peak Summer conditions, but the ITE rates do not accurately capture the annual average typical trip generation expected at the Project site for a number of reasons. The ITE Trip Generation Manual states the Hotel land use may include "restaurants, cocktail lounges, meeting and banquet rooms or convention facilities, limited recreational facilities (pool, fitness room), and/or other retail and service shops" and may provide "guest transportation services such as airport shuttles, limousine service, or golf course shuttle service." Additionally, the ITE Trip Generation Manual Hotel trip generation rates are for a "General Urban/Suburban" location. Based on these descriptions from the ITE Trip Generation Manual, the ITE Hotel (Code 310) land use type trip generation rates were developed based on data from traditional chain-style hotels located in or near large urban areas that are frequented by people on business trips, groups holding events, and general travelers. Those traditional chain style hotels

Comment #	Comment	Response
		have significantly different trip generation characteristics and operations than the Project, which is a rural, resort style hotel located in close proximity to a national park with highly seasonal traffic. The ITE Trip Generation Manual provides peak hour trip generation rates for the Resort Hotel (Code 330) land use type in General Urban/Suburban areas, as shown in transportation impact analysis Table 6. The Resort Hotel trip generation rates are consistently lower than the Hotel trip generation rates, which shows that using the Hotel trip generation rates would overestimate project trips. In addition, the project is located in a rural, remote setting along Highway 120, not in a "General Urban/Suburban" area. The remote setting for the project means that trips to and from the project would be expected to be made less frequently than to another resort hotel in an urban setting due to a lack of nearby destinations (restaurants, retail, entertainment, etc.) and would be expected to be consolidated so as to save and reduce travel time. Finally, the project would largely serve visitors to Yosemite National Park, which receives far more visitors in the summer than during the rest of the year. This means that during the off-season (i.e. winter) the project would experience a reduced number of visitors and trips as compared to a hotel located in an urban area which

Comment #	Comment	Response
		experiences a steadier number of trips year round. In order to account for the unique characteristics of the project described above, the project VMT analysis adjusted and checked the trip generation rates used for the project in two ways. A “typical weekday vs. peak Saturday” factor was developed by obtaining traffic counts for Highway 120 near the project area from the Caltrans PeMS online database. Average daily traffic (ADT) on Highway 120 during an average Saturday in June/July 2018 (i.e. peak summer conditions) was compared against ADT on Highway 120 during a typical weekday in May 2018. It is industry standard practice that spring weekday conditions is a reasonable representation of annual average or typical weekday traffic conditions. This factor was then applied to the peak summer Saturday project trip generation estimates in the Terra Vi transportation impact analysis to account for seasonal/time-of-week variability and other characteristics of the project. This was considered a reasonable assumption because traffic on Highway 120 generally reflects the overall amount of visitors to Yosemite National Park, as it serves as the primary western entrance to the park, and Yosemite visitors are anticipated to be the main guests at the project. In order to verify the reasonableness of this adjustment, the resulting trip generation rate was compared against the hotel trip generation rate

Comment #	Comment	Response
		contained in the Tuolumne County RTDM, which was developed based off of a combination of ITE rates and local trip data. The adjusted trip generation rate was found to be relatively consistent with the hotel trip generation rate in the Tuolumne County RTDM. Therefore, the project trip generation estimate in the VMT analysis is reasonable and does not underestimate project trips.
ORG11-21	<u>Average Trip Length</u> For perspective, we used the VMT analysis results to develop an average trip length for the Project. Specifically, the total Project VMT of 13,091 divided by the claimed weekday trip generation of 586 indicates an average trip length of 22.3 miles per trip. Given that the Yosemite valley is 30 miles away and 85 percent of the lodging-related trips will be to/from there (KDA, p. 31), we don't consider this to be a reasonable result. Consider also that guests checking in and out of the lodging facilities will be oriented to and from locations all over California and beyond. The average trip lengths for that component of the Project's daily traffic will far exceed 22.3 miles. For reference, we used MapQuest to check the travel distance from several California cities to Yosemite valley, as follows: • San Francisco: 188 miles, • Los Angeles: 311 miles, • Stockton: 117 miles, and • Fresno: 94 miles. Here's further perspective on that question: Based on the above, 327 daily trips will be to/from Yosemite valley. At 30 miles per trip, that's 9,818 VMT. With total VMT of 13,091, that leaves 3,273 non-Yosemite VMT. There will 259 non-Yosemite trips (586 – 327 = 259), which results in an average non-Yosemite trip length of 12.64 miles. This is simply unreasonable, given the location of the Project, the likely origin and destination points of guests that are checking in and out, non-resident employee residence locations, and other factors.	Each different type of land use within the project was evaluated separately when analyzing efficiency-based VMT in the project VMT analysis (see Appendix J2 of the Draft EIR), consistent with recommended methodologies contained in the *Governor's Office of Planning and Research Technical Advisory* (OPR Technical Advisory) (December 2018). The employee housing portion of the project was screened out because it is projected to generate less than 110 new external daily trips, consistent with recommendations in both the OPR Technical Advisory and the Tuolumne County VMT Thresholds Memo. The project market was screened out from a detailed VMT analysis because it would be a small-scale market providing limited items to visitors, the majority of trips to and from the market are projected to be either pass-by or internal trips, and the market would essentially function as a local serving retail project as it would serve hotel guests and people already travelling on Highway 120. In other words, it would only serve people already in the area, potentially providing them a new closer

Comment #	Comment	Response
		option, and would not draw many, if any, dedicated trips from other areas. Therefore, the Estimated Project Hotel VMT per Room value shown in Table 3 of the VMT analysis, and the Total Project VMT shown in Table 5 of the VMT analysis, only represent the hotel VMT associated with the 385 Typical Weekday Lodge and Cabin trips shown in Table 2 of the Terra Vi VMT Memo, and are not associated with the total project trips for all land uses. Since preparation of the initial VMT analysis (dated June 6, 2020), the County's methodologies and thresholds for evaluating hotel VMT have been updated. The updated thresholds and methodologies are outlined in the Tuolumne County SB 743 VMT Thresholds Memorandum (Wood Rodgers, dated November 4, 2020). The methodologies and thresholds were updated to better account for all travel and trip lengths between Yosemite National Park and hotel type land uses. Yosemite travel was better accounted for via post-processing hotel trips using mobile phone and GPS based travel data for existing hotels in the County obtained from AirSage and StreetLight. The Terra Vi VMT analysis has been updated using the new methodologies and thresholds and is contained in Appendix P of this Final EIR. The latest version of the Terra Vi VMT Memo is dated November 4, 2020. As shown

Comment #	Comment	Response

in Table 5 of Appendix P, total project annual average VMT is 15,095 and project VMT per room is projected to be approximately 14.6% below the threshold. Therefore, project VMT impacts are still projected to be less than significant. The project is projected to be below the threshold because of its proximity to Highway 120, proximity to tourist destinations, and the internal trip match provided by the employee housing and on-site market. Based on additional data from the RTDM, a breakdown of projected Project trip types and trip lengths is shown in Exhibit 1 below:

Exhibit 1: Terra Vi Trip Types and Lengths

Terra Vi Trip Types and Lengths				
Trip Type	**Percentage of Daily Trips**	**Annual Average Typical Weekday Trips**	**Average Length (miles)**	**Annual Average Typical Weekday VMT**
Employee	25%	96	29	2,785
Visitor - Tourism/Local	59%	227	28	6,357
Visitor - Arrival/Departure	16%	62	96	5,953
Total/Average	**100%**	**385**	**39**	**15,095**
Notes: *All data is from Tuolumne County RTDM. Values are rounded to nearest whole number, so some minor rounding discrepancies may exist.*				

As shown in the table above, the project VMT analysis assumes a reasonable breakdown of trip types and trip lengths to obtain the Total Project Hotel VMT of 15,095. Note that for the Visitor – Arrival/Departure trips, the estimated total trip length (including out-of-county travel) is based on mobile phone and GPS based travel data from AirSage and StreetLight, as well as data from the California Statewide Travel

Comment #	Comment	Response
		Demand Model (CSTDM). The Visitor – Arrival/Departure trip length includes only the portion of the out-of-county travel attributable to the project, since the residential land uses that generate the other end of these trips are also responsible for a portion of the associated VMT, consistent with the RTAC methodology of evaluating interregional trips contained in the *Recommendations of the Regional Targets Advisory Committee (RTAC) Pursuant to Senate Bill 375* (September 2009). The Visitor - Tourism/Local average trip length is 28 miles, which generally represents a large number of trips to/from Yosemite, as well as a smaller percentage of shorter trips to other destinations. The Employee average trip length is 29 miles, which generally represents a large number of trips to/from local communities such as Groveland, as well as some out-of-county travel due to deliveries, etc.
ORG11-22	<u>VMT Standard of Significance</u> As of the time the VMT analysis was prepared and the DEIR published, Tuolumne County had not adopted a standard of significance regarding VMT. Instead, the DEIR says (p. 4.15-17): Tuolumne County is in the process of establishing significance criteria based on VMT thresholds, and alternative criteria are under consideration within the context of OPR [Office of Planning and Research] guidance. Three alternative sets of criteria were described, but the DEIR never explicitly states which (if any) of those was used in the analysis. In any event, if the County has no adopted criteria, how can they credibly determine significance?	Page 4.15-17 the Draft EIR presents the three alternative approaches to determine VMT significance criteria that were being considered by Tuolumne County as the Draft EIR transportation impact analysis was being prepared. The Draft EIR makes use of thresholds customized to specific regions of Tuolumne County based on sub-regional VMT forecasts under the General Plan, as evidenced by the impacts statement on page 4.15-19, which compared sub-regional VMT per hotel room and compares the project to the average for similar facilities in the East

Comment #	Comment	Response
		County region. Please see Appendix P for an updated VMT analysis.
ORG11-23	8. Construction Impacts – The DEIR states that (DEIR, p. 4.15-15): The number of trips made by [construction] vehicles . . . would not exceed the amount of traffic accessing the site during operation of the project. Unfortunately, no support is provided for this statement. A construction traffic volume estimate must be developed to verify the validity of this statement. Further, that estimate must identify the volume of heavy-truck traffic that would travel to and from the Project site during the construction period. Trucks have an inordinate adverse impact on traffic operations and safety, due to their size, weight, and reduced operating characteristics, including slower acceleration and longer stopping distances. Traffic operations and safety impacts associated with such vehicles entering and exiting the high-speed traffic stream on SR 120 must be assessed in detail. In addition to evaluation of potential safety impacts at the SR 120/Sawmill Mountain Road intersection (where construction vehicles will enter and exit the Project site), consideration must also be given to the adverse operational effects of construction-related trucks and other vehicles along SR 120, with particular attention paid to segments of SR 120 that are especially curvy or are relatively steep, such as at Priest Grade, for example.	Please see Response ORG6-66 regarding construction impacts. As noted in the Draft EIR traffic analysis, trucks comprise 5 percent of the Annual Average Traffic Volume of 4,950 on Highway 120 east of Highway 49, including the area between Highway 49 and Big Oak Flat known as the Priest Hill Grade. This represents 248 trucks on a daily basis. The project would add intermittent truck traffic to this area.
ORG11-24	CONCLUSION Our review of the Draft Environmental Impact Report completed in connection with the proposed Terra Vi Lodge Yosemite project in Tuolumne County, California revealed several issues regarding the adequacy of the transportation analysis. The deficiencies we have identified raise significant questions as to the validity of the conclusions presented in the DEIR with respect to Project-related impacts. Of particular concern is the failure of the environmental analysis to include any analysis of the feasibility of safely evacuating the Project in the event of a wildland fire. It remains unknown whether the Project's sole evacuation route, State Route 120, would have sufficient capacity to provide a safe means of escape from an approaching wildfire. Moreover, the DEIR fails to disclose that the Project would increase hazards due to sight distance constraints and roadway design deficiencies. Further, the DEIR's estimate of the volume of Project-related traffic has substantial flaws that must be addressed. Similarly, the analysis of vehicle-miles-traveled, which	The comment provides a conclusion for the comments above. Please see Responses ORG11-01 through ORG11-23.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
	provided the basis for determination of the Project's transportation impacts, is also highly flawed. These issues must be addressed prior to approval of the proposed project and its environmental documentation by Tuolumne County. We hope this information is useful. If you have questions concerning any of the items presented here or would like to discuss them further, please feel free to contact me at (906) 847-8276.	
ORG11-25	*Attachment A: Project Site Plan*	The comment provides an attachment with the project site plan, dated June 2020. No response is required.
ORG11-26	*Attachment B: Yosemite National Park Traffic Counts, Big Oak Flat, January 1985-February 2020*	The comment provides an attachment with the Yosemite National Park Traffic Counts for Big Oak Flat Road, dated January 1985 through February 2020. No response is required.
ORG11-27	*Attachment C: Table 201.1 Sight Design Standards*	The comment provides an attachment with the Caltrans Site Distance Standards from the Highway Design Manual, dated July 1, 2020. No response is required.
ORG11-28	*Attachment D: Table 405.2B Deceleration Lane Length*	The comment provides an attachment with the Caltrans Deceleration Lane Length from the Highway Design Manual, dated July 1, 2020. No response is required.
ORG11-29	*Attachment E: Table F.14 Pass-By and Non-Pass-By Trips Weekday, PM Peak Period Land Use Code 851 - Convenience Market (Open 24 Hours)*	The comment provides an attachment with the Pass-By and Non-Pass-By information by the Institute of Transportation Engineers Trip Generation Handbook, dated August 2014. No response is required.
ORG11-30	*Attachment F: Table 5.11 Pass-By Trips and Diverted Linked Trips Weekday, p.m. Peak Period Land use 851 - Convenience Market (Open 24 Hours)*	The comment provides an attachment with the Pass-By and Diverted Length Trips by the Institute of Transportation Engineers Trip Generation Handbook, dated June 2004. No response is required.
Members of the Public		
PUB1	Jenny Pfeiffer, July 3, 2020	

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
PUB1-01	My family has owned a cabin on sawmill mountain for the last 50 years and I am NOT for the Terra Vi Lodge and think this a terrible development that would be bad for the area. I would like to respond to the EIR, I do not agree with a lot of the findings and I think there is a lot of magical thinking involved. Even with this, they did find some significate effects that you can not ignore. Please read my comments below: WATER SUPPLY Despite well tests done in a wet year that show plenty of water that is supposedly more than sufficient to meet daily water needs of each project, the reality is that groundwater is always a gamble. If wells were tested at the end of multiple years of drought, the well test results would be highly different. What happens when the water drops by 50% which could happen this year, 2020 was a very dry year. It would be interesting to see how the wells perform this oct. Is there a plan if they run out of water? What will they do if they run all the wells dry in the surrounding area? With climate change a reality, this sonario is not out of the question. There is no surface water nearby so this is a big reason this project is so irresponsible.	Please see Responses ORG6-32 and ORG6-42.
PUB1-02	The report says "The Tuolumne County Water Quality Plan identifies residential and commercial on-site sewage disposal systems, leaking underground storage tanks, and unobstructed grazing practices as key sources of existing contamination. Chronic sources of soil erosion and enhanced sediment delivery to local waterways are also identified as a concern.9" The report says "The downstream receiving water for the project site is the Tuolumne River" what happens if the waste water contaminates the Tuolumne River. This river brings many tourists, if it was contaminated then the tourists will not come and the business that rely on them would be hurt. the report says "Implementation of the proposed project could violate water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality."	All wastewater would be treated on-site to Title 22 recycled water standards. Wastewater will be recycled on-site and any additional volume of treated wastewater will be infiltrated on-site via the on-site leach fields. Therefore, no wastewater from the site will be released into the Tuolumne River. Please also see Master Response 2.
PUB1-03	Need to test at least 2 years in a row, 2019 was very wet so that was not a realistic year to test the well capacity.	While 2019 as a whole was somewhat wetter than average, the period from July through September was less than half as wet as the average of the previous 100 years. Please see Response ORG6-42. Please see Appendix M,

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
		Supplemental Hydrogeology Information, of this Final EIR.
PUB1-04	Another water issue is to fight a fire, if they are low on water because of a dry winter (very possible, we just had one this year, 2020) and barely getting enough to run the lodge, what happens if a fire starts and they do not have enough water to fight the fire? This development is not alone, there are other cabin nearby and would put them at risk.	As stated on page 4.16-7 of the Draft EIR, the on-site well would provide sufficient water even during a multiple dry year scenario: "According to the SWRCB, the well capacity is determined to be half of the 10-day pumping rate, which equates to 26.5 gpm. The calculation of well capacity includes a significant safety factor (50 percent), to account for sustainable production during single and multiple dry years. Water levels in the aquifer beneath the project site stabilized while the wells were pumping 53 gpm, which is more than four times the peak demand. The water levels stabilized approximately 188 feet above the most productive fractures in Well PW-1 and approximately 354 feet above the most productive fractures in Well PW-2. Therefore, even in periods of single and multiple dry years, the on-site wells have more than enough capacity to meet the water demands of the site. Further, pumped well water would be supplemented by captured rainwater that would be stored in one of the on-site water tanks.
PUB1-05	The report says “Cumulative projects that install on-site water wells could potentially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge” Our well at our cabin was one of the well tested. “When the off- site residential well 26G(B) was pumping, there was also a response in the Terra Vi on-site source wells” which means they are connected. If they run their well dry there is a good chance ours will run dry as well. Not to mention that since	Please see Response ORG6-42.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
	they tested our water it has tasted terrible, they do not know why and they have not fixed it. If it does not improve soon something must be done.	
PUB1-06	Fire The report says "The project would result in the need for new or physically altered fire protection facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives." That mean the county is on the hook for providing more services.	Impact PS-1 in Chapter 4.14, Public Services and Recreation, determined that the proposed project would incorporate a number of features that would help limit the number of incidents on the project site that could generate emergency calls for fire protection or emergency medical services and reduce the extended responses time from the GCSD station. Such features include physical characteristics such as buildings with non-combustible exterior finishes; high performance fire extinguishing and alarm system, on-site water storage, and defensible space. Non-physical features include staff and guest fire prevention and preparedness program; no cooking allowed in guest rooms; and periodic fire safety drills. Despite these project characteristics, impact discussion PS-1 found that the proposed project has the potential to exacerbate the existing condition of long response times due to distance. Impact discussion PS-1 includes the adoption of Mitigation Measure PS-1 which would require on-site trained emergency staff, supply of personal protective equipment, and communication at all times between a fire officer and recognized Emergency Command Center. With the inclusion of Mitigation Measure PS-1, and adoption of the project characteristics outlined in Chapter 4.14, the impact was

Comment #	Comment	Response
		determined to be less than significant. Please also see Master Response 6.
PUB1-07	The report says "This represents an increase in demand on services provided by the GCSD, TCFD, and CAL FIRE, which would increase the deficiencies in service due to the distance from a fire station and existing response times. Calls from the Groveland station to the project site, which is out of the GCSD district, would take an estimated 22 minutes, and could create the potential for delayed response times for emergencies within the GCSD boundary while station personnel are responding to the project site." I couldn't have said it better.	The comment is noted. The comment does not address the adequacy of the Draft EIR. Please see Master Response 6 regarding public services.
PUB1-08	The report says "Despite the fire resistant and suppression physical features, non-physical features, and training program, the proposed project would still exacerbate existing fire protection service response time deficiencies in the region due to an increase in visitors and employees on the project site. While the proposed project would provide service improvements to the project site, GCSD and TCFD would still require alteration or expansion of staffing, equipment, and facilities, to maintain acceptable response times. Therefore, the proposed project would have a significant impact regarding fire protection services." Can the county afford this?	As described in Chapter 4.14, Public Services, Parks, and Recreation, of the Draft EIR, Mitigation Measure PS-1 would require the proposed project to provide on-site trained and certified emergency staff to reduce the demand on fire protection services. CEQA does not require that financial impacts be evaluated in the environmental review process, therefore the Draft EIR does not evaluate the financial impact the proposed project could have on the community. Please also see Master Response 6.
PUB1-09	The report says "An assessment by the TCFD concluded that the proposed project, in combination with cumulative projects in the area, would create the need to expand existing fire services and hire additional staff to adequately meet the additional service demand. Therefore, the proposed project, in combination with cumulative projects, could result in significant cumulative impacts regarding fire protection services." Can the county afford this?	As described in Chapter 4.14, Public Services, Parks, and Recreation, of the Draft EIR, Mitigation Measure PS-1 would require the proposed project to provide on-site trained and certified emergency staff to reduce the demand on fire protection services. Please also see Master Response 6. CEQA does not require that financial impacts be evaluated in the environmental review process, therefore the Draft EIR does not evaluate the financial impact the proposed project could have on the community.
PUB1-10	The report says "The project would be located in a State Responsibility and could, due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks and thereby expose project	The comment cites Impact Statement WF-2 in Chapter 4.17, Wildfire, of the Draft EIR. Impact discussion WF-2 determined that,

Comment #	Comment	Response
	occupants to, pollutant concentrations from, a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire." Yes I agree and this should not be ok with the county.	despite project features that would reduce wildfire hazards, the project has the potential to, due to the increase of people and vehicles on the project site, exacerbate wildfire risks and expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or uncontrolled spread of wildfire. While this determination would result in a significant impact, the impact was found to ultimately be less than significant with the inclusion of Mitigation Measure WF-2 which would require that the applicant submit a Wildland Fire Prevention Plan and Vegetation Management Plan to the Tuolumne County Fire Prevention Bureau for review and approval prior to receiving a building permit. The project site plan and landscaping documents would be required to conform to the Vegetation Management Plan following its approval. With the approval of a Wildland Fire Prevention Plan and Vegetation Management Plan, and the revision of project site and landscaping plans, the impact would be less than significant.
PUB1-11	The report says "The project's proposed features (listed in Table 4.17-2) would reduce potential wildfire hazards. However, the planting placement, density, and species on the project's landscaping plans are not consistent with these proposed wildfire hazard reduction features. Therefore, the impact would be significant." Need I say more?	Please see Response PUB1-10.
PUB1-12	The report says "Accordingly, the proposed project would not contribute to a cumulative increase in wildland fire hazards in the immediate vicinity of the project site or throughout the region and the potential for cumulative impacts associated with wildfire hazards would be less than significant." -I disagree!	Please see Master Response 5.
PUB1-13	County Services The project says "The project would result in the need for new or physically altered police	As described in Chapter 4.14, Public Services, Parks, and Recreation, of the Draft EIR, Mitigation Measure PS-3 would require the

Comment #	Comment	Response
	facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives. " I ask again, can the county afford this?	proposed project to include private security personnel on staff to reduce the demand on police services which reduces the impact to a less-than-significant level. CEQA does not require that financial impacts be evaluated in the environmental review process, therefore the Draft EIR does not evaluate the financial impact the proposed project could have on the community.
PUB1-14	The report says "The proposed project would create a significant impact if it would substantially impair an emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan." This is a big problem, if this project along with under canvas and nearby cabins need to evacuate all at the same time then this would not be possible. One main road and one little fire access road is not enough. There could be loss of life.	Please see Master Response 4 regarding emergency evacuation.
PUB1-15	The report says "As there are no other helipads in the immediate vicinity of the project, this feature would be beneficial as it would provide improved emergency helicopter access in comparison to existing conditions." Under Canvas now says they will have a heli pad. Isn't one enough? They are very loud. And I am not convinced they will only be used for emergency. These developers have lied to us before so I do not trust them and nor should you.	Draft EIR page 3-18 states that the County will include a Condition of Approval which prohibits the use of the helipad for non-emergency uses. Please also see Master Response 3.
PUB1-16	Other: • Impact GHG-1.1: Construction of the proposed project would result in a net increase in GHG [Greenhouse Gas] emissions. • Impact GHG-1.2: Operation of the proposed project would result in a net increase in GHG emissions. • Impact NOI-3.1: Noise levels associated with use of the proposed emergency helipad could result in substantial temporary increases in ambient daytime and/or nighttime noise levels at nearby existing sensitive uses. -these 3 items are all important items that cannot be overlooked that will negatively impact the community.	The commenter expresses concerns regarding the project's GHG emissions and noise impacts and quotes impacts statements in the Draft EIR. These topics are evaluated in Chapter 4.8, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, and Chapter 4.12, Noise, of the Draft EIR.
PUB2	**Joann Pfeiffer, July 7, 2020**	
PUB2-01	I am a concerned land owner on sawmill mountain Please help us stop this over built project. The traffic problems it will create are huge. Also the water shortage is a big concern for us. I can't imagine that the sewage for this many people won't also be impacted all of us. I sure do not understand how this could be ok with you or	The commenter expresses concerns regarding traffic, water supply, and sewage but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. These topics are evaluated in Chapter 4.15,

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
	anyone who has a love for one of the most beautiful place in California. Please help us Save this area	Transportation, Chapter 4.10, Hydrology and Water Quality, and Chapter 4.16, Utilities and Service Systems, of the Draft EIR. Please also see Master Response 2 for more information regarding wastewater.
PUB3	**Joann Pfeiffer, July 7, 2020**	
PUB3-01	Please help us redirect this project. It's so big and will create a huge traffic problem We are worried about our water supply We also worry about that much sewage going into our ground that will harm our water supply We have lots of wild life in this area that will also be disrupted This project is too big and has not tried to even fit into the environment instead it looks more like an office building Please help Thank you J. Pfeiffer Sent from my iPhone	The commenter expresses concerns regarding traffic, water supply, sewage, and wildlife but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. These topics are evaluated in Chapter 4.15, Transportation, Chapter 4.10, Hydrology and Water Quality, Chapter 4.16, Utilities and Service Systems, and Chapter 4.3, Biological Resources, of the Draft EIR.
PUB4	**Kathy Seaton, July 7, 2020**	
PUB4-01	As a former Groveled area resident I am keenly aware of how this project could impact our former community. Without a public sewer system, how can the waste be kept from polluting the Tuolumne River and other wells in the area?	Please see Response PUB1-02. Please see Master Response 2 for more details on wastewater treatment.
PUB4-02	I understand that the water quantity tests were done during a wet year. We all know what can happen to the water supplies/wells during a drought and we are due for another in the short run. (We had to drill a new well, to replace our dried-up one, shortly before we sold our ranch there in 2016.)	Please see Response ORG6-42.
PUB4-03	And that doesn't even begin to address the fire risk. Because of the extreme fire danger in the Sierra summers, I thought we were trying to keep development OUT of the trees. This just puts EVERYONE in greater danger. We don't want to see another Paradise!	Please see Master Response 5.
PUB4-04	Speaking of paradise, this one will be ruined with all the extra traffic and noise. It's the peace and quiet and folks live in the mountains to enjoy. These developments will create havoc for people who struggle to survive in the area.	The commenter expresses concerns regarding traffic but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. Traffic is evaluated in Chapter 4.15, Transportation, of the Draft EIR.
PUB5	**Cindy Charles, July 10, 2020**	
PUB5-01	As a resident of Tuolumne County who is currently reviewing the DEIRs for Under Canvas and Terra Vi, I am writing to request a 30 day extension in the deadline for public comments for both	The comment requests an extension of the public review period of the Draft EIR. Please

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
	projects. The two DEIR documents are unusually large for Draft Environmental Impact Reports and contain a lot of important technical information to be analyzed. In addition, the adjacent projects are interconnected via their potential cumulative impacts which makes submitting comments given the thousands of pages within the DEIRS even more arduous. The usual 45 day period for thoroughly and thoughtfully writing comments on these two very large projects next to each other is simply inadequate. I am sure the County is seeking comprehensive and well-thought comments in order to guide these developments, especially since the developers have invested a great deal of effort and resources in producing such extra-large documents for public review. It would extremely beneficial to all if the public were granted an additional 30 days to provide feedback. Also, as John knows, I have not had functioning telephone service or internet service at my home in Groveland for some months suddenly in 2020, and therefore have had an added burden of getting in my car to travel away from my home to work on reading the DEIRs, accessing additional information on the internet and communicating with others about these DEIRs. This situation has contributed to my struggle with composing my comments by the 45 day deadline. Thank you in advance for a timely response to this request.	see Master Response 1, which explains the County's decision not to extend the public review period of the Draft EIR.
PUB6	**Dan Courtney, July 10, 2020**	
PUB6-01	At this point I do not see any way myself and the other neighbors can adequately review and comment on all these thousands of pages of materials, I would like to request a 15 day extension on the YUC comment period and a 30 day extension on Terra Vi. With COVID 19 already disrupting life and business there is just no way we can provide intelligent feedback and each of these projects will have substantial impacts on our properties, so these relatively short extensions will give us a fair chance to review and comment. Please consider this request and let me know if it's acceptable or if you need a more formal request.	The comment requests an extension of the public review period of the Draft EIR. Please see Master Response 1, which explains the County's decision not to extend the public review period of the Draft EIR.
PUB7	**Matthew Chapman, July 11, 2020**	

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
PUB7-01	In concert with the concerns of John Buckley, I matthew Chapman would also request 30 day extensions regarding DEIR responses and comments. The nature of the projects involved and the simultaneous release of both DEIR that are very complex and lengthy in scope coupled with covid 19 restricting conditions affecting personal contacts with various involved parties to which correspondence has become constrained to phone tag limitations , with contact unreliable and strained. It is in the interests of full and fair process tbis request is seconde. Matthew Chapman.	The comment requests an extension of the public review period of the Draft EIR. Please see Master Response 1, which explains the County's decision not to extend the public review period of the Draft EIR.
PUB8	Tim Hutchins, July 11, 2020	
PUB8-01	I am requesting that the County Planning Dept. extend the comment period deadline for the DEIR for the proposed Under Canvas development by 30 days. I am requesting an extension of the comment period for the DEIR for the proposed Terra VI development by 120 days. It is an unreasonable expectation that any interested party would be able to truly read and then be able to comment on a document of 1,263 pages in the current allotted brief period. The TV document is even more extensive with 1,866 pages and so will require even more time for interested parties to be able to read and fact check and then comment on the document. That both of these documents were released with such a brief comment period and during the current crisis, even if they were a reasonable length, is more than enough justification for a more lengthy comment period. The County also needs to take adequate time to analyze theses massive documents and I don't see how the CO Planning Dept. could possibly do their legally required due diligence without more time. Given the length, complexity, and scope of the documents denying an extension of the comment periods could be perceived as a coordinated effort to overwhelm the commenters and the County planers by the developers. So in order to avoid any appearance of any such coordinated effort, even if unintentional, I am making a request for the lengthen comment periods for the period requested above.	The comment requests an extension of the public review period of the Draft EIR. Please see Master Response 1, which explains the County's decision not to extend the public review period of the Draft EIR.
PUB9	Nancy Constantino, July 12, 2020	

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
PUB9-01	I have received the documents and have been reviewing the DEIR's for both Yosemite Under Canvas and Terra Vi. While I have been working diligently to review all of the information, it is apparent that there is not enough time to thoroughly evaluate and thoughtfully comment on both projects simultaneously. I formally request a 30 day extension for each of the comment period deadlines.	The comment requests an extension of the public review period of the Draft EIR. Please see Master Response 1, which explains the County's decision not to extend the public review period of the Draft EIR.
PUB10	**Sam and Helen Flanery, July 13, 2020**	
PUB10-01	We would like to voice our concerns over the Hardin Flat Project. We own the property at 11230 Sawmill Mountain Road in Groveland. We have owned and been paying taxes on this property for over 30 years. We remember when the said property was rezoned, and at the time we were told it would be for a small RV park not a large resort. The two projects could not be more different; the proposed project has a hotel, restaurant, helicopter pad and grocery store. This in *[sic]* not what we were told would be happening to this land and this proposed project is unacceptable. We have many concerns about this project and would like to outline just a few for you: 1. Sewage / Leach field: The proposed hotel is on a high side of a hill so the leach field will be bleeding into us. Rush Creek has had issues with this. What will stop this from happening here? 2. EIR: This should be required. The MND is old and not valid a lot has changed since this report was issued. 3. Road Entrance / Traffic: Easement Access 4. Security and Our Privacy: We are very concerned about people wondering back onto our property. 5. Fire: Increase chances with more people. 6. Water Supply: You will drain our water supply as it is non-sustainable. As we mentioned we have owned this property for over 30 years. Besides us our children, grandchildren and many friends enjoy coming to our cabin, we enjoy being outdoors and spending quality family time together. It was rough for us to recover after the Rim Fire, we lost the majority of our trees from the fire and an out building. This project will destroy the peace and serenity we have at our cabin.	The comment is noted. The comment is a re-submittal of a letter submitted prior to the preparation of the Draft EIR and does not address adequacy of the Draft EIR itself.
PUB11	**Layne Hackett, July 13, 2020**	

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
PUB11-01	I am writing to express my concerns regarding the impact of the Terra Vi project on our already fragile environment: Yosemite, and its surrounds, continue to be stressed by the influx of people visiting the park each year. Pollution is already a problem, and foot traffic between the two proposed lodging facilities create a significant safety issue.	The comment is noted. The comment does not address adequacy of the Draft EIR.
PUB11-02	Lodging for four hundred plus visitors means that much less water for residents and businesses. Water is a finite commodity. We have no way, as of yet, to access more than Mother Nature provides us. And people from outside an area often disregard efforts too conserve. (Lack of understanding or lack of caring)	The commenter expresses concerns regarding water supply but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. Water supply is evaluated in Chapter 4.10, Hydrology and Water Quality, of the Draft EIR.
PUB11-03	Then, of course, is the matter of waste! If you've ever changed a diaper, I'm sure you can imagine the magnitude of that concern when the septic system fails! There is potential for significant leakage into ground water and even into the Tuolumne. This magnificent area of our state and country is entrusted you and your group. I hope you seriously consider the long-term impact of any decision you make.	The commenter expresses concerns regarding the project's wastewater generation and disposal but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. Wastewater is evaluated in Chapter 4.16, Utilities and Service Systems, of the Draft EIR. Please also see Master Response 2.
PUB12	Sam and Helen Flanery, July 14, 2020	
PUB12-01	We own the property at 11230 Saw Mill Mountain Road, Groveland CA, we have owned this property for over 30 years. We would like to voice our concerns over The Under Canvas and The Terra Vi Projects. First off, we would like you to extend the deadline for letters regarding these projects for another 30 days. There is an enormous amount of information to sift through. Just in case the deadline is not extended we are going to go ahead and voice some of our concerns.	The comment requests an extension of the public review period of the Draft EIR. Please see Master Response 1, which explains the County's decision not to extend the public review period of the Draft EIR.
PUB12-02	1. Water Supply: The water supply test that was half heartedly conducted was done so in a short period of time during a fluke rainier than normal season. These tests are normally conducted over years during different seasons to get an accurate reflection. It is known, throughout California, that our state has been in a drought for years. All the properties in this area are on a	Please see Response ORG6-42.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
	well system, and during dry seasons the Terra Vi project could pull enough water from the ground to dry up the water supply to numerous properties in the area.	
PUB12-03	2. Sewage / Leach Field: Both of these projects are going to rely on an engineered septic system which will have an astonishing amount of waste to treat. the Terra Vi project is on the high side of the hill so the leach field will bleed into us. The resort up the road, Rush Creek, has had numerous issues with this. This waste could easily end up contamination our well, again our only water source.	Please see Response ORG6-32 and Master Response 2.
PUB12-04	3. Road Entrance: Exiting out of Saw Mill Mountain Road onto 120 can already be difficult sometimes without the hundreds or cars and pedestrians these projects will add. This will be an added traffic hazard, and in the case of a vehicle accident it will pull emergency resources from surrounding areas.	Please see Responses ORG6-63 through ORG6-68.
PUB12-05	4. Fire: It was rough for us to recover after the Rim Fire. We lost about 80% of our trees and an outbuilding. We are just now starting to see some growth again of bushes and trees or as a fire would view it fuel. At the Under Canvas project they are proposing wood stoves, campfires and BBQ's. The Rim Fire was caused by one campfire and Under Canvas will have over one hundred ignition sources. Not to mention the additional careless people who are not use to being in the woods and would not realize how dangerous throwing a cigarette in the grass in this area could be. Since, the Rim Fire the wind just whips through there like never before and would move a fire quickly. Besides the loss of trees and buildings you will be putting numerous lives in danger. Lives of the residents of Saw Mill Mountain, the guest of both properties and the fire fighters and other emergence personal, this is just reckless and unnecessary on your part.	The comment provides a statement and opinion regarding the Yosemite Under Canvas project and does not address the analysis of the Terra Vi Lodge Draft EIR, therefore no further response is required.
PUB12-06	5. Security / Our Privacy: The Terra Via Property will be within a mile of our property. We are concerned with people wandering onto our property and either damaging it our stealing things. Private property signs do not keep people out. We are also concerned about noice *[sic]* pollution as they will be having wedding and parties with an amplified sound system.	The commenter does not provide any evidence that future site users will engage in illegal activities. Regarding noise, please see Response PUB67-11. CEQA does not require that trespassing or crimes be evaluated in the environmental review process, therefore the Draft EIR does not evaluate trespassing or crime impacts the proposed project could have on the community.
PUB12-07	The Under Canvas and the Terra Vi projects could both be moved closer to Groveland and if they were not across the street from each other this would alleviate a lot of the concerns. There maybe *[sic]* better opportunities for septic, they would be closer to town for emergency services	Please see Master Response 7.

Comment #	Comment	Response
	and farther away from homes so they could not drain others water supplies. Hopefully, a new location would also have a safer road entrance and exit.	
PUB12-08	The EIR was conducted too quickly to give an accurate assessment of all of the issues stated above.	The comment is noted. The comment does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR.
PUB13	**Matthew R. Moore, July 14, 2020**	
PUB13-01	I am writing to ask that you extend the periods of public review for both the Yosemite Under Canvas and the Hanjsi projects by at least 30 days. For the applicants to be given so much time to prepare their reports and for the public to have so little time to review their massive reports is not appropriate. Furthermore, the public has been calling for the cumulative effects of these projects to be considered together. So to have the periods for review overlap is not realistic. Finally, to have to review these lengthy reports during the current pandemic—when so many people are managing so many other, frankly, more important, challenges—is unconscionable. Surely, the county's intention is to allow the public to fully review and comment. I ask respectfully for your serious consideration of this request.	The comment requests an extension of the public review period of the Draft EIR. Please see Master Response 1, which explains the County's decision not to extend the public review period of the Draft EIR.
PUB14	**Geoff Dowd, July 15, 2020**	
PUB14-01	I wrote you months ago, and I'm sad to see that this project is still moving forward. I have several concerns about this project's impact on all that makes the region special. Namely, the wilderness alive and well as... healthy wilderness. Not scorched Earth. My greatest fear is not the increased traffic, water availability, nor the lack of housing regionally for staff... but simply WILDFIRE RISK. All of the above leads to greater risk of a wildfire. The region has seen several in the past and needs no more. Personally, having just travelled through Mammoth Lakes, Lake Tahoe, and regions in between, it is clear to me that there is increased interest in the great outdoors, the Sierra Nevada and anything to escape what is increasingly difficult times in suburban and city regions, exacerbated by the global pandemic. Simply put: the regions – especially this one where Terra Vi is planned to be built – is becoming overly congested without the proper infrastructure to provide safe enjoyment of the land. No doubt, this will lead to avoidable DEATH AND DESTRUCTION. You know this to be true.	The commenter expresses concerns regarding wildfire but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. This topic is evaluated in Chapter 4.17, Wildfire, of the Draft EIR. Please also see Master Response 5.

Comment #	Comment	Response
	If the developers truly cared about the wellbeing of its future customers, hotel guests, and the long-time residents of the region – and the Great Outdoors, they would not push forward with such a dangerous development. It is pure greed. Thank you for including my comments in the record. Do the right thing, shut this down.	
PUB15	**Ellie Owen, July 15, 2020**	
PUB15-01	1. Fire- how can this project be approved after the findings of the Tuolumne County Grand Jury Report on fire safety? Most of Tuolumne County's fire engines and equipment are very old and will soon be obsolete. The county does not have the funds to buy new equipment. The Grand Jury identified a lack of evacuation preparedness in our county. A massive evacuation would be a disaster with the amount of traffic that already exists on Hwy 120, the gateway corridor to Yosemite National Park. To think of adding another 400 vehicles from Terra Vi and 247 from Under Canvas not counting employee vehicles could easily become an inferno waiting to happen with the next wildfire. With the addition of that many more people, the likelyhood of fires goes up exponentially. Because Terra Vi and Under Canvas are right across the road from each other and owned by the same developers, why is a traffic study not required? Why shouldn't it be combined as one study?	Please see Appendix J, Transportation, of the Draft EIR for the Traffic Impact Analysis prepared for the proposed project in accordance with California Senate Bill 743. Please see Master Response 4 regarding emergency evacuation.
PUB15-02	2. Water- to calculate water availability in a non drought year seems foolish. With our history of drought, shouldn't that be an important part of the calculation? How many wells are on the property? How deep are the wells? How many gallons per minute does each one yield? How will they effect the wells of property owners adjoining the project? When PG&E shuts off power because of fire danger, how will the water be accessed? Gravity does not produce water pressure needed for fire protection.	Please see Response ORG6-42. The proposed project includes a backup generator to supply power in the event of a power outage.
PUB15-03	3. Insurance- so many of the residents of Tuolumne County have had their fire insurance policies canceled. Does Terra Vi have fire insurance? Have you seen their policy?	The comment is noted. The comment does not address adequacy of the Draft EIR and is outside the scope of CEQA.
PUB15-04	When the county is in the red and laying off staff, how will it justify sending an inspector to the Terra Vi site which is hours away for months on end?	The comment is noted. The comment does not address adequacy of the Draft EIR and is outside the scope of CEQA.
PUB15-05	Lastly, the hwy 120 corridor is the gateway to the Park and should be protected so as not to end up like the southern entrance.	The Draft EIR recognizes that the project site is located along Highway 120, a gateway to Yosemite. For example, pages 4.1-27 to 4.1-

Comment #	Comment	Response
		28 of the Draft EIR state, "The project site is located along the Highway 120 corridor, which serves as a gateway to Yosemite National Park. The corridor sets the stage for visitors of the park and provides aesthetic conditions that convey the rural forest nature of the region. As such, the hotel lodge would be surrounded by native landscaping consisting of conifers and black oaks, with ornamental native small trees, shrubs, groundcovers, and grasses. The mixed-conifer landscape would extend to the lodge perimeter areas, which would reinforce the forest setting. As shown on Figures 4.1-8c and 4.1-9c, the proposed project would be almost entirely concealed from Highway 120, except for a view of the resort sign located off of Sawmill Mountain Road, once the proposed landscape buffer is fully mature 10 years post planting."
PUB16	Jenny Pfeiffer, July 15, 2020	
PUB16-01	I just wanted to make sure you got my first comment (below, sent on July 3rd) and here are some more comments from me as well: First I want to address the aesthetics of Verra *[sic]* Vi, the design is terrible and does not fit with the surroundings at all!!!! It looks like an office building not a wilderness lodge. Rush Creek's design is soooooo much better than this design. It's embarrassing that is might get approved. If this gets built and then goes under will they just leave it to be an eye sore? I hope you all are considering what happens if they go out of business or run out of money before they are done building, with the current pandemic and the coming economic recession/depression this is very likely.	The commenter expresses concerns regarding aesthetics but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. This topic is evaluated in Chapter 4.1, Aesthetics, of the Draft EIR. The commenter's July 3, 2020 letter is included in this Final EIR as Letter PUB1. Please see Responses PUB1-01 through PUB1-16.
PUB16-02	1. The DEIR's Analysis of and Mitigation for Wildfire Risk, and Emergency Evacuation and Response Impacts Is Inadequate. The DEIR understates the Project's potential wildfire risks and fails to provide any analysis in	As described in Chapter 4.17, Wildfire, the proposed project features are designed to reduce wildfire risk. Please see Master Response 4 and Master Response 5.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
	support of its conclusion that these risks are less than significant. The proposed Project lies within a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone, and the Project site itself has burned multiple times, most recently in the 2013 Rim Fire. The DEIR's wildfire risk analysis is inadequate for the following reasons: • The DEIR largely relies on the implementation of Project features (such as separation between buildings, fire-resistant building materials, a vegetation management plan, employee training and a helipad) to suggest that the Project's wildfire-related impacts would not be significant level. The DEIR provides no evidence that these features would be sufficient to protect people and structures from the threat of a wildland fire.	
PUB16-03	• The DEIR fails to analyze wildfire risks resulting from inadequate fire protection services. For calls to the Project site, the closest fire station in Groveland would have at best a 22-minute response time with no traffic, three times the 7-minute standard for response times. The DEIR admits that firefighters would be unable to reach the Project site within established response times, but never considers how the inability of emergency responders to access the site in a timely manner would affect wildfire risk.	The Draft EIR is intended to analyze the impacts of the proposed project on the environment, not those of the environment on the proposed project, such as existing fire protection services. The Draft EIR includes the estimated response times for fire protection services, acknowledging the distances from existing fire stations and time it would take for services from existing fire stations to reach the project area. In analyzing wildfire impacts, the Draft EIR uses CEQA Guidelines Appendix G thresholds to analyze the impacts that the proposed project would have on wildfire risks. For GCSD's comments on the Draft EIR, please see Comment Letter GOV4 from GCSD and the associated responses. Please also see Master Response 6.
PUB16-04	• The DEIR does not analyze the Project's impacts on emergency access. It simply notes the existence of driveways providing access to Sawmill Mountain Road and to SR-120, but does not consider the capacity of SR 120 and traffic conditions on this roadway during an emergency event such as a wildfire.	Emergency evacuation is addressed in the Draft EIR under impact discussions HAZ-6, TRANS-4, and WF-1. Please also see Master Response 4 for more details on evacuation.
PUB16-05	• The DEIR fails to evaluate any evacuation scenarios. It assumes evacuation via SR-120 will be feasible, but does not consider whether SR-120 could accommodate the Project's traffic	Please see Master Response 4 regarding emergency evacuation.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
	together with the traffic from other evacuees during a wildfire event, or whether SR-120 might be blocked during a wildfire.	
PUB16-06	• The DEIR fails to analyze the cumulative impacts of the Project on emergency access and emergency response, when combined with the impacts of the proposed Yosemite Under Canvas development, the Thousand Trails/Yosemite Lakes RV Expansion, the Berkeley Tuolumne Camp Restoration project, and the Mountain Sage Conditional Use Permit project. Together these projects would likely create traffic congestion on SR-120 during a wildfire evacuation.	Please see Response ORG6-22.
PUB16-07	• The Project would conflict with goals and policies in the Tuolumne County General Plan, as it would increase exposure to wildfire risk, impede emergency access, and strain fire protection services. The DEIR does not identify these inconsistencies as significant impacts of the Project.	Table 4.17-2 of the Draft EIR provides a list of project features that would be implemented to reduce the risk of wildfire, and compares the proposed project features to the existing wildfire regulatory framework, including policies of the Tuolumne County General Plan. For example, wide separation between buildings to prevent structure to structure ignitions and provide easy access by emergency responders would be consistent with General Plan Goal 9E to "provide structural fire protection to persons and property within Tuolumne County consistent with the needs dictated by the level of development and in accordance with current Federal, State, and local fire protection agency regulations and policies". Exterior building materials constructed to comply with most recent wildland-urban interface building code requirements, and incorporation of a vegetation management plan would be consistent with General Plan Policy 17.E.3 to "Require new development to have adequate fire protection and to include, where necessary, design and maintenance features that contribute to the protection of the County from the losses associated with wildland fire."

Comment #	Comment	Response
		The project is allowed in the Tuolumne County General Plan and Zoning Ordinance, so in assigning these land use designations, the County has determined that this site is appropriate for commercial development. As described in Chapter 4.17, Wildfire, of the Draft EIR, impacts regarding wildfire would be less than significant with mitigation, therefore the proposed project would not be in conflict with wildfire risk policies of the General Plan. The project would also not impede emergency access; please see Master Response 4 explaining emergency evacuation. In addition, while the proposed project has the potential to increase demand for fire protection services, this impact is reduced to less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measure PS-1 and PS-2.
PUB16-08	2. The DEIR's Analysis of and Mitigation for the Project's Water Quality Impacts is Inadequate. • The DEIR provides no analysis in support of its conclusion that the Project's wastewater treatment system and leach field would not harm water quality. Instead, it wrongly claims that any water quality impacts from the wastewater treatment system would be less than significant simply because the Project's wastewater treatment would comply with applicable regulations.	The proposed on-site wastewater treatment system has been changed. The new proposed wastewater system would treat all wastewater on-site to Title 22 recycled water standards and any additional volume of treated wastewater will be infiltrated on-site via the on-site leach field. Therefore, no water quality issues would arise from this system. Please see Master Response 2.
PUB16-09	• The DEIR provides no evidence that proposed water testing and treatment measures would be effective in mitigating contamination found in the Project's drinking water supply. Water wells at the site were found to contain arsenic, iron, turbidity, and color levels that exceed drinking water maximum contaminant standards. The DEIR calls for further water testing and asserts that if contaminant levels remain high, the Project would install a water treatment unit, which it claims would reduce impacts to a less than significant level. However, it lacks details	Please see Response ORG6-34.

Comment #	Comment	Response
	about the proposed follow-up testing and treatment measures, and omits performance standards for these measures.	
PUB16-10	• The DEIR lacks analysis in support of its conclusion that a proposed drainage plan for runoff management and detention or retention facilities would sufficiently mitigate stormwater impacts. The DEIR finds that the Project would increase impervious surfaces and stormwater volumes which could require the expansion of existing stormwater facilities or the construction of new facilities, a significant impact. The DEIR fails to provide adequate mitigation measures for these impacts.	Please see Response ORG6-31.
PUB16-11	• The DEIR fails to analyze cumulative impacts on water quality. It concludes that the Project, in combination with the Yosemite Under Canvas project, Thousand Trails/Yosemite Lakes RV Expansion, Berkeley Tuolumne Camp Restoration project, and Mountain Sage Conditional Use Permit project, would result in less-than-significant cumulative impacts on hydrology, water quality, and groundwater. However, it contains no analysis in support of this conclusion, instead relying on Project features and regulatory compliance to claim impacts would not be significant.	Please see Response ORG6-37.
PUB16-12	3. The DEIR's Analysis of and Mitigation for the Project's Noise Impacts is Inadequate. • Multiple residences located close to the Project site would be impacted by Project noise, but the DEIR largely addresses impacts to only one residence. The DEIR fails to specify the number of homes in the area, their specific location or their distance from the Project.	Please see Response ORG6-46 and Appendix L, Supplemental Noise Analysis, of this EIR.
PUB16-13	• The Project will generate noise from sources including vehicle traffic, truck circulation, a loading dock, and an outdoor generator. The DEIR fails to provide adequate mitigation for these impacts. The DEIR also concludes that construction-related noise would be less than significant suggesting that these impacts would be "short-term." A construction project that lasts two years cannot be considered short-term.	Please see Response ORG6-46 and Appendix L, Supplemental Noise Analysis, of this EIR.
PUB16-14	• The DEIR fails to adequately analyze and mitigate impacts relating to helicopter noise. The DEIR admits that helicopter takeoff and landing from the Project helipad would produce substantial increases in daytime and nighttime noise. The DEIR does not adequately analyze how helicopter-related noise would impact residents in the area or identify adequate mitigation for these impacts.	Please see Response ORG6-58.
PUB16-15	4. The DEIR's Transportation Analysis Fails To Adequately Analyze Or Mitigate Impacts Relating to Roadway Hazards. • The Project would require construction of a new eastbound receiving lane on SR-120 to handle increased traffic from the Project, but this lane would be too short for traffic to merge safely. The DEIR fails to identify this deficiency as a significant roadway hazard.	Please see Response ORG6-63.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
PUB16-16	• The Project would cause a sight distance "deficiency" at the intersection of SR-120/Sawmill Mountain Road that would need to be mitigated by regrading and tree cutting. The DEIR does not provide any evidence to suggest that Caltrans would approve this roadway project.	Please see Response GOV8-04, which notes that Caltrans approval of the design of planned improvements to Highway 120 would occur when plans are submitted as part of the encroachment permit. As shown in Table 1-1 and Chapter 3, Revisions to the Draft EIR, of this Final EIR, encroachment permit approval for these intersection improvements would be required prior to the start of construction of the Terra Vi project.
PUB16-17	• The DEIR fails to analyze roadway safety hazards that would occur during Project construction. It does not evaluate the potential for accidents caused by slow-moving construction trucks and equipment entering and exiting SR-120 during the 2-year construction period.	Please see Response ORG6-66.
PUB16-18	• The DEIR fails to adequately analyze safety risks to bicyclists. It wrongly concludes that bicycle safety impacts are insignificant because cyclists would supposedly only travel a short segment of SR-120 between Sawmill Mountain Road and Hardin Flat Road. It ignores other bicycle traffic along SR-120, including traffic between the Project and other more distant points such as Yosemite National Park, and the Project's safety impacts on these cyclists.	Please see Response ORG6-67.
PUB16-19	• The DEIR ignores cumulative roadway safety impacts. It does not analyze how traffic from the Project, together with traffic from the Yosemite Under Canvas development, the Thousand Trails/Yosemite Lakes RV Expansion, the Berkeley Tuolumne Camp Restoration project, and the Mountain Sage Conditional Use Permit project, would cumulatively affect the roadway safety.	Please see Response ORG6-68.
PUB16-20	• The DEIR does not mention pedestrians walking across the hwy to go to the store from Under Canvas. How is that safe? You know this will happen and there will be accidents.	Please see Response ORG6-67.
PUB16-21	From: jenny pfeiffer <jenny@pfeifferfoto.com> Date: Friday, July 3, 2020 at 7:51 PM To: <qyaley@co.tuolumne.ca.us> Subject: Terra Vi Lodge Yosemite Dear Quincy Yaley (and board of supervisors) My family has owned a cabin on sawmill mountain for the last 50 years and I am NOT for the Terra Vi Lodge and think this a terrible development that would be bad for the area. I would like	The comment is a duplicate of Comment Letter PUB1. Please see Responses PUB1-01 through PUB1-16.

Comment #	Comment	Response
	to respond to the EIR, I do not agree with a lot of the findings and I think there is a lot of magical thinking involved. Even with this, they did find some significate effects that you can not ignore. Please read my comments below: WATER SUPPLY Despite well tests done in a wet year that show plenty of water that is supposedly more than sufficient to meet daily water needs of each project, the reality is that groundwater is always a gamble. If wells were tested at the end of multiple years of drought, the well test results would be highly different. What happens when the water drops by 50% which could happen this year, 2020 was a very dry year. It would be interesting to see how the wells perform this oct. Is there a plan if they run out of water? What will they do if they run all the wells dry in the surrounding area? With climate change a reality, this sonario is not out of the question. There is no surface water nearby so this is a big reason this project is so irresponsible. The report says "The Tuolumne County Water Quality Plan identifies residential and commercial on-site sewage disposal systems, leaking underground storage tanks, and unobstructed grazing practices as key sources of existing contamination. Chronic sources of soil erosion and enhanced sediment delivery to local waterways are also identified as a concern.9" The report says "The downstream receiving water for the project site is the Tuolumne River" what happens if the waste water contaminates the Tuolumne River. This river brings many tourists, if it was contaminated then the tourists will not come and the business that rely on them would be hurt. the report says "Implementation of the proposed project could violate water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality." Need to test at least 2 years in a row, 2019 was very wet so that was not a realistic year to test the well capacity. Another water issue is to fight a fire, if they are low on water because of a dry winter (very possible, we just had one this year, 2020) and barely getting enough to run the lodge, what happens if a fire starts and they do not have enough water to fight the fire? This development is	

Comment #	Comment	Response
	not alone, there are other cabin nearby and would put them at risk. The report says “Cumulative projects that install on-site water wells could potentially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge” Our well at our cabin was one of the well tested. “When the off- site residential well 26G(B) was pumping, there was also a response in the Terra Vi on-site source wells” which means they are connected. If they run their well dry there is a good chance ours will run dry as well. Not to mention that since they tested our water it has tasted terrible, they do not know why and they have not fixed it. If it does not improve soon something must be done. Fire The report says “The project would result in the need for new or physically altered fire protection facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives.” That mean the county is on the hook for providing more services. The report says “This represents an increase in demand on services provided by the GCSD, TCFD, and CAL FIRE, which would increase the deficiencies in service due to the distance from a fire station and existing response times. Calls from the Groveland station to the project site, which is out of the GCSD district, would take an estimated 22 minutes, and could create the potential for delayed response times for emergencies within the GCSD boundary while station personnel are responding to the project site.” I couldn’t have said it better. The report says “Despite the fire resistant and suppression physical features, non-physical features, and training program, the proposed project would still exacerbate existing fire protection service response time deficiencies in the region due to an increase in visitors and employees on the project site. While the proposed project would provide service improvements to the project site, GCSD and TCFD would still require alteration or expansion of staffing, equipment, and facilities, to maintain acceptable response times. Therefore, the proposed project would have a significant impact regarding fire protection services.” Can the county afford this? The report says “An assessment by the TCFD concluded that the proposed project, in combination with cumulative projects in the area, would create the need to expand existing fire	

Comment #	Comment	Response
	services and hire additional staff to adequately meet the additional service demand. Therefore, the proposed project, in combination with cumulative projects, could result in significant cumulative impacts regarding fire protection services." Can the county afford this? The report says "The project would be located in a State Responsibility and could, due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from, a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire." Yes I agree and this should not be ok with the county. The report says "The project's proposed features (listed in Table 4.17-2) would reduce potential wildfire hazards. However, the planting placement, density, and species on the project's landscaping plans are not consistent with these proposed wildfire hazard reduction features. Therefore, the impact would be significant." Need I say more? The report says "Accordingly, the proposed project would not contribute to a cumulative increase in wildland fire hazards in the immediate vicinity of the project site or throughout the region and the potential for cumulative impacts associated with wildfire hazards would be less than significant." -I disagree! County Services The project says "The project would result in the need for new or physically altered police facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives. " I ask again, can the county afford this? The report says "The proposed project would create a significant impact if it would substantially impair an emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan." This is a big problem, if this project along with under canvas and nearby cabins need to evacuate all at the same time then this would not be possible. One main road and one little fire access road is not enough. There could be loss of life. The report says "As there are no other helipads in the immediate vicinity of the project, this feature would be beneficial as it would provide improved emergency helicopter access in comparison to existing conditions." Under Canvas now says they will have a heli pad. Isn't one	

Comment #	Comment	Response
	enough? They are very loud. And I am not convinced they will only be used for emergency. These developers have lied to us before so I do not trust them and nor should you. Other: • Impact GHG-1.1: Construction of the proposed project would result in a net increase in GHG [Greenhouse Gas] emissions. • ▪ Impact GHG-1.2: Operation of the proposed project would result in a net increase in GHG emissions. • ▪ Impact NOI-3.1: Noise levels associated with use of the proposed emergency helipad could result in substantial temporary increases in ambient daytime and/or nighttime noise levels at nearby existing sensitive uses. -these 3 items are all important items that cannot be overlooked that will negatively impact the community. Thank you for taking the time to read my comments, Jenny Pfeiffer Jenny Elia Pfeiffer 415.999.9196 - http://www.pfeifferfoto.com	
PUB17	Jenny Pfeiffer, July 15, 2020	
PUB17-01	I am formally requesting the deadline for comments be extended for terra vi and for under canvas. The time given is not nearly enough time to be able to respond properly. We need another 30 days.	The comment requests an extension of the public review period of the Draft EIR. Please see Master Response 1, which explains the County's decision not to extend the public review period of the Draft EIR.
PUB18	Jill Oringer, July 16, 2020	
PUB18-01	1. The DEIR's Analysis of and Mitigation for Wildfire Risk, and Emergency Evacuation and Response Impacts Is Inadequate. The DEIR understates the Project's potential wildfire risks and fails to provide any analysis in support of its conclusion that these risks are less than significant. The proposed Project lies within a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone, and the Project site itself has burned multiple times, most recently in the 2013 Rim Fire. The DEIR's wildfire risk analysis is inadequate for the following reasons:	Please see Master Response 4, which explains emergency evacuation, and Master Response 5, which explains wildfire hazards.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
	• The DEIR largely relies on the implementation of Project features (such as separation between buildings, fire-resistant building materials, a vegetation management plan, employee training and a helipad) to suggest that the Project's wildfire-related impacts would not be significant level. The DEIR provides no evidence that these features would be sufficient to protect people and structures from the threat of a wildland fire.	
PUB18-02	• The DEIR fails to analyze wildfire risks resulting from inadequate fire protection services. For calls to the Project site, the closest fire station in Groveland would have at best a 22-minute response time with no traffic, three times the 7-minute standard for response times. The DEIR admits that firefighters would be unable to reach the Project site within established response times, but never considers how the inability of emergency responders to access the site in a timely manner would affect wildfire risk.	Please see Response PUB16-03.
PUB18-03	• The DEIR does not analyze the Project's impacts on emergency access. It simply notes the existence of driveways providing access to Sawmill Mountain Road and to SR-120, but does not consider the capacity of SR 120 and traffic conditions on this roadway during an emergency event such as a wildfire.	Please see Master Response 4 regarding emergency evacuation.
PUB18-04	• The DEIR fails to evaluate any evacuation scenarios. It assumes evacuation via SR-120 will be feasible, but does not consider whether SR-120 could accommodate the Project's traffic together with the traffic from other evacuees during a wildfire event, or whether SR-120 might be blocked during a wildfire.	Please see Master Response 4 regarding emergency evacuation.
PUB18-05	• The DEIR fails to analyze the cumulative impacts of the Project on emergency access and emergency response, when combined with the impacts of the proposed Yosemite Under Canvas development, the Thousand Trails/Yosemite Lakes RV Expansion, the Berkeley Tuolumne Camp Restoration project, and the Mountain Sage Conditional Use Permit project. Together these projects would likely create traffic congestion on SR-120 during a wildfire evacuation.	Please see Response ORG6-22 and Master Response 4.
PUB18-06	The Project would conflict with goals and policies in the Tuolumne County General Plan, as it would increase exposure to wildfire risk, impede emergency access, and strain fire protection services. The DEIR does not identify these inconsistencies as significant impacts of the Project.	Please see Response PUB16-07 and Master Response 5.
PUB18-07	2. The DEIR's Analysis of and Mitigation for the Project's Water Quality Impacts is Inadequate. • The DEIR provides no analysis in support of its conclusion that the Project's wastewater treatment system and leach field would not harm water quality. Instead, it wrongly claims that any water quality impacts from the wastewater treatment system would be less than significant simply because the Project's wastewater treatment would comply with applicable regulations.	Please see Response ORG6-32 and Master Response 22.
PUB18-08	• The DEIR provides no evidence that proposed water testing and treatment measures would be effective in mitigating contamination found in the Project's drinking water supply. Water	Please see Response ORG6-34.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
	wells at the site were found to contain arsenic, iron, turbidity, and color levels that exceed drinking water maximum contaminant standards. The DEIR calls for further water testing and asserts that if contaminant levels remain high, the Project would install a water treatment unit, which it claims would reduce impacts to a less than significant level. However, it lacks details about the proposed follow-up testing and treatment measures, and omits performance standards for these measures.	
PUB18-09	• The DEIR lacks analysis in support of its conclusion that a proposed drainage plan for runoff management and detention or retention facilities would sufficiently mitigate stormwater impacts. The DEIR finds that the Project would increase impervious surfaces and stormwater volumes which could require the expansion of existing stormwater facilities or the construction of new facilities, a significant impact. The DEIR fails to provide adequate mitigation measures for these impacts.	Please see Response ORG6-31.
PUB18-10	• The DEIR fails to analyze cumulative impacts on water quality. It concludes that the Project, in combination with the Yosemite Under Canvas project, Thousand Trails/ Yosemite Lakes RV Expansion, Berkeley Tuolumne Camp Restoration project, and Mountain Sage Conditional Use Permit project, would result in less-than-significant cumulative impacts on hydrology, water quality, and groundwater. However, it contains no analysis in support of this conclusion, instead relying on Project features and regulatory compliance to claim impacts would not be significant.	See Response ORG6-37.
PUB18-11	3. The DEIR's Analysis of and Mitigation for the Project's Noise Impacts is Inadequate. • Multiple residences located close to the Project site would be impacted by Project noise, but the DEIR largely addresses impacts to only one residence. The DEIR fails to specify the number of homes in the area, their specific location or their distance from the Project.	Please see Response ORG6-46 and Appendix L, Supplemental Noise Analysis, of this EIR.
PUB18-12	• The Project will generate noise from sources including vehicle traffic, truck circulation, a loading dock, and an outdoor generator. The DEIR fails to provide adequate mitigation for these impacts. The DEIR also concludes that construction-related noise would be less than significant suggesting that these impacts would be "short-term." A construction project that lasts two years cannot be considered short-term.	Please see Response ORG6-46 and Appendix L, Supplemental Noise Analysis, of this EIR.
PUB18-13	• The DEIR fails to adequately analyze and mitigate impacts relating to helicopter noise. The DEIR admits that helicopter takeoff and landing from the Project helipad would produce substantial increases in daytime and nighttime noise. The DEIR does not adequately analyze how helicopter-related noise would impact residents in the area or identify adequate mitigation for these impacts.	Please see Response ORG6-58.
PUB18-14	4. The DEIR's Transportation Analysis Fails To Adequately Analyze Or Mitigate Impacts Relating to Roadway Hazards.	Please see Response ORG6-63.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
	• The Project would require construction of a new eastbound receiving lane on SR-120 to handle increased traffic from the Project, but this lane would be too short for traffic to merge safely. The DEIR fails to identify this deficiency as a significant roadway hazard.	
PUB18-15	• The Project would cause a sight distance "deficiency" at the intersection of SR-120/Sawmill Mountain Road that would need to be mitigated by regrading and tree cutting. The DEIR does not provide any evidence to suggest that Caltrans would approve this roadway project.	Please see Responses ORG6-64 and GOV8-04.
PUB18-16	• The DEIR fails to analyze roadway safety hazards that would occur during Project construction. It does not evaluate the potential for accidents caused by slow-moving construction trucks and equipment entering and exiting SR-120 during the 2-year construction period.	Please see Response ORG6-66.
PUB18-17	• The DEIR fails to adequately analyze safety risks to bicyclists. It wrongly concludes that bicycle safety impacts are insignificant because cyclists would supposedly only travel a short segment of SR-120 between Sawmill Mountain Road and Hardin Flat Road. It ignores other bicycle traffic along SR-120, including traffic between the Project and other more distant points such as Yosemite National Park, and the Project's safety impacts on these cyclists.	Please see Response ORG6-67.
PUB18-18	• The DEIR ignores cumulative roadway safety impacts. It does not analyze how traffic from the Project, together with traffic from the Yosemite Under Canvas development, the Thousand Trails/Yosemite Lakes RV Expansion, the Berkeley Tuolumne Camp Restoration project, and the Mountain Sage Conditional Use Permit project, would cumulatively affect the roadway safety.	Please see Response ORG6-68.
PUB19	**Michael B. Allen, Esq., July 17, 2020**	
PUB19-01	I am a long time Groveland resident residing at 20351 Pine Mountain Drive. This project should not go forward until the developer addresses the significant drain on Groveland Community Services that will be caused by the operation of this facility . Specifically ambulance and fire. This developer must either have its own ambulance and fire suppression services or if it intends to rely on Groveland Services it should pay for the expansion of fire and ambulance services in Groveland necessary to protect and secure the residents of Groveland including Pine Mountain Lake.	The commenter expresses concerns regarding emergency services on the project site but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. Emergency service and response is evaluated in Chapter 4.14, Public Services and Recreation, of the Draft EIR. Please also see Master Response 6.
PUB20	**Suzanne Ctibor, July 17, 2020**	
PUB20-01	I am writing you to show my concern for the impact this project will have, not only to the aesthetic of the surrounding National Forest, or the impact on what little wildlife still resides here after the Rim Fire, but also the major impact this will have on Highway 120. If you have never driven either Old Priest, or New Priest grade, you have no idea how dangerous that part of the road is. If you have driven either Grades, then imagine driving them with two or 3 times the traffic! Highway 120 is not built for the amount of traffic we have now, let alone this whole new	The commenter expresses concerns regarding aesthetics and traffic but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. This topic is evaluated in Chapter 4.1, Aesthetics, and Chapter 4.15, Transportation, of the Draft EIR.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
	complex. The entire route of 120 from Moccasin to the Entrance of Yosemite, is an unsafe road, especially if you are not used to driving in the mountains. There have been many horrific accidents on this road, and there will be many more, as a lot of unsure city drivers are dangerous drivers on this road.	
PUB20-02	Also, I'd like to point out that this new complex is very far from any emergency help, or, an ambulance, fire suppression, or sheriff in case of an emergency.	The commenter expresses concerns regarding emergency services on the project site but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. Emergency service and response is evaluated in Chapter 4.14, Public Services and Recreation, of the Draft EIR. Please also see Master Response 6.
PUB20-03	There is only one way in, and one way out. What will happen if there is a need for evacuation? 120 is only a two lane highway, how will hundreds and hundreds of people, from not only Terra Vi, but Evergreen, and the new Rush Creek Lodge get safely out of there, if there is an emergency? It will be like the people of Paradise, who tried to leave, but were instead burned alive in their cars stuck in traffic on a two lane road with only one escape route.	Please see Master Response 4 regarding emergency evacuation.
PUB20-04	Please consider these facts, and, don't put corporate greed in the ahead of common sense. There are many small businesses in Groveland, and surrounding areas that need the revenue that comes from dining, renting rooms, gas and groceries, that depend on the tourists that have no huge 300 unit motels to go to instead of staying in or around Groveland, Big Oak Flat, and Buck Meadows. This complex is just not a good fit!	The comment is noted. The comment does not address the adequacy of the Draft EIR.
PUB20-05	I am very passionate about this, and, the EIR that says there will be no impact. That's just ridiculous, how can it not have an impact on otherwise virgin soil, a sewer system with leech fields that will drain towards the Middle Fork of the Tuolumne River, not to mention the extra pollution all those extra vehicles will be spewing.	Please see Response PUB16-08 for a discussion on the leach fields. Please see Master Response 2, which explains that the project no longer proposes a septic system. Mitigation Measures HYD-1a and HYD-1b will ensure that the proposed project includes drainage facilities to adequately manage stormwater flows and quality, ensuring that site run-off does not create off-site pollution impacts.

Comment #	Comment	Response
		Potential impacts from auto emissions are evaluated in Chapter 4.2, Air Quality, of the Draft EIR.
PUB20-06	Please, please, think about my above reasons, and just say no to more traffic, more city drivers on this dangerous road, and the impact of emergency fire and law enforcement being so far away, or an evacuation that will be unfathomable to even try to help all the extra people, and cars get out if need be. And, not to mention the impact on our Forest and Wildlife, and our way of life in a small little tourist town that needs the revenue of the tourist in the summer, so that we can eat, pay our bills, and be able to stay and enjoy this town and our simple way of life. I, and many other locals that have lived here all our lives, don't want to be put into any more danger on this road, and surely don't want to be forced out of our homes because all our small businesses are gone. I for one, prefer working for a 'mom and pop' business as opposed to working for a huge corporation from some other country. Thank you for any consideration of this matter.	The comment provides a summary of the comments above. Please see Responses PUB20-01 through PUB20-05.
PUB21	**Sam Flanery, July 18, 2020**	
PUB21-01	I wrote an email last week addressing these projects but it dawned on me that you may prefer to receive a PDF. My original letter was not included in the DEIR report I surely hope this was an oversight and not done on purpose.	The comment is noted. The comment does not address the adequacy of the Draft EIR. Comments received on the initial project application prior to the preparation of the Draft EIR are included in Appendix Q of this Final EIR.
PUB21-02	We own the property at 11230 Saw Mill Mountain Road, Groveland CA, we have owned this property for over 30 years. We would like to voice our concerns over The Under Canvas and The Terra Vi projects. First off, we would like you to extend the deadline for letters regarding these projects for another 30 days. There is an enormous amount of information to sift through. Just in case the deadline is not extended we are going to go ahead and voice some of our concerns. 1. Water Supply: The water supply test that was half heartedly conducted was done so in a short period of time during a fluke rainier than normal season. These tests are normally conducted over years during different seasons to get an accurate reflection. It is known, throughout California, that our state has been in a drought for years. All the properties in this area are on	Please see Master Response 1 regarding the request for an extension to the public review period. The Draft EIR looks at environmental impacts in accordance with CEQA Guidelines; off-site security concerns do not pertain to the analysis of the Draft EIR. The comment also offers an opinion on alternative project locations. Hydrology impacts are addressed in Chapter 4.10, Hydrology and Water Quality; public service

Comment #	Comment	Response
	well systems, and during dry seasons the Terra Vi project could pull enough water from the ground to dry up the water supply to numerous properties in the area. 2. Sewage / Leach Field: Both of these projects are going to rely on an engineered septic system which will have an astonishing amount of waste to treat. The Terra Vi project is on the high side of the hill so the leach field will bleed into us. The resort up the road Rush Creek has had numerous issues with this. This waste could easily end up contaminating our well, again our only water supply. 3. Road Entrance: Exiting out of Saw Mill Mountain Road onto 120 can already be difficult sometimes without the hundreds of cars and pedestrians these projects will add. This will be an added traffic hazard, and in the case of a vehicle accident it will pull emergency resources from surrounding areas. 4. Fire: It was rough for us to recover after the Rim Fire. We lost about 80% of our trees and an outbuilding. We are just now starting to see some growth again of bushes and trees or as a fire would view it fuel. At The Under Canvas project they are proposing wood stoves, campfire pits and BBQ's. The Rim Fire was caused by one campfire and Under Canvas will have over one hundred ignition sources. Not to mention the additional careless people who are not use to being in the woods and would not realize how dangerous throwing a cigarette in the grass in this area could be. Since, the Rim Fire the wind just whips through there like never before and would move a fire quickly. Besides the loss of trees and buildings you will be putting numerous lives in danger. Lives of the residents of Saw Mill Mountain, the guests of both properties and the fire fighters and other emergency personal, this is just reckless and unnecessary on your part. 5. Security / Our Privacy: The Terra Via Property will be within a mile of our property. We are concerned with people wandering on to our property and either damaging it or stealing things. Private property signs do not keep people out. We are also concerned about noise pollution as they will be having wedding and parties with an amplified sound system. The Under Canvas and The Terra Vi projects could both be moved closer to Groveland and if they were not across street from each other this would alleviate a lot of the concerns. There maybe better opportunities for septic, they would be closer to town for emergency services, and farther away from homes so they could not drain others water supplies. Hopefully a new location would also have a safer road entrance and exit.	impacts from the proposed project are addressed in Chapter 4.14, Public Services, Parks, and Recreation; transportation impacts are addressed in Chapter 4.15, Transportation; and utilities impacts are addressed in Chapter 4.16, Utilities and Service Systems. Please also see Master Response 7. Chapter 4.15, Transportation, of the Draft EIR analyzes potential safety hazards associated with the Sawmill Mountain Road/Highway 120 intersection. Fire-related impacts and public service demands are addressed in Chapter 4.9, Hazards and Hazardous Materials; Chapter 4.14, Public Services, Parks, and Recreation; and Chapter 4.17, Wildfire. Please also see Master Responses 5 and 6. Lastly, please see Response ORG6-42 for a discussion on the water supply test. The wastewater treatment system on-site has been changed from the system described in the Draft EIR. All wastewater from the proposed project will be diverted to an on-site wastewater treatment plant that will treat wastewater to Title 22 recycled water standards for use by the proposed project. Any additional treated wastewater will be infiltrated on-site with no water quality impacts downstream. Please also see Master Response 2.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
	The EIR was conducted too quickly to give an accurate assessment of all of the issues stated above.	
PUB22	**Denise Flanery Kraft, July 18, 2020**	
PUB22-01	I am against the Terra Vi and Yosemite Under Canvas Projects. Please see the attached PDF with my concerns. I am opposed to both the Yosemite Under Canvas and The Terra Vi projects. I feel both are being pushed through without any concern for the wildlife, environment or long time home owners in the area.	The commenter expresses concerns regarding wildlife but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. This topic is evaluated in Chapter 4.3, Biological Resources, of the Draft EIR.
PUB22-02	My parents have owned property off of Saw Mill Mountain Road for 32 years. I wrote a letter against the project and the beginning of this and it did not make it into your final report, I hope that was just an oversight on your part and that you are taking these letters seriously.	The comment is noted. The comment does not address the adequacy of the Draft EIR.
PUB22-03	Here are a few of the reasons I am against the project but not all because I don't feel like I was given enough time to digest the DEIR in depth before the due date for comments.	The comment provides an introduction to the comments below. Please see Responses PUB22-04 through PUB22-10.
PUB22-04	Fire Risk: The area is just now beginning to see some growth from the Rim Fire 7 years ago. My family lost an outbuilding and the majority of trees on their property. You are proposing bringing more people to the area, who in all likely hood *[sic]* are not outdoors people or fire safe and allowing them to have BBQ's and firepits. The Rim Fire was caused by one fire not properly put out and started miles away and look how much damage it caused. It was a blessing no lives were lost fighting the fire or trying to escape it. Yet you are going to build two properties across the street from each other with one way back into town during an emergency it will be almost impossible for people to escape safely.	The commenter expresses concerns regarding wildfire but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. This topic is evaluated in Chapter 4.17, Wildfire, of the Draft EIR. Please also see Master Response 5.
PUB22-05	Traffic Concerns: Despite the traffic conditions during an emergency even getting into and out off Saw Mill Mountain Road normally can be difficult. Not only will you be adding more cars to the mix most likely you will have pedestrians trying to walk across the highway from one project to the other. There is a blind corner there and someone will get killed.	The commenter expresses general concerns regarding traffic and emergency services but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. Traffic is evaluated in Chapter 4.15, Transportation, of the Draft EIR. Please also see Master Response 4.
PUB22-06	Water Supply: Our only source of water is our well. We did notice a drop in our water while you were doing your testing. It did recover after the testing stopped but once The Terra Vi project is up and running it will be drawing water on a more continuous basis and will most likely dry up our water source. Who will be responsible for us to get water then.	Please see Response ORG6-42. Testing was at a rate significantly above water demand and the test program was designed to maximize the impact on nearby wells in order to ensure the analysis was

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
		conservative. Operational pumping rates will be significantly less than tested rates.
PUB22-07	Septic: Rush Creek up the road as had many issues with their waste. It is my concern that our water supply will get contaminated and / or the Tuolumne River could get contaminated. Getting the river contaminated would have long reaching and negative effects on the wildlife in the area.	The commenter expresses concerns regarding the project's wastewater disposal but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. Wastewater is evaluated in Chapter 4.16, Utilities and Service Systems, of the Draft EIR.
PUB22-08	Wildlife: Deer, owls, wolves, bears, and quails are just a few of the wildlife species I've seen in the area. As these animals natural habitat is taken away from them where are they going to relocate to.	The commenter expresses concerns regarding wildlife in the vicinity of the project site but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. Wildlife is evaluated in Chapter 4.3, Biological Resources, of the Draft EIR.
PUB22-09	Pollution: The more people who come to the area the more pollution they cause, noise pollution, waste, and environmentally by car emissions. The Terra Vi project is going to have a helicopter pad and amplified sound system. That not only affects the residents in the area, but also the wildlife who call this area their home.	The commenter expresses concerns regarding the project's noise generation, waste, GHG emissions, and impacts to wildlife but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. These topics are evaluated in Chapter 4.12, Noise, Chapter 4.16, Utilities and Service Systems, Chapter 4.8, GHG Emissions, and 4.3, Biological Resources, of the Draft EIR.
PUB22-10	I hope you will reconsider building both of these projects at this location. There have been other proposed sites closer to town, which would be easier for emergency services, not across the street from each other and not located so closely to people's houses.	Please see Master Response 7 which compares the proposed project location to that of a site located closer to Groveland under the Alternative Location Alternative.
PUB23	**Linda King, July 18, 2020**	
PUB23-01	Greetings, My name is Linda King. I am a property owner and tax payer in Tuolumne County. Please don't let our area be burdened with two big resorts. We have a single ambulance in Groveland, a single food market. We have one traffic signal. We are already overburdened with traffic and tour busses using our toilets and water fountains at Mary Lavaroni park. We tax payers should not always be having higher taxes and more traffic. Law enforcement is already problematic. There have never been enough deputies here, altho *[sic]* they do their best, and try and live here	The commenter expresses concerns regarding emergency services on the project site but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. Emergency service and response is evaluated in Chapter 4.14, Public Services and Recreation, of the Draft EIR. Please also see Master Response 6.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
	when possible. My hope is that neither project will be approved. If one HAS to come, please only one.	
PUB24	Christina Kraft, July 18, 2020	
PUB24-01	I am opposed to the Terra Vi Lodge Yosemite and Under Canvas projects. Please see attached PDF. To whom it may concern, My name is Christina Kraft and our family has owned a house on Sawmill Mountain Road for 32 years. I am opposed to the building of the Lodge and Glamping tents for many reasons.	The comment serves as an introduction to the comments below. Please see Responses PUB24-02 through PUB24-05.
PUB24-02	WATER SUPPLY - Despite well tests done in a wet year that show plenty of water that is supposedly more than sufficient to meet daily water needs of each project, the reality is that groundwater is always a gamble. If wells were tested at the end of multiple years of drought, the well test results would be highly different. Emphasizing the lack of a public water supply of surface water from a reservoir, lake, or river. We don't want our wells to run dry.	Please see Response ORG6-42.
PUB24-03	SEPTIC - Similarly, because there is no public sewer system, each of the two projects must rely on an engineered septic system to treat the truly staggering amounts of wastewater that will be produced. Painstaking sifting through the EIR for each project and debating or questioning assertions made about the assurance that septic treatment will be adequate is a second very important issue. The potential for our well supplies and the Tuolumne River to be contaminated is another concern.	The commenter expresses concerns regarding the project's wastewater generation and disposal but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. Wastewater is evaluated in Chapter 4.16, Utilities and Service Systems, of the Draft EIR. Please also see Master Response 2.
PUB24-04	FIRE RISK - Having the Under Canvas project (with 99 wood stoves and campfire pits and barbecues)- puts over a hundred ignition sources into the forest landscape at a site that already burned hot once in the recent Rim Fire and has fuels ready to burn again. Emphasizing that the two projects not only pose risk of ignitions but perhaps even worse will put hundreds of visitors in the path of a potential summer wind-blown wildfire is a key argument that pushes against the need for public safety. Building these two projects at an alternative location near Groveland would greatly diminish all three of the issues identified so far.	Cumulative impacts regarding wildfire are addressed in the Draft EIR under impact discussion WF-5. As discussed in Chapter 4.17, Wildfire, of the Draft EIR, future development under the proposed project would not interfere with implementation of emergency response plans or result in significant wildfire-related impacts, with the implementation of mitigation measures. As with the proposed project, the Yosemite Under Canvas project would be subject to the same federal, State, and regional

Comment #	Comment	Response
		regulations, as well as regional safety plans, such as the Tuolumne County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan and Tuolumne County Community Wildfire Protection Plan. Compliance with regulatory requirements, proactive fire suppression design features, the inclusion of project components that would reduce wildfire risks to employees and guests, and the implementation of applicable mitigation measures such as WF-2 for the proposed project would reduce the cumulative wildfire impacts from the proposed project to less than significant. An alternative site for the proposed project closer to Groveland was analyzed in Chapter 6, Alternatives, as the Alternate Location Alternative. The alternate location near Groveland would still be located in a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone and would include most of the same building features as would be used as part of the proposed project to reduce wildfire risks. Therefore, it was concluded that impacts regarding wildfire for the site located closer to Groveland would still be similar to those of the proposed project. Please also see Master Responses 5 and 7.
PUB24-05	After losing our garage with all of my grandfather's carpentry tools in it and coming inches to losing our beloved house, we cannot have any more fire risk. For these reasons it will not be a good idea to build these so close to our homes.	The commenter expresses concerns regarding wildfire but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. This topic is evaluated in Chapter 4.17, Wildfire, of the Draft EIR. Please also see Master Response 5.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
PUB25	**Dennis Kraft, July 18, 2020**	
PUB25-01	I am against the Terra Vi and Yosemite Under Canvas projects. My family has had a cabin in the area for over 30 years. I feel the EIR was rushed and not complete. I have numerous concerns, here are just a few of the things I do not think the EIR answered fully: Traffic conditions, Impact on Wildlife, Water Supply, Septic, Fire Risk, and noise. This project is being pushed through without consider for any of these things. The county is only thinking of the tax revenue they will gain from the project and not thinking of the safety or well being of the people of who will be affected by this project.	The commenter's concern that the EIR "was rushed" is not accurate, as the EIR has been underway since Spring 2019. The commenter expresses concerns regarding the project's traffic, wildlife, water supply, septic, wildfire, and noise impacts but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. These topics are evaluated in Chapter 4.15, Transportation, Chapter 4.17, Wildfire, Chapter 4.10, Hydrology and Water Quality, Chapter 4.16, Utilities and Service Systems, Chapter 4.12, Noise, and Chapter 4.3, Biological Resources, of the Draft EIR. Please also see Master Responses 2 and 5.
PUB26	**Beth Martin, July 18, 2020**	
PUB26-01	Below are my comments as a resident of Tuolumne County re: the environmental impacts from the proposed Terra Vi resort. As a full-time resident of Groveland, I am very concerned about the development of the Terra Vi. The draft environmental impact report does not adequately address how to mitigate the major impacts that this enormous project will have on residents living nearby. I am most concerned about fire protection, law enforcement and ambulance coverage, as well as traffic.	The commenter expresses concerns regarding emergency services, traffic, and wildfire response but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. These topics are evaluated in Chapter 4.14, Public Services and Recreation, and Chapter 4.17, Wildfire, of the Draft EIR. Please also see Master Responses 5 and 6.
PUB26-02	Fire and Ambulance This resort is proposed for an extreme high-fire zone. Yet local firefighting resources are limited. What happens when our local fire services are unavailable to residents in Groveland because they've been called out to a medical or fire emergency at Terra Vi? How long will we have to wait while our houses burn?	The commenter expresses concerns regarding emergency services on the project site but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. Emergency service and response is evaluated in Chapter 4.14, Public Services and Recreation, of the Draft EIR. Please also see Master Response 6.
PUB26-03	Second, if there is a catastrophic wildfire, how is everyone supposed to evacuate? The hundreds of people at Terra Vi would be rushing to evacuate along with residents Groveland, Pine Mountain Lake, Big Oak Flat and all along the Highway 120 corridor. The limited evacuation	Please see Master Response 4.

Comment #	Comment	Response
	routes are all on rural, two-lane roads. We saw with Paradise, CA in 2018 what happens when thousands of people are all racing for their lives from a wildfire. Without addressing this extreme fire risk, the county and the EIR is being irresponsible.	
PUB26-04	And if someone in Groveland suffers a medical emergency, especially heart attack or stroke, how will they get adequate care if the EMTs are at Terra Vi? To survive a stroke, every second counts. To avoid death or lifelong serious disability, treatment must begin within ONE HOUR of a stroke. How can that happen if there is no local EMT available because they are 30 minutes away at Terra Vi? The answer: they won't. People's lives and quality of life will be put at serious risk.	The commenter expresses concerns regarding emergency services on the project site but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. Emergency service and response is evaluated in Chapter 4.14, Public Services and Recreation, of the Draft EIR. Please also see Master Response 6.
PUB26-05	The only way to mitigate these issues is to build a new fire/EMT station near Terra Vi, Under Canvas, Rush Creek, Evergreen Lodge and Berkeley Camp, to service the needs of those resorts. And those resorts should pay for the cost of building, staffing and maintaining equipment at this new station.	Mitigation Measure PS-1 provides supplemental firefighting services for the project. Because the impact will be mitigated to a less-than-significant level, the County is not required to consider additional mitigation measures. For GCSD's comments on the Draft EIR, please see Comment Letter GOV4 from GCSD and the associated responses.
PUB26-06	Law Enforcement CHP and Sheriff Department coverage in Groveland, Big Oak Flat and Pine Mountain Lake is already thin. There are only a few regular patrols, and virtually no traffic enforcement within the Pine Mountain Lake development right now. Law enforcement responds mostly to emergencies, and the response time can be lengthy if a CHP or sheriff's officer is not already in the vicinity. Terra Vi will bring in hundreds of additional people to the area. It is unreasonable to expect that existing law enforcement can add this huge resort to its enforcement area without neglecting the Groveland/Big Oak Flat area more than they already do.	The commenter expresses concerns regarding emergency services on the project site but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. Emergency service and response is evaluated in Chapter 4.14, Public Services and Recreation, of the Draft EIR. The proposed project has the potential to increase demand for police services to the project site. Impacts to police services would be reduced to a less-than-significant level with implementation of Mitigation Measure PS-3: The Terra Vi Lodge shall include private security personnel on staff (Manager on Duty) to provide security, complaint resolution, and interfaces with law enforcement/emergency personnel in case

Comment #	Comment	Response
		of an incident, emergency, or evacuation. These personnel shall be on-site 24 hours a day, seven days a week. The security personnel shall make regular rounds of the Terra Vi Lodge and employee housing and report internally any incidences, as well as report to local authorities if the situation warrants it. Please also see Master Response 6.
PUB26-07	The only adequate mitigation measure is to build and staff a new sheriff's substation along the Highway 120 corridor, with the resorts along that corridor responsible for funding the construction and staffing of the new substation.	Mitigation Measure PS-3 provides supplemental security services for the project. Because the impact will be mitigated to a less-than-significant level, the County is not required to consider additional mitigation measures.
PUB26-08	Traffic During the summer we already see never-ending streams of cars, busses and motorhomes along the Highway 120 corridor, all headed to Yosemite. The impacts to Highway 120/Main Street in Groveland are already significant. This development would encourage even more people to take this route to not just Yosemite but to the resort as an end destination. When I go home from the post office, I often have to wait a full 5 minutes or more before cross traffic coming from Yosemite clears so that I can turn left onto Ferretti Road towards my home in Pine Mountain Lake. Meanwhile, traffic backs up all the way through town so that local residents cannot reach the pharmacy, post office and local businesses without hassle. This project should require some form of traffic mitigation because of the impacts it will have on the town of Groveland and its residents.	The commenter expresses concerns regarding traffic but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. Traffic is evaluated in Chapter 4.15, Transportation, of the Draft EIR.
PUB26-09	In short: this project should not be built without the county taking steps to mitigate these issues by requiring the resort to fund enhanced fire, ambulance and law enforcement services at the very minimum.	The commenter expresses concerns regarding emergency services on the project site but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. Emergency service and response is evaluated in Chapter 4.14, Public Services and Recreation, of the Draft EIR. Please also see Master Response 6.
PUB27	**Kathleen M. and Donald P. Brown, July 19, 2020**	

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
PUB27-01	We would like to make our concerns about the planned developments of Terra VI and Under Canvas in the Sawmill area off Rt.120 between Groveland and Yosemite National Park known to the Tuolumne County Planning Commission. We realize there are positive aspects to the planned development such as an increased tax base, jobs for locals, and fulfilling a need for more facilities for visitors to Yosemite so we are not anti-development but, that said, we also recognize some very major problems that need to be thought through and planned for before this development is approved and undertaken. Totally aside from these two major proposed developments, one of our major concerns is that the 120 corridor into Yosemite not become a series of one-after-another hotels and businesses that will eventually make the area look like that just north of Gatlinburg outside the Great Smoky Mountains National Park. We would like to be assured that there are already welldefined limitations to future development allowed on the corridor in place by the county. For the immediate plan we have several major concerns that we feel need to be addressed and planned for before an approval is given for the development.	The comment serves as an introduction to the comments that follow. Please see Responses PUB27-02 through PUB27-07.
PUB27-02	EMERGENCY SERVICES Of major concern is the unavailability of emergency services in that immediate Sawmill area. Groveland has the closest available ambulance and fire service. The distance of these developments away from Groveland makes speed in response time impossible and takes away immediate response for Groveland area residents should the services be called to the proposed developments. The services are already being shared with Rush Creek/Evergreen developments, thus already having the potential of decreasing response time to our residents. We feel conditions should be attached to any approval requiring the developments to create and maintain emergency services for the area that would ideally also include the Rush Creek and Evergreen as well.	The commenter expresses concerns regarding emergency services on the project site but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. Emergency service and response is evaluated in Chapter 4.14, Public Services and Recreation, of the Draft EIR. Please also see Master Response 6.
PUB27-03	RELIABLE WATER Residents with wells on the 120 Corridor have had trouble with their wells going dry in low precipitation years and have had to dig their wells deeper and deeper to obtain water. Have adequate water studies been done in drought times to assure that water will be available to such large developments without depleting the area water table? If not should another study be done now in a dryer year, if not ideally in drought year, to check for assured water availability. There are also sewage run-off concerns in exceptionally heavy rainy seasons.	Please see Responses ORG6-42 and ORG6-32. See Appendix M, Supplemental Hydrogeology Information, of the Final EIR.

Comment #	Comment	Response
PUB27-04	ROADS AND TRAFFIC At this time the roads along the 120 Corridor are narrow and winding with many areas of limited visability *[sic]*. We would definitely not like to see the roads become major multi-lane highways and loose the county atmosphere but major widening would be necessary in places to allow for safe entrance and exit for these new developments. This is especially true due to the large RVs that will used the proposed Under Canvas development, as well as YARTS buses and delivery trucks to each development. Are there plans for this to be done and who is paying for that? Traffic through Groveland already is bumper to bumper in summer. Won't these developments increase and slow that traffic even more? Has this been discussed completely? How will this be handled?	The commenter expresses concerns regarding traffic but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. Transportation, including proposed roadway improvements to Highway 120, is evaluated in Chapter 4.15, Transportation, of the Draft EIR.
PUB27-05	HOUSING FOR WORKERS Groveland is already providing additional housing for workers for Rush Creek/Evergreen Resorts because their planned housing on site is inadequate. While we realize that the developments may provide work for some Grovelanders, we also realize that today's Groveland residents are mostly retirees so there would have to be an influx of new workers from outside the area. Looking at the plans for these new developments, it does not look like there is enough housing on site for an influx of workers. Should there be a condition added that developments be required to provide more housing than currently planned for their work force?	The comment does not address the adequacy of the Draft EIR. Please see Response PUB77-04 for more detail on proposed employee housing and the county's available housing supply.
PUB27-06	OTHER SERVICES FOR VISITORS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE DEVELOPMENT Also of concern to us is the current inadequacy of MarVal Market to handle residents and visitors needs. This is an impact on the local community. At this point, for about 8 months of the year, residents of the Groveland area avoid going to the market on weekends because it is woefully over-crowded, especially a problem in this COVID era, and there is usually no parking available. The added traffic through the corridor would necessitate a bigger market. Are there any plans to mitigate this problem? We see that Terra VI has what appears to be a small market which I assume will be a combined convenient/gift store. Should a condition of the developments be the creation of a larger market on site to serve that area?	The commenter expresses concerns regarding traffic but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. Traffic is evaluated in Chapter 4.15, Transportation, of the Draft EIR.
PUB27-07	We are sure there are other points of consideration that we have missed. We request that you not rush approval of these developments so they can be adequately thought through. If you decide that these projects should be approved, we hope that you will attach some conditions to the developments that will assure safety in the area and will mitigate some of the impact on our local community which it is your duty to protect.	The comment serves as a summary of the comments above. Please see Responses PUB27-01 through PUB27-06.
PUB28	**Tim Hutchins, July 19, 2020**	
PUB28-01	First I want to state my objections to way this report was released. For a massive document of this size, the largest in Tuolumne Co history, a 45 day period for comments is entirely	The comment requests an extension of the public review period of the Draft EIR. Please

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
	inadequate. Requesting an extension of the 45 day period to give interested parties additional time to analyze the project is and was a reasonable request give the scope of this bloated document. The release of the document almost simultaneously with the Yosemite Under Canvas document, which held the pervious but short lived record for largest document of this type in County history, puts a unreasonable burden on any interested parties ability to analyze, reply or comment. A Planning Department employee, Quincy Yale, when responding to the numerous requests for more time, simply stated that the 45 day period complied with the state minimum and that there would be no extended comment period. The request were for more time, no one was asking if the project comment period was in compliance with the state minimum standards. Commenters were asking for MORE time then the state minimum standard to read and analyze this massive document. I would certainly hope that this simultaneous release of both DEIRs isn't and wasn't a concerted effort by either county planners and/or the two proposed projects to overwhelm the ability of interested parties to respond. If that was or wasn't the case the Planning Departments denial seems to preclude any chance for interested parties to even fully read or process much less provide detailed comments to the thousands of pages of documents. The denial of the requested extension combined with the near simultaneous release of both documents has undermined and delegitimizes this entire process for both projects. I would also hope that the standard for review of this project is consistently higher that of the MINIMUM State standard that the Planning department found adequate for the comment period.	see Master Response 1, which explains the County's decision not to extend the public review period of the Draft EIR.
PUB28-02	The TV DEIR is a much less amateurish self serving document then the YUC DEIR but does conclude, unlike the YNC summery concludes, that there will be at least some unavoidable adverse environmental effects if the development is approved. The TV document is much more professionally produced with the inclusion of pages of glossy computer generated images and thousands of words extolling how environmentally aware the project and developers are. But it does not address the same basic core issues that make YUC canvas and TV, both, inappropriate development for their proposed locations for the same reasons.	The comment is noted. The comment does not address the adequacy of the Draft EIR.
PUB28-03	Safety There is no way to adequately reduce the risk of fire danger and the fact is that much of Tuolumne Co. is at extreme risk from wildfire every year. Tuolumne counties fire services are underfunded, have aging equipment and are inadequate for the areas they already serve. These	Please see Master Response 5.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
	are the conclusions of the counties own recently released grand jury report. Just because a landholder was able to have a zoning change approved 20 plus years ago for commercial recreational land use in no way and should not obligate or influence the county to promote or even consider unsafe development. Common sense would indicate that fire risk alone, with the recent tragic history of fire deaths in California, would more than enough reason to deny permits for any large developments in areas of extreme fire risk. So how can the county acknowledge extreme fire risk and identify the current state of their underfunded and inadequate fire protection in their own Grand Jury report, while simultaneously considering approval of massive growth in an area with no local fire protection services? TOT tax collection should not be the driver for the county to approve this type of lodging development in extreme fire risk areas that will only further strain Co. fire services. It is a short sighted risky and dangerous way to collect revenue and does not put Co. residents or visitor safety first. Any approval for any new development of this scope should have the obligation to permanently fund fire protection service for its development at no new cost to county residents. This should minimally include funding to build, equip, and staff fire stations within reasonable response times. The current Cal Trans storage facility on Sawmill Mtn. road would make an ideal site for a new Co. fire station, funded by developer fees, and if that property is unavailable then the TV property west of Sawmill Mtn road would also serve well. The already permitted expansion of the RV park and the rebuild of Berkley Camp, and the possible approval of YNC and TV will greatly increase the need for emergency services in the area. All four projects need to be required to pool funding for their own local Co. fire protection services and not increase emergency response times by piggybacking on distant Groveland fire services and the alread very thin south Co. emergency services. That all of this already permitted and potential new development will be dependent on the clearly inadequate Hardin Flat road and Sawmill Mtn. roads for egress and emergency evacuations is not safe or acceptable. As the Camp fire tragically provides evidence of wildfire can trap and burn to death people trying to evacuate from fast moving wildfire on inadequate roads. The Co. needs to look at all of these developments in worst case fire scenarios, the providers of insurance for these developments certainly do and will. Rush Creek to their credit honestly admits that fire insurance costs threaten the viability of their business. As anyone who has tired to get fire insurance for any structure in Tuolumne Co. knows it is either unavailable or	

Comment #	Comment	Response
	prohibitively expensive. What are the Co. plans if any or all of these developments are unable to to purchase adequate fire insurance now or in the future? Large developments forced to close because of the very real possibility they are uninsurable will certainly reduce the danger to human life. But mothballed buildings from failed developments will be an eyesore and a attractive hazard, certainly wont improve the scenery on the 120 corridor, and could become an environmental liable. The TV document does not address the potential for a oversupply of lodging, especially high end, on the 120 corridor or the expense and/or total unavailability of insurance which could threaten the viability of not only TV but all the developments in 120 corridor. These two factors could result in multiple abandoned developments that provide no property tax revenue or TOT revenue. Any permit issued for any new commercial development in State designated extreme risk fire areas in the Co. should be required to prove that the property is insurable.	
PUB28-04	Water For a document of its volume and scope the DEIR is surprisingly brief about the availability and reliability of water onsite. The finding of Less Than Significant is based on just the minimum required tests that in no way confirm that any of the onsite wells have sufficient volume of recharge to be a permanent water source for the large scale of this development. All of the other large local hotels/lodging developments, also in fractured granite sub-strata, all, have struggled to have sufficient water for demand. TV did not share their well test information with YUC but the well tests on the adjoining property do show a connection between at least one of the TV and YUC wells. Below are unsupported statements from the DEIR. The first statement while technically true is very carefully worded. The YUC well tests did have a well draw down occur during the TV testing. There was only one day of simultaneous testing which does not seem sufficient to make any type of conclusions, especially any so broad as the statements below. The TV wells were not being tested when this conclusion was reached, their levels remained static but were not operating during the YUC test. Although TVs wells may have not been impacted by the YUC tests at least one of the YUC wells was, even with only one day of simultaneous testing. So the first conclusion is not based in fact. The wells reliability can not be tested during prolonged drought and was not and can not be tested in real time with prolonged demands from both TV and YUC.	The Terra Vi and Yosemite Under Canvas projects shared pumping test data (see Appendix G of both reports). The Terra Vi and Yosemite Under Canvas Well No. 2 pumping tests overlapped for nine days. Further review of the pumping test data suggests that Yosemite Under Canvas Well No. 1 experienced an approximately 1.23 ft recovery after the Terra Vi pumping test was completed. The Yosemite Under Canvas Well No. 2 did not show any interference. Any Yosemite Under Canvas impact on the Terra Vi wells could not be distinguished from the pumping of neighbor wells. This is not a significant impact considering both Terra Vi wells and Yosemite Under Canvas Well No. 1 were pumping approximately 4.7 times the anticipated cumulative demand for the projects. Please see Response ORG6-42 and ORG6-32.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
	• The water levels in the on-site Terra Vi wells showed no impact during the pump testing of the Yosemite Under Canvas wells to the south. Therefore, simultaneous pumping from wells on the Terra Vi property or the Yosemite Under Canvas property would not impact the other property • Yosemite Under Canvas property would not impact the other property. • The proposed project would have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry, and multiple dry years. Nature Bridge the outdoor education NGO in YNP spent tens of millions of dollars to build a new Campus site at the Junction of Hwy. 41 and Henness Ridge road in YNP. The well that was connected to the property, which had been in place since 2007, produced volumes in the same mid 20s GMP as the TV well tests produced. The well is at approximately the same elevation and is located in similar fractured granite substrata. This wells volume fell to 4GPM after the Campus was operating and the chemistry of the water made even that yield unusable. Nature Bridge is fortunate that their property abuts the Yosemite West development and is negotiating with its very small adjacent water district to obtain sufficient water to operate the Campus. But the Campus is currently mothballed and non-operational. TV does not and will not have that or any other option when its wells fail. This seems like at the very least a red flag for project investors as the investment of tens of millions of development dollars will be wasted if any part of the well report predictions are faulty. A much more comprehensive and prolonged well test would seem to to be in the developers own interest. Both at TV and YUC simultaneous prolonged tests with shared data and tests of the adjacent private wells would seem like a common sense perquisite to any building permits being issued Although there is a possibility that Haniji has no intention of operating the property. It may just be sold after construction, so Haniji may have no interest in anything but the absolute minimum testing required and let any buyer of the property deal with the consequences of well failures. The requirement below for this project to be approved has clearly not been met. Future supply that meets demand is not assured and there are no other options for water except the onsite wells. Consider whether the water system proposed to serve a new development has a reliable source of water, sized to serve their existing and future customer's' foreseeable demands. Projects shall only be approved where the water supply system has reliable sources of water capable of	

Comment #	Comment	Response
	meeting present and future demands. Although the DEIR findings were Less Than Significant a major development the size of TV will certainly experience Very Significant affects if its wells fail. The DEIR repeatedly states that wells in fractured granite are not considered as reliable because well yields can vary greatly. Both the extent of sub-surface fractures, the source of the water, and long term recharge rates are not measurable. The DEIR than goes on to state that there is sufficient water on site for the development even in multiple very dry years. There is no data to support that conclusion as there is no way to test multiple dry years to reach that conclusion. There are far more pages in the document about all of the water saving features that will be built into the project then there are of actual well testing data. Water saving and recycling features seem like a obvious benefit to the development, and they are. But well water is actually a very inexpensive source especially when compared to water delivered by water districts. Gray water recycling and storage as the developer plans to install, is a very large investment as it requires parallel plumbing systems. This significantly increases both building and operational costs which, because of the inexpensive well sourced water, if actually abundant, could easily and more economically not be included. The only reason to pay these increased costs for this project would seem that the developers themselves lack confidence as to the reliability of their water source.	
PUB28-05	Traffic Total cumulative traffic impact, numbers and affects from all of the proposed and already permitted developments need much more mitigation then what is in the TY DEIR. The current configuration of both the Hwy.120 Sawmill Flat and Hwy.120 Hardin Flat intersections are inadequate for current levels of traffic much less any new development vehicle traffic. The DEIR does conclude that there are traffic safety issues that need to be addressed. Traffic is obviously the result of cumulative numbers of vehicles but the total numbers of vehicles from all proposed new and already permitted developments needs to be addressed in the DEIR. Yosemite Lakes RV park and its expansion, the Berkley Camp rebuild, YUC and TV will all be accessing hwy.120 from the current intersections sites.	The Transportation Impact Analysis presented in Appendix J of the Draft EIR addresses the cumulative effects of all projects on the overall operation of these intersections under cumulative conditions. As noted in Table 16 of the project Transportation Impact Analysis, all locations will satisfy the Tuolumne County General Plan standard. Please see Response ORG6-68 regarding cumulative safety.
PUB28-06	The Hwy. 120 approach from the west to the Sawmill Flat intersection is a blind hill on a curve and with the potential large increase in traffic from the multiple proposed developments needs a safety solution. The section of Hwy. 120 heading east from TV is currently one of the only	Planned improvements to the Highway 120/Sawmill Mountain Road intersection include work to increase the sight distance

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
	sections of Hwy. 120 in which it is safe to pass. Any new intersection that intrudes on this lone straight section of road will need to have passing lanes constructed elsewhere to mitigate the loss of this passing area. Any approval of either TV or YUC needs to plan for a reconfiguration of the entire section of Hwy 120 from 1/2 a mile in either direction of the proposed sites. This should include turn and merging lanes going both directions, a new passing lane, and will require a rerouting of Hwy 120 to reduce the hazard for the blind hill approach and the additional turning and merging lanes. None of these necessary safety changes that the increased traffic necessitates should be made at any cost to the state or county taxpayers. Not only will the TV projects guests be using the access to the development but the plan for a large market on the site will cause even more cross highway traffic. The YUC project across the Hwy. will only have limited food service. Therefore vehicles and pedestrians from YUC will be making multiple trips in out and across the Hwy. for meals, some of them to the TV market and food service areas.	looking west. As shown in Table 1-1 and Chapter 3, Revisions to the Draft EIR, of this Final EIR, encroachment permit approval for these intersection improvements would be required prior to the start of construction of the Terra Vi project. Please see Response GOV3-06. There are two areas on Highway 120 east of Sawmill Mountain Road where centerline striping allows passing. A 1,000-foot zone exists east of Sawmill Mountain Road and a 1,200-foot zone exists about 2½ miles further east. Widening Highway 120 to provide passing lanes has not occurred at any location of Highway 120 east of Groveland. Passing lanes are not proposed and have not been found to be necessary to satisfy minimum standards of the Tuolumne County General Plan based on analysis of long term cumulative traffic operating conditions on Highway 120. Refer to the Transportation Impact Analysis contained in Appendix J of the Draft EIR starting on page 41. The planned improvements to the Highway 120/Sawmill Mountain Road intersection would provide adequate sight distance and adequate access, and it will not be necessary to “reroute” Highway 120. The Draft EIR project description of the market notes the size and limited scope of offerings available. The automobile traffic

Comment #	Comment	Response
		associated with this use is addressed in the Draft EIR Transportation Impact Analysis, as is the issue of pedestrian safety across Highway 120. Please see Response ORG6-67 for information regarding pedestrian safety.
PUB28-07	The TV project, just like YUC, proposes to piggyback on yet another existing local service by building a YARTS bus stop. This is pure green washing. The subsidized YARTS system in Tuolumne Co. has a total round trip capacity of only 120 passengers per day. In order to serve the number of potential riders at both TV and YUC YARTS will need to add an additional 11 buses per day for a total of 14 buses. The TV DEIR parking plan has an additional 30 spaces for day transit parking. If those vehicles in those parking spots are going to also utilize the YARTS system there will need to be 15 buses per day. This increased number of buses would be a great service to the area and would actually dramatically reduce the increased vehicle traffic that the TV development will produce. TV and YUC should both be given the option of paying to provide these buses or running their own equivalent systems either jointly or separately. But just constructing a inexpensive bus shelter and calling the transit option solution solved is an absolutely minimal effort and is strictly tailored to the DEIR as a solution for the major traffic increase that TV will cause. The DEIR does agree that there will be an impact on existing transit but still plans to piggyback on the existing service.	The Draft EIR describes the current use of YARTS by a comparable lodging facility on Highway 120 near the Yosemite entrance (Rush Creek Lodge) and estimates transit ridership based on the goals established by the Terra Vi project proponents. As noted on Draft EIR page 4.15-8, the YARTS Short Range Transit Plan indicated that in the highest volume summer month a total of 100 riders boarded at Rush Creek Lodge over the month. The overall load factor for YARTS busses (i.e., percentage of seats occupied) was 56 percent on weekdays and 47 percent on weekends. The Draft EIR indicates that, without promotion, Terra Vi's transit demand could be similar to that observed at Rush Creek, which averaged 3 boardings per day. As noted on page 4.15-12, if Terra Vi met its goal of 10 percent of guests using YARTS, then 52 daily guest boardings could occur. This demand, along with use by park & ride would be spread over three existing YARTS routes, or about 11 additional riders per route. Additional routes as suggested by the comment are not needed. Mitigation Measure TRANS-1.1 requires the project applicant provide an on-site transit coordinator.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
PUB28-08	TV also plans to reduce water use by trucking all laundry off site. Also to save water the plan is to use compostable dishes but that solid waste will still need to be trucked off site. TV will need regular garbage service with additional truck trips required on Hwy. 120. The solid waste trucks will use Merell Rd. on the west side of Groveland to access the Co. transfer station. Merell Rd. is currently in very bad condition with crumbling pavement and the road bed collapsing into the drainage ditches on both sides. This is directly related to the truck traffic already going to the transfer station. It also has three very tight corners that the transfer trucks can not navigate safely as they require most of the road to make the hairpin turns. Although this not an issue directly related to this project it is just yet another instance of TV piggybacking onto existing Tuolumne Co. infrastructure without sharing any of the associated costs. There will also need to be food/restaurant supply truck deliveries, hotel supplies, maintenance supplies, merchandise and beverage delivers as well as the "grab and go" groceries to the market, there will also need to be propane deliveries. This is clearly not a minimal amount of truck traffic. This amount of diesel powered vehicles will more than offset any benefits from any electrical vehicle recharging station. It will also slow Yosemite bound traffic with the numerous uphill grades on hwy. 120.	The amount of vehicular traffic associated with the project is estimated in Draft EIR Table 4.14-3. These estimates would include ancillary project traffic by delivery trucks. The traffic operations resulting from the addition of Terra Vi traffic satisfy the requirements of the Tuolumne County General Plan. As a practical matter, truck deliveries are typically scheduled for off-peak traffic hours and would not be expected to be a contributor to peak hour condition on a summer Saturday.
PUB28-09	And then there is the worst case traffic scenario. A fire ignites from a sparking stove at YUC on the edge of the property. The stove is a non EPA compliant stove that was approved by a special waiver issued by the Tuolumne Co. Planning Dept. in 2020 for use in transient lodging i.e. for use in wood and cloth structures. The stove that starts the fire was put in place despite near unanimous opposition from Co. residents in public meetings and DEIR comments. It is 2 AM in late August on a night with 30 mph SW winds and all lodging and "glamping" is at near capacity. Within an hour the fast moving fire has spread to 250 acres. There is the one lone local Groveland fire engine on site with 4 personnel that arrived after 30 minutes. Cal Fire is deployed out of county. Within an hour the fire has already crossed Hwy. 120 closing it as an evacuation route to the east and has doubled to 500 acres. The fire is burning around the perimeter of TV. Minimally trained employees are attempting to use fire hoses to try to contain the fire while guests attempt to evacuate, but the water pressure to the hoses drops from inadequate supply. Fire is again threatening Berkley Camp for the second time in ten years. YUC has already partially burned, the propane tanks have exploded spreading the flames, and panicked guests are fleeing on foot unable to save their vehicles. With in the next hour the fire is at the western edge of Yosemite lakes RV park and is now burning both sides of Hardin flat road, all within three hours. The 400 RV occupants from Yosemite Lakes RV park, the 250 plus guests, now without vehicles,	Please see Master Response 4 regarding emergency evacuation

Comment #	Comment	Response
	and the employees from YC are trying to evacuate thru the fire on foot. 200 guest vehicles, 400 people plus employees, are at TV, and another 75 vehicles plus employees from Berkeley Camp are all attempting to evacuate. But they have no information on a clear path to safety as there is total confusion and chaos. The unfortunate Sawmill mtn. and Hardin Flat Road residents who feared this very event are also trying to evacuate. This is all occurring on the two grossly inadequate roads. One, Hardin Flat Rd. is very narrow and already blocked by fire on both side. The two sheriffs deputies that arrived after 50 minutes and who are attempting to manage the evacuation are unaware of the extent of the fires rapid spread. With Hwy. 120 blocked now to the west and the east and Hardin Flat road engulfed in flames the 400 RVs are attempting exit on Yosemite Lakes Rd. but have to turn around when faced with flames. With complete chaos and no escape route they attempt to go back toward Yosemite Lakes RV park and are overtaken by the fire. This is nearly a duplicate scenario of what happened in Paradise during the Camp fire. The quick spread of wind driven flames and the disorganized evacuation resulted in 83 people burning to death, many in their cars. Tuolumne Co. Planning Dept. and the Board of Supervisors need to take a very sober look at the potential for a tragic disaster of the Camp fire scale and scope in Tuolumne Co. Maybe a site visit to Paradise would be helpful to acknowledge that choices in approving inappropriate development in high fire risk locations can and will have tragic consequences. The deaths in the Camp Fire were largely the result of cumulative very poor planning, zoning and land use decisions by the Township of Paradise. The potential for loss of life from a fast moving fire in the Hardin Flat Sawmill Mtn. area if fully developed as planned, could exceed that of the Camp fire. Given the density of people and vehicles, if all development moves forward this is not an inconceivable outcome. That fast track approval of these developments and just proceeding with construction full speed while ignoring the counties own grand jury report of the fire threat to lives and property is negligent and irresponsible. The DEIR goes thru many pages of fire safety measures and plans. But none of those pages change the fact that, and as the very recent Rim fire that burned the property shows, it is just extremely vulnerable to fire. The county grand jury report states, it is not if, but when it will burn, yet again. Moving forward with project approval despite clear knowledge and warning that there are not adequate safety personnel or equipment in place in an area of extreme fire risk will expose Tuolumne Co. to the same liability for negligence that PG&E is confronted with. It would be very prudent for the Co. to revisit the stove waiver that it issued for non EPA compliant stoves in transient lodging in	

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
	2020. That decision could be very difficult to defend in court. If approved, these leapfrogging hazardous developments are a clear and present danger to visitors and county residents. Hope is really not a very good plan for avoiding the potential disastrous tragedy that these developments will risk every single summer. There is a reason these projects are will be difficult if not impossible to insure.	
PUB28-10	Waste Water The waste water treatment plan in the DEIR, common with the above issues, does not address the potential for failure of the system. System failure could result in violations of the clean water act and contaminate the Middle Fork of the Tuolumne as well as lead to an emergency closure of the development. The document is once again very thin on content when describing the waste water system. It does specify the engineering fairly adequately but completely overlooks the terrain features below the leech field. I have walked the area to the north west of the property along the FS road on the north west side of Sawmill Mtn. road. There is a multi acre seasonal wetland at the head of the unnamed drainage that flows NW into the Middle Fork of the Tuolumne. The DEIR does acknowledge the existence of the spring in the storm water plan, see below, that is the source of water for the seasonal wetland but does not integrate the spring or the wetland into its waste water plan. Seasonal wetlands downhill from a very large leech field are not a combination that will provide for safe or functional operation of the TV waste water system. Already saturated soils will not percolate the large volume of wastewater that 400 guests and food preparation facilities will produce daily. This should be obvious to anyone who has actually walked the property. The perennial channel drainage described below contains indicator plant species, sedges and mature willow trees, both of which are indicators of saturated soils. The DEIR does contain a plan B leech field, which shows that the designers of the waste water plan have a fairly low degree of confidence in the functional operation of the leech field in its existing location. But the plan B field also is located uphill from these same areas of saturated soils. Unless there is another location on the TV property that will not drain into the drainage containing the seasonal wet and spring, or toward the wells of the Sawmill Rd. residents homes, then a leech field is not going to work on this property. Other large lodging facilities have also experienced leech field failures. Cedar Lodge located in the Merced Canyon within 100 yards of the Merced river, with saturated soils, had long term failure of its leech field that resulted in raw sewage flowing thru the parking lot. After repeated failed attempts to find a way to operate the leech field adequately and numerous fines the hotel was required by Mariposa Co. to build a full tertiary sewage treatment plant. Rather than have	Please see Master Response 2. The project proposes an on-site package wastewater treatment system.

Comment #	Comment	Response
	TV go thru the same process of trying to operate a leech field for a very large hotel uphill from a seasonal wetland the Co. should not approve the development without a full tertiary sewage treatment plant in place. The current leech field is not in a site where it will be able to function as needed. The USGS Ascension Mountain quad map (photo-inspected 1992) shows a spring located outside the project boundaries, 300± feet to the north (the same off-site aquatic feature shown in the NWI map). On the quad map, the spring flows into an unnamed perennial channel that flows northwest into the Middle Tuolumne River and, based on topography, EC-01 also would be expected to flow into the same off-site perennial channel 300± feet north of the project boundaries and subsequently to the Middle Fork Tuolumne River.	
PUB28-11	Tuolumne Co. needs to be far more circumspect in even considering large scale developments in remote locations. The somewhat desperate attempt to increase TOT revenues should not overshadow the common sense evaluation of any developments that are inappropriate in their location and scope. The endless expansion of tourism and visitation to Yosemite is not a good model for a business plan as Yosemite NP has clearly already reachd *[sic]* its limits of use. Ever expanding numbers of park visitors is not a sustainable model for the Co. to either promote development or to expand Co. revenues. Foraging ahead with developments that are opposed by the overwhelming majority of area residents should not ever be a policy. Almost universally opposition to new commercial development in remote locations alone should be more than enough to kill the project. A twenty plus year old zoning change should never have priority over issues of safety or quality of life concerns of area residents. Just how many objections by residents and how much opposition does it take for the Planning Dept. to not push forward with this and other unwanted and unneeded development? I have always believed that the majority of government corruption in California is at the Co. government land use, regulation and zoning levels. The unjustified denial of a request for more time for comments and the near simultaneous release of the thousands of pages of the YUC and TV DEIRS certainly has not done nothing to change my belief. But I would like to be proven wrong.	The comment is noted. The comment does not address the adequacy of the Draft EIR.
PUB29	**Charles Kraft, July 19, 2020**	
PUB29-01	My name is Charles Kraft and I am a licensed plumber. My family has a house on Sawmill Mountain road for the past 32 years. I am against the Terra Vi and Yosemite under Canvas projects. In reviewing the EIR I noticed it does not address the Corona Virus in regards to sewage. Recent reports have shown Yosemite Sewage tested positive for the Virus. The virus is	The scientific understanding of the 2019 novel coronavirus (COVID-19) is evolving. At the time of writing this Final EIR, information from the Centers for Disease Control indicates that there has been no known

Comment #	Comment	Response
	known to live up to 3 weeks in sewage. This is a great concern that needs to be addressed. This can sicken and kill many people if this does not get brought up.	transmission of the virus from treated drinking water or exposure to wastewater. Please also see Master Response 2, which explains that the project no longer proposes a septic system.[28]
PUB30	Samantha Wiedemann, July 19, 2020	
PUB30-01	Please acknowledge receiving this email since my last letter opposing this project was not included in the DIER which I hope was just an oversight and not done on purpose… To Whom it May Concern, My Grandparents have owned the property at 11230 Saw Mill Mountain Rd, Groveland CA for over 30 years. I would like to express my concerns over The Terra Vi and The Under Canvas projects and also state that I am extremely disappointed in the decision to not allow an additional 30 days to fully review the EIR's during these challenging times for many Americans. This has led me to believe that the County and Builder do not care about the findings of the EIR, and the concerns over the project, they only care about the money involved and the benefits to themselves.	The comment notes concern that the public review period of the Draft EIR was not extended. Please see Master Response 1, which explains the County's decision not to extend the public review period of the Draft EIR.
PUB30-02	~Fire Risk. As I'm sure you are aware this area was devastated by the RIM fire in 2013 and it has barely started to recover. My Grandparents cabin lost an outbuilding and over half of the trees on their property, all due to one fire that was started miles away by a reckless hunter. The Under Canvas project is projected to have 99 wood stoves with campfire pits and barbecues which will be well over 100 ignition sources in a site that has already devastated by a fire 7 years ago. Homeowners in this area were extremely lucky to be able to get out in time before the RIM fire got to our properties and there were no lives lost. However with all these additional sources of ignition and hundreds of people around if a fire was to start at the Terra VI or Under Canvas site most likely lives would be lost. As an employee of a fire department I understand the need for quick response times in order to control forrest *[sic]* fires before they get out of hand. Will there be a fire station at Terra Vi or Under Canvas projects that will include a Water Tender, Truck and Engine 24/7 to prevent these fires?	The commenter expresses concerns regarding wildfire but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. This topic is evaluated in Chapter 4.17, Wildfire, of the Draft EIR. In addition, please see Master Response 5.

[28] Centers for Disease Control, "Can the virus that causes COVID-19 spread through treated drinking water?" and "Can the COVID-19 virus spread through sewerage systems?" https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/faq.html, accessed September 18, 2020.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
PUB30-03	~Traffic. The proposed second access point for The Under Canvas project directly across from Saw Mill Mountain Rd would cause extreme congestion in that corridor which includes Saw Mill Mountain Rd, CalTrans Shed, Terra Vi, and Hardin Flat. In the case of an emergency, such as a fire that was started at Terra Vi, all these access points and roads will put everyone trying to evacuate at risk. A traffic study should be conducted in this area.	The commenter expresses concerns regarding traffic but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. Traffic is evaluated in Chapter 4.15, Transportation, of the Draft EIR. Please see ORG6-22 regarding potential roadway conflicts properties and Master Response 4 regarding evacuation.
PUB30-04	~Trespassing/ Security. The Terra Vi project is within a mile of our family property. There are no hiking trails around the site so guests will most likely venture out around the hotel and onto private property. No trespassing signs do not work to deter people from exploring. A huge concern is people wandering onto our property, realizing that no one is currently there and breaking in, stealing or damaging items.	The comment is noted. The comment does not address the adequacy of the Draft EIR. Trespassing and crime impacts are beyond the scope of CEQA.
PUB30-05	~Additional Noise. This site has stated that they will be having weddings/parties, however I am concerned about the noise pollution with the amplified sound systems.	The commenter expresses concerns regarding the project's noise generation but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. Noise is evaluated in Chapter 4.12, Noise, of the Draft EIR.
PUB30-06	~Sewage, Water Supply and Leach Field: All properties in the area of Saw Mill Mountain Rd are on a well system. The water supply test that was conducted was done in a short period of time during a wet season which is unusual for this area. This test needs to be done over years in order for it to reflect correct finds. During dry seasons (which is most of the time) the Terra Vi project could pull enough water from the ground to dry up our wells which is the only source of water. This area lacks the use of a public water supply such as a reservoir or river. There is also the concern that our well supplies could be contaminated.	Please see Response ORG6-42 and ORG6-32. Testing showed significantly more flow than calculated demand.
PUB30-07	~Safety: Having the Terra Vi and The Under Canvas project so far from Groveland will cause a strain on public services such as Fire, Ambulances, and Police Officers. With so many more people in the woods there are bound to be accidents, fires, or even incidents where law enforcement is needed. This pulls resources away from the city of Groveland (where residents pay for these services) and delays the response time for everyone.	The commenter expresses concerns regarding emergency services on the project site but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. Emergency service and response is evaluated in Chapter 4.14, Public Services and Recreation, of the Draft EIR. Please also see Master Response 6.
PUB30-08	The county needs to consider a different location for these proposed projects. Such as the site known as “The Scar”. This will elevate all of the concerns that are listed above. Additionally while I was reviewing the DIER I also noticed that none of my families original letters of concerns were	The Draft EIR evaluated an Alternate Location Alternative which determined that an alternate location would yield relatively

Comment #	Comment	Response
	added, and I heard that a lot of the neighbors letters were not added as well. I hope that this was just an over site and not the counties way of silencing the majority of people that are against this project. Because our letters of concern were not added originally, please respond to this email stating it was received.	similar results as the proposed project with reduced impacts in regard to noise, public services, parks and recreation, and utilities and service systems. The Alternate Location Alternative would not include a helipad. Refer to Chapter 6, Alternatives, of the Draft EIR, for more information. Please also see Master Response 7.
PUB31	**Zachary Wiedemann, July 19, 2020**	
PUB31-01	Please see the attached letter of opposition regarding the Terra Vi & Under Canvas Projects, as well as my concerns regarding the EIR that was conducted. Please respond letting me know that this email was received. The original letter I wrote in December of 2018 was not added to the original EIR. I hope that this letter of opposition is added. My family has owned the property at 11230 Saw Mill Mountain Road in Groveled for over 30 years. I would like to voice my concerns over The Under Canvas and The Terra Vi projects as well as the DIERs that were performed. First off, I would like to to *[sic]* state how disappointed I am that the additional 30 day request was not granted. It shows that the people who run this County only care about themselves and not the people they are suppose to *[sic]* serve, or the land up here they are suppose to *[sic]* protect. Here are a list of the concerns over the projects that I believe will be detrimental to the ecosystem as well as the land surrounding the area.	This comment is replaced, by request, with comment letter PUB41. Please see Responses PUB41-01 through PUB47-07.
PUB32	**Dan Courtney, July 20, 2020**	
PUB32-01	Hello Quincy and Taryn, has there been any change in the decision to grant an extension on the commend deadline for either Yosemtie *[sic]* Under Canvas or Terra Vi? If not, what time of day is the cut-off for comments? I didn't notice a time so I'm assuming the comment period expires at Midnight?	The comment requests clarification on the end date of the public review period for the Draft EIR. No response is required.
PUB33	**Dan Courtney, July 20, 2020**	
PUB33-01	Tuolumne County decision makers, I am a neighboring property owner adjacent to the Manly property. I, and many of my neighbors and interested parties, have been struggling to digest the DEIR prepared for Yosemite Under Canvas, which I understand is the largest DEIR ever in the history	The comment requests an extension of the public review period of the Draft EIR. Please see Master Response 1, which explains the

Comment #	Comment	Response
	of Tuolumne County. That is, until the Terra Vi DEIR was distributed at roughly the same time. In addition to the obvious but valid delays caused by COVID the information posted on the County website is missing critical reports and was apparently changed at some point after being posted, creating confusion and additional delays as we had to essentially start over to insure we were using the latest data. Below is an email I just sent to Natalie Rizzi. Please consider this request. I believe it is reasonable and will provide your constituents with a more reasonable opportunity to review and comment without significantly impacting the timeframe of the project. This is an important review and it's in all of our best interests to get it right. Please review: Natalie, I just spoke with my hydrogeologist, Ken Schmidt, and he informed me that the DEIR posted for Yosemite Under Canvas did not include the pump test logs & pump test results which are typically provided. Apparently his firm, Kentthe Schmidt and Associates, requested this information last week but was sent drilling logs from Geoscience who was contracted by Hansji for the Terra Vi project., rather than Water Resources Inc who performed the pump tests for Yosemite Under Canvas. Mr. Schmidt told me both Appendix D and Appendix F are still missing for the Yosemite Under Canvas DEIR. Without this standard information he is not able to perform a complete analysis. As you are aware, the requirement to prove there is sufficient water to sustain this development while not depleting the water supply for the surrounding area, including the proposed Terra Vi hotel / resort is one of the most critical factors and decision points for the proposed development. Therefore I would like to request an extension of time on the deadline to provide comments on the Yosemite DEIR for five business days from the date this critical information is provided to the hydrogeologist and all other interested parties, both private and government. Please let me know if this is acceptable.	County's decision not to extend the public review period of the Draft EIR.
PUB34	Brewer Dennis, July 20, 2020	
PUB34-01	Please see my attached letter of opposition for the Terra Vi and Under Canvas Project which contains my issues with the EIR that was conducted. Quincy, please respond that you received this email, because I have heard that you have been ignoring these letters, and not including them in the EIR. I would like to express my concerns over The Terra Vi and The Under Canvas projects. While reviewing the DEIR I noticed that my previous letter stating my concerns on this project was not	The comment serves as an introduction to the comments that follow. Please see Responses ORG34-02 through ORG34-06.

Comment #	Comment	Response
	added in with the others, I hope that this was just an over site *[sic]*. Listed below are my concerns regarding the EIR.	
PUB34-02	Fire Safety: In the Tuolumne County Fire Safety Report titled "Are We Ready?" Published on June 30, 2020 the opening line states " it is not a question of will we have a catastrophic fire in Tuolumne County, but of when." Later on it states that "…tourism have shaped the likelihood of a devastating fire that threatens lives, livelihood and our natural resources upon which the community depends." And the last quote from the report " Tuolumne faces unprecedented danger to life and property from wildfire." The Terra Vi project is projected to have a grand total of between 554-610 people on site, and Under Canvas 426-500 people. A massive forest fire could be started by just one of these people flicking a cigarette into the forest. Also the Under Canvas is also projected to have 99 wood stoves along with campfire pits and barbecues which will be well over 100 ignition sources. As I'm sure you are aware the Rim fire was started by 1 reckless campfire miles away, and it still devastated the area that you want to build these projects on. I also did not see in the EIR if one of these sites would have a 24/7 Fire Department that is equipped with a Fire Tender, Type 3 Engine, as well as a Type 6 Engine. I do not believe that Tuolumne County can afford to put three Engines in this area and build a new Fire Station since according to the Matrix Report which was published in the County Safety Report apparatuses older than 15 years should be in reserve status yet Tuolumne County Fire Department has 5 Engines which are 35 plus years old and 20 engines that are 25 plus years old. Even if these apparatuses were in service 24/7 at one of the sites, I still would not take away the danger that these 100+ ignition sources could cause. If you follow what the Fire Safety Report states building these projects is reckless, and could/will cause lives lost when a wildfire comes in this area again.	Please see Master Response 5.
PUB34-03	Traffic Concerns: It is currently hard to pull out onto HWY120 from Saw Mill Mountain due to a blind curve in the road West of the intersection. With the additional cars and people it will make it that much harder, and will certainly cause a motor vehicle accidents. If the proposed projects are across the street from each other there is also the likely hood of pedestrians walking across HWY120 and getting hit and killed by a vehicle. When a wildfire is caused by one of these two properties it will make it nearly impossible for everyone to get out safely due to the increased traffic as well as only 1 lane in both directions.	The commenter expresses concerns regarding traffic but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. Traffic is evaluated in Chapter 4.15, Transportation, of the Draft EIR. Please also see Responses ORG6-22 and ORG6-63 through ORG6-66.
PUB34-04	Sewage and COVID-19: As stated in a news article that came out this week COVID-19 was located in the sewage of Yosemite Park. When Rush Creek was built they put in the best sewage system as required however since opening they have been dealing with grey and brown sewage. Because there is no public sewer system each of the projects will need to rely on an engineered	Please see Response PUB29-01.

Comment #	Comment	Response
	septic system to treat the waste that will be produced. This waste could contaminate our wells just like it is at Rush Creek. With the new concerns of COVID-19 this drain off could be deadly to anyone using the wells.	
PUB34-05	Water: Continuing on the issue of our wells being contaminated, there is the potential for the Terra Vi project to dry up our wells because there is no public water supply in the area such as a reservoir or lake. The well test that was done hastily was done during an unusually wet year. From my understanding these are normally conducted during multiple seasons for at least a year or two. Since we do no have an accurate Well Test that was done it is very likely that our wells will dry up due to this project.	Please see Response ORG6-42 and ORG6-32. Testing showed significantly more flow than calculated demand.
PUB34-06	Wildlife: Wildlife is prevalent in this area, including Deers, Bears, Coyotes,Foxes Owls and Quails. If their natural habitat is taken away from them where are they going to go?	The commenter expresses concerns regarding wildlife in the vicinity of the project site but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. Wildlife is evaluated in Chapter 4.3, Biological Resources, of the Draft EIR.
PUB35	**Sam Flanery, July 20, 2020**	
PUB35-01	I would like to add to my concerns the Coronavirus possibly getting into our sewage system as Yosemite National Park has now tested positive for the virus in their sewage system. The DEIR did not address the Coronavirus.	Please see Response PUB29-01.
PUB35-02	I wrote an email last week addressing these projects but it dawned on me that you may prefer to receive a PDF. My original letter was not included in the DEIR report I surely hope this was an oversight and not done on purpose.	The comment is noted. The comment does not address the adequacy of the Draft EIR.
PUB36	**Sam Flanery, July 20, 2020**	
PUB36-01	I recently sent you an email stating my concerns over both of these projects. I have a new one which I would like to add. I am gravely concerned about the Coronavirus getting into the sewage system. This has just happened at Yosemite National Park. As you know the Coronavirus is a deadly disease which we are learning more about each day. All we do know for sure is that is spreads easily and can kill people. Having this virus in the sewage system might not only kill people, it could kill animals and leave our water supply unusable.	Please see Response PUB29-01.
PUB37	**Denise Flanery Kraft, July 20, 2020**	
PUB37-01	Thanks for letting me know your received my email. I do have a new concern that was not raised in my email and I would like to bring to your attention. The DEIR did not address the Coronavirus. The coronavirus has now been found in Yosemite	Please see Response PUB29-01.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
	National Park's Sewage. What precautions will be take to make sure this does not happen at Under Canvas.	
PUB37-02	I am against the Terra Vi and Yosemite Under Canvas Projects. Please see the attached PDF with my concerns.	The comment serves as an introduction to the comment that follows. Please see Response PUB37-03.
PUB37-03	I send an earlier email stating my objections to the Terra Vi and Yosemite Under Canvas projects. Since, then I new concern has come to my attention. The DEIR did not address the Coronavirus. The coronavirus has now been found in Yosemite National Park's Sewage. What precautions will be take to make sure this does not happen at Terra Vi and Yosemite Under Canvas.	Please see Response PUB29-01.
PUB38	**Keith Martin, July 20, 2020**	
PUB38-01	I am against the Terra Vi and Yosemite Under Canvas Projects. Please see the attached PDF with my concerns.	The comment serves as an introduction to the comments that follow. Please see Responses ORG38-02 through ORG38-03.
PUB38-02	Attached is a pdf of my letter of concern about the DEIR's for Terra Vi and Yosemite Under Canvas. I have seen comments concerning water use and waste water, fire safety and availability of fire, ambulance and law enforcement made by others. I agree that the DEIR for both projects inadequately addresses these concerns and as currently proposed these projects could negatively affect my own access to fire, ambulance and law enforcement services.	The comment serves as an introduction to the comment that follows. Please see Response ORG38-03.
PUB38-03	I am particularly concerned about the proposed Yosemite Under Canvas project. This project proposes to construct 99 vacation rentals, many with plumbing and wood stoves. However, they propose to construct these vacation rentals as canvas tents. It appears that under the guise of being a campground, these tent vacation rentals would not be subject to the more rigorous building code requirements that apply to structures. The developers anticipate upwards of 250 occupants each day. The fire, sanitation and exiting requirements of our building codes are based on years of experience with catastrophe and are designed to protect building occupants. The flimsy tent structures proposed by Yosemite Under Canvas lack any significant protection against fire. The only fire protection mentioned is that the canvas must meet State Fire Marshall standards for fire resistance. In addition, each tent is to have a wood burning stove manufactured by a	The comment is noted. The comment refers to the Under Canvas project and does not address the adequacy of the Draft EIR.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
	company in Utah that supplies hunters and campers but which does not reference any nationally recognized standards to which their stoves must comply. My house in Groveland has a wood stove manufactured by a nationally recognized company and listed by the county as meeting county standards. When installing this stove, the base, adjacent walls, flu and chimney all had to meet building code standards primarily with regards to fire protection. In addition, my house was constructed to resist code specified lateral forces from wind and seismic as well as vertical loads from snow and human usage. The DEIR did not reference any nationally recognized standards for the installation of wood stoves in tents used as a commercial vacation rental facility, if one even exists. The DEIR did not reference any required permits or inspections of the construction of the vacation rental tents to verify compliance with nationally recognized standards which might not exist. As a citizen of Tuolumne County, a resident of Tuolumne County and Taxpayer in Tuolumne County I am concerned about the county becoming liable for irresponsibly approving an ill-conceived project. Thousands of tourists would occupy the Yosemite Under Canvas project assuming that their safety and well being were protected by Tuolumne County oversight and approval of the project. Should there be large scale injury and death caused by the failure of the county to demand that Yosemite Under Canvas meet recognized fire, building and safety standards, then I fear that successful litigation against the county would result in massive judgements whose repayment would fall on all the citizens of Tuolumne County. I am a licensed California Civil and Structural Engineer. I have been involved in designing and getting approval of structures since 1976. I am a member of the Structural Engineer's Association of Southern California and have served on several committees recommending code changes. I served as a Structural Specialist with FEMA USAR CATF2 from 1991 to 2016 and responded to emergencies both domestic and foreign. I have qualified as an expert witness in California Courts and have testified in cases concerning structural problems. Based on my many years of experience in building design, disaster response and involvement with the legal system, I fear this project has serious issues which have not been adequately covered in the DEIR. My wife and I are avid campers, hikers and backpackers. We are both certified outings leaders by the Sierra Club and have been leading trips for nearly 30 years. It is our experience as outings leaders that you need to be prepared for bad things to happen. Before we became romantically involved, we were co leading backpacks in the Sierra. One of the first trips we co lead involved a	

Comment #	Comment	Response
	late season backpack over Parker Pass in the Yosemite high country. Our trip was aborted in the middle of the night when we were hit by an early season blizzard. Our hike out that morning in freezing blowing snow was epic. Fortunately, it did not deter us from continuing to lead trips together, and two years later we were in Yosemite Valley, walking into the chapel and exchanging our wedding vows. Several years ago, my wife and I were leading a camping trip in Anza Borrego State Park. On our last night of the trip, as we all went to sleep, the night was calm. Several hours later the wind began to blow and we were soon experiencing 70 mph gusts. Everyone in our group had their tent blow down. Tents are not made to resist 70 mph wind gusts. After my wife and I successfully took down our own tent and gear, we then helped some of our fellow campers who had become trapped in their collapsed tents. Imagine the scenario if this event was to occur at Yosemite Under Canvas and the collapsed tents with trapped occupants had wood stoves still burning in the rubble. It is ironic that the DEIR states that the wood stoves being considered for Yosemite Under Canvas are named the "Hunter" model. The last great Tuolumne County catastrophe was caused by a hunter's irresponsible campfire. Does Tuolumne County want another great disaster, this time the carnage and destruction linked to 99 irresponsibly operated Hunters?	
PUB39	Bill McMahon, July 20, 2020	
PUB39-01	I'm renewing my request for additional time to respond to the Yosemite under canvas and Terra Vi projects. You did not respond to my earlier request. Please provide a response today. Thank you	The comment requests an extension of the public review period of the Draft EIR. Please see Master Response 1, which explains the County's decision not to extend the public review period of the Draft EIR.
PUB40	Bill McMahon, July 20, 2020	
PUB40-01	We are opposed to the Yosemite under canvas project. As a preliminary matter, we'd like to express our disappointment with how the county has handled things so far. I personally attended the meeting in Groveland last year, and I lodged many objections. None of them made it into the Record. That is inexcusable. We understand the county is strapped for cash. But that does not permit you to disregard procedures and ignore all of our concerns. We live on Hardin Flat Road part time, and will be retiring there soon. Our property is situated several hundred yards downhill from the proposed Glamping site. Which means that our water well is subject to getting polluted from the clamping *[sic]* project. It also means our water is subject to being diminished or completely taken by the clamping *[sic]* project. We are not willing to endure that and we and our neighbors will sue if this project gets approved. Just letting you	The commenter provides an opinion on the nearby Yosemite Under Canvas project and does not address adequacy of the Draft EIR. Therefore, no response is required.

Comment #	Comment	Response
	know that upfront. This is not going be an easy project and you best heed all of our concerns now. Air pollution is also going to be a big factor. Why haven't you addressed air quality in the preliminary report.? Many of us objected on that basis and yet you ignored it. Because harden flat is located in a basin. The smoke from campfires at Yosemite Lakes Campground already fills the basin and lingers. The problem will be much worse if the Glamping project is approved. There simply is not enough airflow to avoid having unhealthy air from so many campfires. The noise of having hundreds of people staying very close to our property will be intolerable. Please don't ignore that concern. And remember, it's not just humans who are disturbed by that level of noise. Again, we brought up the potential impact to the natural environment and wildlife. Why is the county ignoring us? We also have security concerns. Because the southern boundary of the Glamping project is literally a stones throw from our property. We do not want people from the Glamping site walking through our woods or coming near our home. Which means we would have to undertake the expense of building a fence. It is not right that we should have to deal with that.	
PUB40-02	One of the most ridiculous aspects of the county's actions so far, is ignoring the safety issues created by having terra vi and the Glamping project built. The traffic impact will be huge. There will be traffic safety issues involved with having hundreds, actually more than 1000, people driving in and out of Hardin flat and sawmill mountain. The county must weigh the cumulative impact of having both those developments there. As it is, the county is playing games by pretending that each of those developments alone would have minimal impact.	The commenter expresses concerns regarding traffic but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. Traffic is evaluated in Chapter 4.15, Transportation, of the Draft EIR. Please also see Response ORG6-22.
PUB40-03	The county has failed to address other public safety issues. The roadway and those intersections could not handle emergency traffic during an evacuation. And the county simply does not have the resources to provide an adequate level of response for law-enforcement or fire or ambulance/rescue personnel. What is the county's plan in this regard?	Please see Master Response 4.
PUB41	**Zachary Wiedemann, July 20, 2020**	
PUB41-01	My family has owned the property at 11230 Saw Mill Mountain Road in Groveled *[sic]* for over 30 years. I would like to voice my concerns over The Under Canvas and The Terra Vi projects as well as the DIERs that were performed. First off, I would like to to *[sic]* state how disappointed I am that the additional 30 day request was not granted. It shows that the people who run this County only care about themselves and	The comment serves as an introduction to the following comments and expresses concern that the public review period of the Draft EIR was not extended. Please see Responses PUB41-02 through PUB41-07 and refer to Master Response 1, which explains

Comment #	Comment	Response
	not the people they are suppose to *[sic]* serve, or the land up here they are suppose to *[sic]* protect. Here are a list of the concerns over the projects that I believe will be detrimental to the ecosystem as well as the land surrounding the area.	the County's decision not to extend the public review period of the Draft EIR.
PUB41-02	1. Water Supply: For starters the water supply test was half heartedly conducted and was done in a more wetter than normal winter season. To my understanding these tests should be conducted over multiple different seasons to get an accurate depiction of water supply in different climates and different parts of the year. California goes through droughts quite often especially lately and with the properties and with the properties in the area being on well systems the projects could pull enough water from the ground and dry up the wells. The wells are our only source of water and if the water supply were to dry up or become contaminated it would be extremely damaging to us and the environment.	Please see Responses ORG6-42 and ORG6-32. Testing showed significantly more flow than calculated demand.
PUB41-03	2. Sewage/ Leach Field: Both of these projects are going to rely on an engineered septic system to treat all of the waste. For projects of this size this'll be a lot of waste to treat. Being that The Terra Vi project is on a higher hill and the leach field has the opportunity to bleed into our wells and contaminate our water. To show that this is areal and very dangerous issue the resort up the road Rush Creek has had numerous issues with this with no way of stopping or treating the issue.A new concern regarding the Sewage is that fact that COVID-19 was found in the sewage in Yosemite Park. This should be a real concern and should be taken into consideration when thinking about this project. COVID-19 is an extreme virus that we still no little about, however from what we do know it causes great illness as well as death from some people that become infected.	Please see Responses ORG6-32 and PUB29-01.
PUB41-04	3. Road Entrance/ Traffic: The intersection of Saw Mill Mountain Rd and 120 is extremely difficult most of the time to drive onto especially during peak times when people are trying to go to and from Yosemite. With all the added car traffic and food *[sic]* traffic from people walking across 120 to get to both sites it will lead to additional traffic hazards. If an accident were to occur or a pedestrian was hit it will pull emergency resources from the surrounding areas.	The commenter expresses concerns regarding traffic but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. Traffic is evaluated in Chapter 4.15, Transportation, of the Draft EIR. Please also see Response ORG6-67.
PUB41-05	4. Fire Damage and Hazards: As everyone is aware the rim fire of 2013 devastated the area. The rim fire was caused by a single reckless hunter who started a campfire and it went out of control and caused an incalculable amount of damage. This fie took about took about 80-90% of the trees in the area and burned down an outbuilding on our property. It very narrowly missed the main house but it caused some damage to that as well. With a fire this bad being caused by one reckless hunter, what damage could be done by hundreds of visitors with the projects promising	The commenter expresses concerns regarding wildfire but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. This topic is evaluated in Chapter 4.17, Wildfire, of the Draft EIR. In addition, please see Master Response 5.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
	wood stoves, campfire pits, and BBQ's. If it is a particularly dry season, which happens all the time, one spark from a fire pit catches some dry brush on fire it could lead to another massive fire. It only takes one careless person to cause a massive fire.	
PUB41-06	5. Security and Privacy: The Terra Vi project will be within a mile of the property. One of the concerns we have is people wandering into our property and either damaging or stealing things. This are is not known for hiking trails and walking on 120 is very dangerous, which could lead to people walking on the dirt paths we use to get in and out of our property. With this project promising wedding and other parties it will lead to a lot of noise pollution.	The comment is noted. The comment does not address the adequacy of the Draft EIR. CEQA does not require that trespassing or crime be evaluated in the environmental review process, therefore the Draft EIR does not evaluate trespassing or crime impacts the proposed project could have on the community.
PUB41-07	These are just some of the concerns that I and our family have regarding these two projects. There is an area closed *[sic]* to Groveland called " The Scar" that would alleviate a lot of these concerns. It is closer to emergency services so if there is a hazard/ fire emergency services could respond much quicker. Since the Scar area is a much larger area of land it is farther away from other personal properties and homes os *[sic]* the projects would not be drawing water from person water supply wells. Where the Scar is located on 120 it is a long flat road where you can see both ways and could be perfect for traffic lights. It is also just far enough away from the Yosemite Gates that it will not get congested even during peak times. Lastly while reviewing the DEIR I notices that my pervious comment letter was excluded. It also came to my attention that all of my families comment letters were excluded. I hope this letter is included into the next report and the other letters were not left off purposely. Please respond to this letter to let me know that it was received and will be added to the many other letters of opposition regarding this project.	Please see Master Response 7.
PUB42	**Sharon Coolidge, July 20, 2020**	
PUB42-01	At first, when I read about the Terra Ve *[sic]* & Yosemite Under Canvas proposed developments I immediately thought about how such large resorts could be even considered for this geographic area with so many critical items screaming to be addressed. I stand with many NOT being in favor of these proposed projects especially without an EIR, when there is already a major project underway, the Berkeley Tuolumne Camp. This is a huge, $60 million rebuilding project is only a few minutes away.	The comment serves as an introduction to the comments below. Please see Responses PUB42-02 through PUB42-09 and refer to Master Response 1, which explains the County's decision not to extend the public review period of the Draft EIR.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
	Here is a brief list of what other concerns I have and I don't feel are being addressed and need MUCH further study:	
PUB42-02	1. How is the Covid 19 pandemic going to affect the development process and the future viability of these endeavors. Are these businesses even feasible with what's going on with the travel & leisure industries? What if these places get built and then go belly up? Who ends up 'holding the bag"?	The comment does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR.
PUB42-03	2. Emergency response of police, fire and medical. Mariposa County I believe required Tenaya Lodge over near Fish Camp to build & staff their own EMS department. Seems like a good idea! And make the development owners pay for staffing.	The commenter expresses concerns regarding emergency services on the project site but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. Emergency service and response is evaluated in Chapter 4.14, Public Services and Recreation, of the Draft EIR. Please also see Master Response 6.
PUB42-04	3. Water and sewer - even with the best, most modern engineered systems like the one Rush Creek Lodge installed had major problems.	The commenter expresses concerns regarding water supply and sewer but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. These topics are evaluated in Chapter 4.10, Hydrology and Water Quality and Chapter 4.16, Utilities and Service Systems, of the Draft EIR. Please also see Master Response 2.
PUB42-05	4. Traffic, noise and smoke from all the woodstoves	The commenter expresses concerns regarding traffic, noise, and air quality but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. These topics are evaluated in Chapter 4.15, Transportation, Chapter 4.12, Noise, and Chapter 4.2, Air Quality, of the Draft EIR.
PUB42-06	5. Parking problems already in Yosemite - how does 1000+ more even get through the entrance gate when the Park is already so jammed with tourists. Major holidays already have limits on vehicles allowed entry. Traffic jams at entrance gates are already miles long with folks sitting there with their car engines running, just waiting for the chance to clog already crowded roads in the Park.	The comment is noted. The comment does not address the adequacy of the Draft EIR.
PUB42-07	6. Employees - there's a whole nother *[sic]* aspect of what's going to happen? What about SIP orders?	The comment is noted. The comment does not address the adequacy of the Draft EIR.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
PUB42-08	7. These types of projects need to be closer to towns where there are already systems in place to handle a lot of these problems.	The Draft EIR evaluated an Alternate Location Alternative which determined that an alternate location would yield relatively similar results as the proposed project with reduced impacts in regard to noise, public services, parks and recreation, and utilities and service systems. The Alternate Location Alternative would not include a helipad. Refer to Chapter 6, Alternatives, of the Draft EIR, for more information. Please also see Master Response 7.
PUB42-09	You all owe it to the citizens who have voiced their concerns and you need to protect Yosemite National Park itself to see these issues and problems resolved before approval gets handed out!	The comment is noted. The comment does not address the adequacy of the Draft EIR.
PUB43	**Tom Coolidge, July 24, 2020**	
PUB43-01	I am concerned over the many environmental and public safety issues that have not been adequately addressed in the planning of these very invasive projects. The questions regarding water/sewer, traffic, emergency response/ public safety and pollution have all been well-documented by now, so I would save you some time by simply stating that, in my opinion, there should be significantly more attention and research devoted to those items. I believe an objective assessment will reveal the negative aspects far outweigh any monetary benefit to the county, and the extensive environmental damage it will cause is unacceptable and irreversible. I appreciate the time, energy, and thought you devote to this proposal!	The commenter expresses concerns regarding water supply, sewer, traffic, emergency response, and pollution but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. These topics are evaluated in Chapter 4.10, Hydrology and Water Quality, Chapter 4.16, Utilities and Service Systems, Chapter 4.14, Public Services and Recreation, and Chapter 4.2, Air Quality, of the Draft EIR. Please also see Master Responses 2 and 6.
PUB43-02	I am concerned over the many environmental and public safety issues that have not been adequately addressed in the planning of these very invasive projects. The questions regarding water/sewer, traffic, emergency response/ public safety and pollution have all been well-documented by now, so I would save you some time by simply stating that, in my opinion, there should be significantly more attention and research devoted to those items. I believe an objective assessment will reveal the negative aspects far outweigh any monetary benefit to the county, and the extensive	The comment is a repeat of comment PUB43-01.

Comment #	Comment	Response
	environmental damage it will cause is unacceptable and irreversible. I appreciate the time, energy, and thought you devote to this proposal!	
PUB44	Lee Zimmerman, July 24, 2020	
PUB44-01	I feel the need to make sure you are aware of something. We and others really question the decision by the planning department to issue two massive EIR's of 2000+ pages for 45-day comment period with deadlines within 10 days of each other (Yosemite Under Canvas & Terra Vi). Given that a single project like one of these comes around every few years, we would have expected the county to appropriately stagger the comment periods, particularly given the massive volume of the documents provided. There is clearly a feeling in the community, which I am hearing from many, of bad faith by the county in trying to stack these two review periods on top of each other to push them through by limiting the ability for thoughtful review and comments, particularly given the scale of the developments and documentation. All is of course exacerbated by current Covid restrictions and demands, which might alone be reason for greater timing flexibility and sensitivity. I wanted to bring this up before the Terra Vi deadline in case your department wanted to address it. Separately, as I mention below, the current Terra Vi docs alone are 400 megs in size, which puts an undue burden on folks who may not be able to have the bandwidth needed to download them easily, restricting access in particular for those of lesser means. Again, this leaves the appearance of trying to limit the ability for the community to review the EIR, when Terra Vi could easily have been asked to provide in a lower resolution PDF that was not such a hurdle to folks to download and use. Thanks for your time.	The comment expresses concern that the public review period of the Draft EIR was not extended. Please see Master Response 1, which explains the County's decision not to extend the public review period of the Draft EIR.
PUB45	Angie Norquist, July 26, 2020	
PUB45-01	In my previous letter, my concerns were not address in the DEIR for Terra Vi Lodge. My name is Angelene Norquist own a home on Sawmill Mountain Rd. my family has own this property since l987. For 33 years we have paid taxes, cleaned up the property to prevent fire danger in the area and cleaned up after the Rim Fire 2013, removing dead trees and replanting new trees to replace the ones that were lost in the fire. The Sawmill Mountain residents have protected this area for many years, and now trying to protect our community and property from over development in the area. I have many concerns about this TERRA VI LODGE YOSEMITE PROJECT, which the DEIR has failed to address.	The commenter expresses concerns regarding water supply but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. Water supply is evaluated in Chapter 4.10, Hydrology and Water Quality, of the Draft EIR. Please also see Master Response 5 regarding wildfire.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
	WATER SUPPLY, were are you going to get the water when your wells will not produce enough water for the demand you need. Ground water is always a gamble, there is no surface water for you to pull from. You will deplete our wells……..	
PUB45-02	SEPTIC there is no public sewer system, you must rely on an engineered septic system to treat truly staggering amounts of wastewater that will be produced. The potential for our well supplies and the Tuolumne River to be contaminated.	The commenter expresses concerns regarding the project's wastewater generation and disposal but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. Wastewater is evaluated in Chapter 4.16, Utilities and Service Systems, of the Draft EIR. Please also see Master Response 2.
PUB45-03	FIRE RISK, In l952 fire came through this area and burned timber and homes, 1987 again Fire came through this area and burned timber and homes, 2013 once again Fire came through this area and burned timber and homes, This area is in a HIGH FIRE AREA, and yet you do not see this.	The commenter expresses concerns regarding wildfire but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. This topic is evaluated in Chapter 4.17, Wildfire, of the Draft EIR. Please also see Master Response 5.
PUB45-04	TRAFFIC CONCERNS ON HIGHWAY 120: During the Rim Fire 2013 there were hundreds of people were trying to evacuate on the two lane road Highway 120, When Tuolumne County faces danger in this fashion, Highway 120 has a very limited capacity to allow for timely evacuation. This can put significant impact and a threat to the lives of the residents of the area. As shown during the 2018 Camp Fire in Paradise, Ca., many people were found burned in their cars, having had difficulty evacuating due to a two lane road. I believe that until Terra Vi Lodge can properly address the concerns of the local residents in the area, this should not be allowed to proceed with any development.	The commenter expresses concerns regarding traffic but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. Traffic is evaluated in Chapter 4.15, Transportation, of the Draft EIR.
PUB46	**Jayne Muraki Rasmussen, July 26, 2020**	
PUB46-01	I am writing as an architect and former environmental planner with the State of California supporting the CSERC's request for a full environmental impact report and required public hearings for the proposed Terra Vi lodge. Much study is needed to support such a development based on the information at hand showing the detrimental effects to local residents and the natural wonder that is Yosemite and its surrounds. Please consider the CSERC's request with all seriousness for the future of Yosemite and California. Many thanks in advance for your help.	The comment is noted. The comment does not address the adequacy of the Draft EIR.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
PUB47	**Peter Williams, July 26, 2020**	
PUB47-01	I am writing you as an active business in tourism and understand the problems of over developing popular areas which today is one of the major problems in the world. Yosemite park is such a beautiful and popular area but it does have limited water supplies traffic and and *[sic]* is an area of extreme fire danger. I feel that it would be a shame to continue to develop around the park and create more traffic more pollution and more people in such a limited area where at the moment it is already over visited and not enough infrastructure to support more visitors. Sometimes we need to realize when we have a good thing and not destroy it or overdo it tourism has become so popular now in the world that it is become a danger and we must be aware of that before it's too late. I ask you today to reconsider any development around or in the Yosemite park and only develop the park in an ecological way that will make it less polluted and more enjoyable for the whole world to visit don't forget this is one of the wonders of the world you have……. please treasure it and keep it as natural as possible for all of the visitors. Thank you for your consideration Peter Williams	The commenter expresses concerns regarding traffic and air quality but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. These topics are evaluated in Chapter 4.15, Transportation, and Chapter 4.2, Air Quality, of the Draft EIR.
PUB48	**David A. George, July 27, 2020**	
PUB48-01	The following is my main list of concerns related to the proposed development of the Terra Vi project in the Sawmill Mountain area. I appreciate your consideration of these concerns before moving forward unabated. Please confirm receipt of this email. WILDFIRE RISKS AND EVACUATION PLANNING The DEIR grossly understates the wildfire risks and fails to provide any analysis in support of its conclusion that these risks are less than significant. Terra Vi would be situated within what is considered a 'Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone', and this area has already succumbed to past forest fires not the least of which was the Rim Fire of 2013. There does not seem to be any attention paid to fire protection services and how these would be provided for. There is, however, an admission that firefighters from Groveland would be unable to reach the area in an acceptable amount of time during a crisis. Shouldn't this be concern enough to fully address the fire danger and evacuation procedures? There's a reliance on Highway 120 as an emergency	Fire protection services are addressed in accordance with CEQA Guidelines Appendix G, Environmental Checklist, in Chapter 4.14, Public Services, Parks, and Recreation of the Draft EIR. In addition, the project would include several features and mitigation measures to reduce fire risk, as described in Chapter 4.9, Hazards and Hazardous Materials; 4.14, Public Services, Parks, and Recreation; and Chapter 4.17, Wildfire. Access regarding Sawmill Mountain Road is addressed in Response ORG6-14.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
	access road that creates a dangerous assumption. What if the highway is shut down? How would everyone be evacuated in a scenario like this? The DEIR does not analyze Terra Vi's impacts on emergency access in a case such as this. It does not consider the capacity of Highway 120 and traffic conditions on this roadway during an emergency event such as a wildfire. Remember, 1S03 is a Forest Route. This Route is managed by the Forestry Service and exists for maintenance of the forest and not meant for commercial access. It is also a dead-end road and serves as the ONLY access and egress for the residents of Sawmill Mountain. The DEIR's lack of evacuation planning will lead to a disaster waiting to happen.	Please see Master Response 4 regarding emergency evacuation and Master Response 5 regarding wildfire.
PUB48-02	WATER SUPPLY AND WATER QUALITY It has been proposed in the DEIR to locate leach lines for the septic system directly above our property. The septic lines would run into a known wetland situated just above and running through our property, into a creek and eventually the Tuolumne River. Since our well is located just below these proposed lines, our water source would most definitely be contaminated. There have also been recent reports that the sewage water in Yosemite National Park has tested positive for the Corona virus. This is a risk that we would be unduly exposed to, not to mention the contamination that untreated sewage would bring. Our health with regard to water quality has clearly not been considered in the DEIR. The supply of water is also of great concern, mainly due to the fact that we already have difficulty in obtaining adequate water for our own small property. The most difficult exercise we experienced in the establishment of our homestead was finding a viable water source. When considering the volume of water that the Terra Vi project development would be slated to require (which is not mentioned in the DEIR) it is simply not logical to believe that our individual property wells would remain productive. Having such a large project development nearby would undoubtedly sap our existing water supply. This area is simply not suited to support the water requirements of not only the residents of Terra Vi, but also the subsequent need for fire suppression by the fire department.	Please see Responses ORG6-32, ORG6-42 and PUB29-01.
PUB48-03	UNAUTHORIZED USE OF FOREST ROUTE 1S03 The same fallacy of the intention by the Yosemite Under Canvas developers to use Forest Route 1S09 as a commercial use road also applies to Terra Vi's use of Forest Route 1S03. This simply should not be permitted due to the fact that this particular road is for use by the Forestry Service only and is not designated as a commercial use road. The amount of traffic alone would deteriorate the only road access we have to our properties especially when you factor in the allowance for heavy equipment to service the Terra Vi project both during construction AND afterwards to maintain its use by the public. Usage of this road would create a major issue of proper and effective evacuation planning in case of fire or other emergency. Exiting Sawmill	Regarding the hotel's proposed use of Sawmill Mountain Road, please see Response ORG6-14. Sawmill Mountain Road is maintained by the USFS. Regarding evacuation, please see Master Response 4. Please also see Master Response 6.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
	Mountain onto Highway 120 is already a problem for normal traffic because of how it traverses at that point with a blind corner at the West end. Increasing this traffic due to Terra Vi's presence will most assuredly lead to increased accidents on the highway due to the bottlenecks created during normal situations let alone any emergency scenario.	Regarding roadway safety for vehicles exiting Sawmill Mountain Road onto Highway 120, as described on page 3-28 of the Draft EIR, the project would include improvements along the Highway 120 frontage at the intersection with Sawmill Mountain Road to provide a left-turn lane on eastbound Highway 120, a right-turn pocket on westbound Highway 120, and improved sight distance. In addition, Mitigation Measure TRANS-3 in the Draft EIR requires that the project construct the intersection to ensure that the hillside and vegetation in conformance with Caltrans standards to ensure acceptable sight distance. Please also see Responses ORG6-63 through ORG6-66.
PUB48-04	<u>NOISE AND TRAFFIC</u> Make no mistake, the Terra Vi project is a massive project situated in an otherwise serene and largely undeveloped area. The argument could be made that this development is being considered for the 'greater good' much like a highway overpass displaces the lowly and unfortunate residents living beneath but in turn provides improved transportation for the masses. But I fail to see how this development does anybody any good at all, especially the forest when you consider the environmental impact, induced fire hazards and increased traffic and resultant noise pollution. The helipads that the DEIR describes alone would create an incredible amount of noise not to mention the constant heavy traffic that large commercial supply trucking provides just to keep a place like this running. Highway 120 is a two-lane artery, only and it was never designed to take on the increased traffic that this development would attract. We can already hear about every single car that traverses this stretch of road through the Sawmill Mountain area due to the fact that the most recent Rim Fire took out the majority of the trees and growth that served as a natural noise suppressor. The Terra Vi development would easily multiply this noise level and make living nearby it an uncomfortable environment to say the least. In conclusion, the aforementioned concerns must necessarily be noted and addressed before moving forward with the Terra Vi project as it has been outlined and described to the affected community in the DEIR. I truly appreciate your consideration and attention.	The commenter expresses concerns regarding the project's noise and traffic generation but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. These topics are evaluated in Chapter 4.12, Noise, and Chapter 4.15, Transportation, of the Draft EIR.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
PUB49	Ron & Joy Lopez, July 27, 2020	
PUB49-01	We are becoming increasingly reluctant to comment on anything that brings out "sides". But it still seems possible to us that everyone CAN win if we listen and are respectful. In that somewhat outdated hope, we offer our thoughts. The Terra VI project goal should be to add an asset to the community, not a detriment or burden. Planned Growth is so much better for everyone. Growth is inevitable, even desirable, when healthy parameters are established and followed. From a visitors point of view, we believe the Yosemite corridor would benefit from more comfortable overnight and recreational facilities. That would he an ideal way to expose people to the healthy ecosystem we are trying to save and maintain. Caring for nature is not a natural impulse without some extended exposure. It is then to everyone's advantage to provide more access into a healthy ecosystem. Terra VI could be such a venue. The all too common practice of benefiting the wallet of the corporate entity (reasonable) without consideration of the short and longterm impact on the natural and human communities (unreasonable) can obviously be addressed. This means, of course, LESS money pouring into corporate coffers but a better world for everyone. Some of those items that we see with quite limited exposure to the project are: 1. A plan acceptable to the hosting community that provides expanded Emergency Services that will address the increased flux in traffic and people. Really, the concept should be to add an asset to the community, not a detriment or burden (did we say that before?). 2. To add a sizable transient human population into the middle of a stressed but highly valued natural community requires reaching for 10 in an industry that frequently settles on 3. Water, sewage and waste, traffic, employee housing, noise and lights can and should be addressed with the highest independently judged environmental score. Go for the Green! (LEED) The intent should be to meet and surpass the efforts modeled by Evergreen and Rush Creek. 3. Sensitivity to the thriving local human community that Terra VI would be joining. From an artist/handyman friend of ours, who lives in a cabin nearby the proposed project, to the already present tourist providers, the local retailers, artists, farmers and retirees (including several close friends who are income dependent on AirBnB's)...reaching again for a 10 would have	The commenter expresses concerns regarding water supply, sewage, solid waste, traffic, employee housing, noise, and lights but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. These topics are evaluated in Chapter 4.10, Hydrology and Water Quality, Chapter 4.16, Utilities and Service Systems, Chapter 4.13, Population and Housing, Chapter 4.12, Noise, Chapter 4.15, Transportation, and Chapter 4.1, Aesthetics, of the Draft EIR. Please also see Master Response 2.

Comment #	Comment	Response
	ramifications far beyond the obvious. If an individual can have impact, a family even more, a corporation much more. To sum it up, the concept should be to add an asset to the community, not a detriment or burden, (in case you lost that in all these words). We believe that to be an attainable goal in this project - only with carefully written mandates to protect existing natural, community (and indeed global) resources.	
PUB50	**Jan Torpy, July 27, 2020**	
PUB50-01	I am writing to you today in response to the proposal to build a luxury lodge, Terra Vi near the entrance to Yosemite in Tuolumne. What I recall from conversations with my friends who live in Groveland; there are many concerning factors which need to be looked at when thinking about forward with this project. The biggest issue that I come up with is that this is a high fire area. Building there would have many more people to evacuate, more lives to be lost, and stretch the public safety systems extremely thin. This would be taking away from the long time residents who already live there. This is a fragile ecosystem that you would be building on. Along with fires, there is a severe draught history in this very area. Taking more water away from what does not hardly exist is not fair to the residents and businesses that are already there. Plus, building a structure of this magnitude might easily put local business out of work as they would not be able to compete with "bigger and better," Please rethink this. This project does not have to fold but perhaps taken elsewhere where the environment could make it sustainable and add to the community not take from it.	The commenter expresses concerns regarding emergency services and wildfire on the project site but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. These topics are evaluated in Chapter 4.14, Public Services and Recreation, and Chapter 4.17, Wildfire, of the Draft EIR. Please also see Master Responses 5 and 6.
PUB51	**Robert Asquith, July 28, 2020**	
PUB51-01	I am having some trouble reconciling differences between these two DEIRs. Please respond to my attached letter. Thanks. I have read the Yosemite Under Canvas DEIR and the Terra VI DEIR. Please help me understand how one DEIR can call out numerous items that require mitigation and the other does not. • Was one of the DEIRs just flat wrong? • Do the mitigation items stop at highway 120? • What is the role of Tuolumne County Planning in policing these documents on behalf of the County residents? • How is Tuolumne County Planning going to reconcile these gross inconsistencies before the projects proceed?	While the Draft EIRs for the Terra Vi Lodge and Yosemite Under Canvas projects are based on similar baseline settings, the EIRs evaluate two different projects and therefore would not be expected to contain identical impact determinations.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
PUB51-02	Here is but one example – the Terra VI DEIR lists 22 specific impacts requiring mitigation while the Under Canvas DEIR lists 6 impacts requiring mitigation. Do we have birds and bats that do not cross highway 120? There is something clearly wrong with: 1) Under Canvas DEIR, 2) Terra VI DEIR, and/or 3) Tuolumne County planning process to be so very different.	Please see Response PUB51-01.
PUB51-03	I am extremely concerned that between the consultants that prepared these DEIRs and Tuolumne County on whose behalf it was prepared, there were so many blatant errors and omissions. Also, it is very disappointing that Tuolumne County released two very lengthy DEIRs at almost the same time, during summer months when many residents are unavailable, and during the Covid crisis. The lack of consideration for review extension could lead one to the conclusion the County was trying to minimize resident review and comment and rush approval. This is not the manner in which I expect Tuolumne County to act as guardians of the integrity of developments within our County.	The comment expresses concern that the public review period of the Draft EIR was not extended. Please see Master Response 1, which explains the County's decision not to extend the public review period of the Draft EIR.
PUB52	**Mary Lou Bailey, July 28, 2020**	
PUB52-01	Our beautiful. Natural Treasures are being eroded now at a faster rate than ever before. Yosemite is overrun with visitors now, and adding another oversized tourist venue will guarantee more damage to the delicate eco system. Please do not approve further development In a this *[sic]* fragile area.	The comment is noted. The comment does not address the adequacy of the Draft EIR.
PUB53	**Constance C. Brown, July 28, 2020**	
PUB53-01	I am writing to express my concerns about the proposed development of Terra Vi Lodge on the north side of Highway 120 at the intersection of Summit Mountain Road. I am not altogether opposed to the development of more guest housing in the Yosemite area, but a project of size at this particular location is unusually risky in a number of ways. There is no public water, and there is no assurance that the existing water supply system could be reliable during multi-year periods of drought; there is no public sewer service and no adequate plan for how the effluent from the guests and staff on the property will be treated; fire has already burned this property (in 2013) and there is no reason to believe that it won't happen again; it is not convenient to public services, like sheriffs, medical care, etc.; it could have considerable negative impact on existing tourist businesses in the area. I am requesting that the County do two things: 1) require an Environmental Impact Report for the development at this location, and 2) consider other locations for this project.	The commenter states a concern that the Draft EIR did not adequately address several items of concern, particularly the evaluation of an alternative location. The Draft EIR evaluated an Alternate Location Alternative which determined that an alternate location would yield relatively similar results as the proposed project with reduced impacts in regard to noise, public services, parks and recreation, and utilities and service systems. Refer to Chapter 6, Alternatives, of the Draft EIR, for more information.
PUB54	**Wendy Francis, July 28, 2020**	
PUB54-01	I was very surprised to hear of the proposal for the development up near Harden Flat. Even though I have not lived in the Groveland area since the 1990s I am still well aware of some of	The commenter expresses concerns regarding water supply, sewer, and wildfire

Comment #	Comment	Response
	the issues that plague the foothills and mountain areas. A development of that size would require a tremendous amount of water, not to mention a substantial sewage treatment plan. My understanding is that water is always a major concern in the ongoing drought issues in California. I'm not too optimistic on that changing in the future. Additionally, having gone through the major Complex Fire in the late 1980s, fire is such a huge issue in the mountains that I have grave reservations about the development and the ability to safely evacuate the people staying there. The idea is frightening to even consider, despite the possible safety procedures that might be implemented. There have been too many examples of tragedy resulting from fires and the inability to get people out in areas where the roads are limited. The environmental impact of a development that size would no doubt add to slow depletion and destruction of the natural resources of the area. My strong recommendation and hope is that the board will seriously consider protecting the Hwy 120 corridor to the Park by keeping it undeveloped and natural. Thank you for your consideration of this critical issue.	but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. These topics are evaluated in Chapter 4.10, Hydrology and Water Quality, Chapter 4.16, Utilities and Service Systems, and Chapter 4.17, Wildfire, of the Draft EIR. Please also see Master Responses 2 and 5.
PUB55	Georgia McKenzie, July 28, 2020	
PUB55-01	I'm writing to express my concern about the Terra Vi Lodge development. Based on the lack of water, safety concerns, environmental impact and the economic impact on Groveland, I am strongly against this development. Terra Vi is clearly reckless and driven by money with disregard to the needs of the local people and the environment. I find it disturbing that a lodge that is supposed to showcase the beauty of the local environment puts that very environment in such peril by harming it with sewage treatment, fire danger, and drilling for wells in an already over-stressed water table. For shame. There are other appropriate sites that would be a more responsible choice if a development such as this must move forward at all. To allow Terra Vi to continue forward is blatantly irresponsible. Stop Terra Vi Lodge right now.	The commenter expresses concerns regarding water supply, sewer, and wildfire but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. These topics are evaluated in Chapter 4.10, Hydrology and Water Quality, Chapter 4.16, Utilities and Service Systems, and Chapter 4.17, Wildfire, of the Draft EIR. Please also see Master Responses 2 and 5.
PUB56	Anne Anderson, July 29, 2020	
PUB56-01	I would like to register my strong opposition to the Terra Vi development proposal at the gates of Yosemite National Park. This proposal never should have gotten as far as it has, and it needs to be ended now. Here are my concerns:	The comment serves as an introduction to the comments that follow. Please see Responses PUB56-02 though PUB56-07.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
PUB56-02	1. Extreme Fire Danger — For this reason alone, this property should not be developed. This property has already been overrun by wildfire once. It is clearly vulnerable to additional massive windfueled wildfires that have become routine in our state.	The commenter expresses concerns regarding wildfire but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. This topic is evaluated in Chapter 4.17, Wildfire, of the Draft EIR. Please also see Master Response 5.
PUB56-03	2. Lack of water — With no access to public water service and no aquifer beneath the property, relying on a couple of wells for such a massive development is foolhardy. The neighbors' wells are sure to be negatively affected, and how will those neighbors be compensated? The loss of the reasonable use of their property is not an acceptable tradeoff.	The commenter expresses concerns regarding water supply but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. Water supply is evaluated in Chapter 4.10, Hydrology and Water Quality, of the Draft EIR.
PUB56-04	3. Lack of sewer — Without access to public sewage services, the plan to treat all sewage on the property sounds dubious at best. What evidence do you have that the developers can actually pull this off? Has this technology been proven to work at such a large scale? It is more likely that the property will become one giant, smelly cess pool at the GATEWAY to Yosemite. John Muir would be horrified.	The commenter expresses concerns regarding the project's wastewater generation and disposal but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. Wastewater is evaluated in Chapter 4.16, Utilities and Service Systems, of the Draft EIR. Please also see Master Response 2.
PUB56-05	4. Terrible location — There are clearly identified, better locations for a greatly scaled down, rightsized project of this sort. The town of Groveland, for example, is an obvious choice where public water and sewer services can be negotiated. Impacts to the livelihoods of the current residents of Groveland should also be considered strongly in any proposed project. The fact that there are no services — fire, police, water, and sewer — anywhere near this site should be unacceptable to Tuolumne County.	The commenter states a concern regarding the location of the project. The Draft EIR evaluated an Alternate Location Alternative which determined that an alternate location would yield relatively similar results as the proposed project with reduced impacts in regard to noise, public services, parks and recreation, and utilities and service systems. Refer to Chapter 6, Alternatives, of the Draft EIR, for more information. Please also see Master Response 7.
PUB56-06	5. Traffic — There are already miles-long traffic jams of cars trying to get into Yosemite. Tuolumne County should be interested in ensuring that the experience of going to Yosemite is a pleasant one, so that visitors have a positive memory of the county. The experience of being	The commenter expresses concerns regarding traffic but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft

Comment #	Comment	Response
	stuck in a traffic jam next to an overbuilt, high-end resort for the wealthy is not going to endear the county to the thousands of visitors who come through daily.	EIR. Traffic is evaluated in Chapter 4.15, Transportation, of the Draft EIR.
PUB56-07	In sum, a project such as this should never have gotten past the trial balloon stage. That the developers have already spent a lot of money on this project should not deter you and the county supervisors from doing the right thing. Just say no to this project.	The comment serves as a summary of the preceding comments. Please see Responses PUB56-01 though PUB56-06.
PUB57	**Cris Barsanti, July 29, 2020**	
PUB57-01	I am writing to express my concerns with the Terra Vi project off Hwy 120, near Hardin Flat. As I've been reading over sections of the DEIR I find that this development is inappropriate for this location. I think it is fair to ask how this parcel was considered for Commercial Recreation zoning. As you know it is bordered by lands zoned A-10, RE-5, RE-2 and Public which seem incompatible with the C/R zoning. Since I'm not familiar with the history, I don't know if the owners of the adjacent parcels fought this zoning when it was approved. I believe that the owners of the neighboring parcels expected that the land would stay undeveloped for at least 10 years when the Murray trust entered into a CA Forest Improvement Program in 2018 after the devastation caused by the Rim Fire. I imagine that if this project is approved the trust will have to reimburse the State of CA for the funds it has already spent on reforesting this parcel.	The commenter states a concern regarding the location of the project. The Draft EIR evaluated an Alternate Location Alternative which determined that an alternate location would yield relatively similar results as the proposed project with reduced impacts in regard to noise, public services, parks and recreation, and utilities and service systems. Refer to Chapter 6, Alternatives, of the Draft EIR, for more information. Please also see Master Response 7.
PUB57-02	Since the parcel is rated by Cal Fire as being in a Very High Fire Hazard Security Zone it is unconscionable to allow accommodations for in excess of 400-600 guests and employees. Additionally the CA PUC classifies the parcel as a Tier 2 Fire Threat. With the increase in multi year droughts and the climate warming we are experiencing it seems unwise to "play with fire" so to speak.	The commenter expresses concerns regarding wildfire but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. This topic is evaluated in Chapter 4.17, Wildfire, of the Draft EIR. Please also see Master Response 5.
PUB57-03	The lack of public water is another important concern. The two wells that were recently drilled on the property during a normal rainfall year may not be adequate during drought years. Drawing the large amount of water needed to service this project from the fractured underground water table will most likely adversely affect the neighbors' wells. Short of a lawsuit will the neighbors be adequately compensated should this happen? (It is my understanding that Rush Creeek has found it necessary to truck in water during our frequent drought years.)	Please see Responses ORG5-03 and ORG6-32.
PUB57-04	The lack of public sewer is most concerning. With the leach field planned for what the neighbors describe as a wetlands or at best a wet meadow, what is to keep the effluent from contaminating their wells or seeping into the ephemeral streams that eventually make their way to the Middle Fork Tuolumne River.	Please see Response ORG6-32 and Master Response 2.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
PUB57-05	Considering the nearby approved and pending developments including the Berkeley Camp Restoration, the Under Canvas project across Hwy 120 and the 1000 Trails Yosemite Lakes RV Park expansion, the traffic into and out of Yosemite will be more unbearable than it is currently. Last weekend a friend waited 1 1/2 hours to get into the Park even with the reduced amount of visitors allowed and the requirement to have a reservation. With all the added potential visitors these developments will generate, the traffic will be comparable to LA ftraffic *[sic]* jams. I am heartened to notice that a YARTS bus stop is planned in front of the Terra Vi Lodge.	The commenter expresses concerns regarding traffic but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. Traffic is evaluated in Chapter 4.15, Transportation, of the Draft EIR.
PUB57-06	The location of the development, 25 miles from Groveland where emergency medical, law enforcement and ambulance service are located means that if there is a need for these public services in this remote location which is more likely with 400-600 people present, the people living close to the towns of Groveland and Big Oak Flat will be left uncovered.	The commenter expresses concerns regarding emergency services on the project site but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. Emergency service and response is evaluated in Chapter 4.14, Public Services and Recreation, of the Draft EIR. Please also see Master Response 6.
PUB57-07	The Helipad will increase noise and present a potential safety hazard to neighbors. The quiet, peaceful atmosphere they have enjoyed for many years will be quite changed by this development. It is good to know that the Helipad would be used for emergencies only, so theoretically it would be used infrequently.	The commenter expresses concerns regarding the project's noise generation but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. Noise is evaluated in Chapter 4.12, Noise, of the Draft EIR.
PUB57-08	The disruption of the resident mule deer migration to and from their summer and winter range is concerning as they have been already impacted by the devastation of the Rim Fire and encounters with visitors on walking trails through their migration routes will be detrimental.	The commenter expresses concerns regarding wildlife in the vicinity of the project site but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. Wildlife is evaluated in Chapter 4.3, Biological Resources, of the Draft EIR.
PUB57-09	My final concern is the increased GHG emissions generated by this developement *[sic]*. As each year goes by we get closer and closer to the point of no return when it will be too late to reverse the damage that is being caused by humans' contributions to the planet's warming. The DEIS finds that the GHG emmisions *[sic]* that will be created by this project are significant and unavoidable. This finding alone should be enough to table the project.	The commenter expresses concerns regarding the project's GHG emissions but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. GHG emissions are evaluated in Chapter 4.8, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, of the Draft EIR.
PUB58	**Justin Berton, July 29, 2020**	
PUB58-01	*Water Supply- It is worth repeating that this site is an area with no aquifers and "...subsurface material consists primarily of impermeable granitic and greenstone bedrock which can result in a low groundwater yield." and "The characteristics of the fractured rock and weather fluctuations*	Please see Response ORG6-42. Testing showed significantly more flow than calculated demand.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
	have led to some wells providing unreliable sources of water." (previous IS/MND). Even the current DEIR for this project notes that "Fractured rock provides inconsistent groundwater conditions; some parcels are underlain by small pools of groundwater that are reliable, and others tap into less reliable subsurface rills and streamlets. The Tuolumne-Stanislaus Integrated Regional Water Management Plan determined that existing data are insufficient to quantify the total available sustainable groundwater supply. This is not atypical in fractured rock environments such as those that occur throughout the Sierra foothills". Anyone who lives in California knows that every winter is different and we have the potential for a multi-year drought. This DEIR does not take this into consideration at all. In fact, there is no scientific evidence provided to support the contention that the 50% reduction factor will come even close to accurately predicting reduced capacity during multiyear droughts. This is a huge project, the fact that this is not addressed is completely irresponsible. What happens when 500-800 people run out of water in August during peak Yosemite tourists season?	
PUB58-02	Another problem with this report is that the DEIR indicates that 16,640 gpd is sufficient to supply 500+ people with their daily water requirements. Assuming 500 people, this results in only a 33 gpd allocation per person! Again most Californians know this is an unrealistic amount and you all should know this as well.	Please see Response ORG5-04.
PUB58-03	This is a very tough water conservation goal. More realistic is 55 gpd. If one uses a 55 gpd consumption rate per person for 500 people, the daily demand at Terra Vi is now estimated to be 27,500 gpd. This more realistic demand comes much closer to the highly optimistic (i.e. very wet year) pumping rate of 38,160 gpd. To exceed the pumping capacity, consumption would only have to increase to 77 gpd per person (not unlikely). Especially with tourists on vacation they do not understand the very real water problem this area deals with during droughts and are more likely to over use water rather than conserve water.	Please see Response ORG5-04.
PUB58-04	This is all before we take into consideration the effects of the Under Canvas project. These two resorts would put a heavy strain on the water available in the area. There are many houses near these two developments and both will put them all at risk of losing their water supply. I still do not understand why the alternative site is not an option I did not see any of the reasons given as worthy. For example, the very real problems with water supply and wastewater disposal would be adequately addressed at the alternate site because of the capacity for municipal water supply and sewage service. Similarly, wildfire risk issues would be mitigated by being closer to the fire station and a reduced necessity for landscape screening (AKA fuel loading).	The purpose of the Draft EIR is to provide an analysis for the project as it is proposed. The comment provides an opinion and does not address the analysis of the Draft EIR. The Draft EIR includes cumulative analysis for all subject areas in Chapters 4.1 through 4.17, which consider the potential cumulative impacts of the proposed project in combination with other nearby projects

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
		including the Yosemite Under Canvas project. Cumulative impacts with respect to water supply (impact discussion UTIL-3), wastewater service (impact discussion UTIL-6), and wildfire (impact discussion WF-5) were concluded to be less than significant.
PUB58-05	Wastewater treatment and potential groundwater contamination – Even if one uses the very low estimate of pumping rate of 16,640 gpd for this project, wastewater production will exceed 6 million gallons per year. The DEIR estimates that 7,000 gpd of grey water will be produced and used for irrigation. Thus, over 2.5 million gallons of grey water would be available for irrigation; that is a lot of irrigation for native vegetation! Realistically, and as noted in the DEIR, there will thus be a surplus of grey water that will also have to be released into the leach fields.	Please see Master Response 2. The project proposes an on-site package wastewater treatment system that would treat up to 130 percent of the proposed project's water demand of 17,833 gpd.
PUB58-06	Combining this grey water surplus with the remaining 3.5 million gallons of blackwater sewage, the load on the septic system is immense. Given this incredible loading, it is absolutely astounding that there is not a real analysis of whether the proposed leach fields will be able to accommodate this wastewater load. The only evidence provided is a quote from the soil analyst that the site "should provide a more than adequate area for the wastewater system". However, the analyst also said that "The exact amount of area needed for the commercial development wastewater system can only be determined during the wastewater system design process".	As described in Response PUB58-05, the project proposes an on-site package wastewater treatment system. Please see Master Response 2 for details.
PUB58-07	Because there does not appear to be any real design at this point, the ability of these leach fields to handle this load is completely unknown. As far as I can tell, the DEIR does not give even the most minimal tests that are used in designing leach fields such as a percolation test or soil loading rates. These are tests that are commonly used even when designing septic systems for single family dwellings. The fact that this has not been done for a huge development truly boggles the mind. The DEIR assumes without evidence that this wastewater will have been adequately treated before moving into the groundwater. Percolation tests are necessary to determine whether the wastewater will be sufficiently treated before it mixes with the groundwater.	As described in Response PUB58-05, the project proposes an on-site package wastewater treatment system. Please see Master Response 2 for details.
PUB58-08	The soil analyst also notes that "This area is a low-lying saddle that has the potential to accumulate excess moisture from winter storm events." Accumulation of excess moisture means that the soils at this site could become saturated. This soil saturation can cause backups of the entire wastewater treatment system and thus increase the chance of groundwater contamination. Again, percolation tests and soil loading studies are needed to assess the possibility of this major malfunction in wastewater storage capacity.	As described in Response PUB58-05, the project proposes an on-site package wastewater treatment system. Please see Master Response 2 for details.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
PUB58-09	Another problem is the direction of the leach fields. The underground flow typically follows the surface terrain meaning it would be flowing down to the existing houses and their wells, as opposed to flowing uphill towards Hwy 120, as shown in the submittal, indicated by the arrow pointing south. This has further potential to contaminate existing wells.	As described in Response PUB58-05, the project proposes an on-site package wastewater treatment system. Please see Master Response 2 for details.
PUB58-10	Finally, this flawed analysis of the wastewater load from Terra Vi does not even consider the potential wastewater input from the nearby proposed Under Canvas project. In sum, this analysis of the potential problems with wastewater disposal and groundwater contamination is totally inadequate.	Please see Response ORG6-32.
PUB58-11	Wildfire risk – The project area is located within a CALFIRE "Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone" and so the concentration of a very large number of people in a relatively isolated (and highly flammable) location is a very bad idea. In fact, it seems pretty unconscionable to expose the 500+ folks at this facility (plus an additional 250+ at the proposed Under Canvas Project) to the extreme fire danger at this site when the closest fire station is a half hour away in Groveland. The crew from Groveland has only one engine and if there is a significant wildfire at this site, the crew would face an almost impossible job of trying to adequately protect this project and the Under Canvas development (and other facilities); especially difficult given that they would likely arrive fairly late to the fire scene. In addition, during a large wildfire event the station would likely prioritize Groveland and thus this site would be completely unprotected.	Please see Chapter 4.17, Wildfire, of the Draft EIR for the wildfire impacts analysis. Please also see Master Response 5.
PUB58-12	The potentially deadly traffic congestion that might result during combined evacuation of this facility and the Under Canvas glamping project across the street bring to mind visions of what happened at Paradise on a road that was bigger than Route 120. One of the more bizarre suggestions in this DEIR to reduce evacuation congestion was to have people shelter in place; apparently in a basement room that somehow would maintain proper ventilation for those inside while a firestorm rages above (!). This is completely irresponsible and almost laughable if it did not involve suggesting that people shelter in place during a wildfire! We had a cabin catch fire and burn down during that last major wild fire (rim fire) and I assure you if anyone had been sheltering in place in the basement they would have certainly died. There was nothing left but the metal roofing material. Even the washer and dryer completely melted. This line of thinking is shocking and I hope you do not think that this is an actual option during a wildfire.	Please see Master Response 4 regarding emergency evacuation.
PUB58-13	We would not have a problem with this project if it were at the alternate site. However, as currently proposed, this project is a total environmental and socio-economic disaster for the people of Tuolumne County. The residents of this County depend on their elected officials and planners to do the right thing for their well-being in the face of financially driven development.	The commenter states a concern regarding the location of the project. The Draft EIR evaluated an Alternate Location Alternative which determined that an alternate location

Comment #	Comment	Response
	This DEIR is so flawed and I hope you understand how they are trying to inaccurately minimize the impacts of this project so that you will approve it. You must require them to do further study to prove they will not deplete the water supply or contaminate the area wells or you should deny it. Please do the right thing and deny this project as it currently stands and encourage the developer to seriously consider the alternate site.	would yield relatively similar results as the proposed project with reduced impacts in regard to noise, public services, parks and recreation, and utilities and service systems. Refer to Chapter 6, Alternatives, of the Draft EIR, for more information. Please also see Master Response 7.
PUB59	Connie Brown and Anne Anderson, July 29, 2020	
PUB59-01	I would like to register my strong opposition to the Terra Vi development proposal at the gates of Yosemite National Park. This proposal never should have gotten as far as it has, and it needs to be ended now. Here are my reasons: 1. Extreme Fire Danger — For this reason alone, this property should not be developed. This property has already been overrun by wildfire once. It is clearly vulnerable to additional massive wind-fueled wildfires that have become routine in our state.	The commenter expresses concerns regarding wildfire but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. This topic is evaluated in Chapter 4.17, Wildfire, of the Draft EIR. Please also see Master Response 5.
PUB59-02	2. Lack of water — With no access to public water service and no aquifer beneath the property, relying on a couple of wells for such a massive development is foolhardy. The neighbors' wells are sure to be negatively affected, and how will those neighbors be compensated? The loss of the reasonable use of their property is not an acceptable tradeoff.	The commenter expresses concerns regarding water supply but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. Water supply is evaluated in Chapter 4.10, Hydrology and Water Quality, of the Draft EIR.
PUB59-03	3. Lack of sewer — Without access to public sewage services, the plan to treat all sewage on the property sounds dubious at best. What evidence do you have that the developers can actually pull this off? Has this technology been proven to work at such a large scale? It is more likely that the property will become one giant, smelly cess pool *[sic]* at the GATEWAY to Yosemite. John Muir would be horrified.	The commenter expresses concerns regarding the project's wastewater generation and disposal but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. Wastewater is evaluated in Chapter 4.16, Utilities and Service Systems, of the Draft EIR. Please also see Master Response 2.
PUB59-04	4. Terrible location — There are clearly identified, better locations for a greatly scaled down, rightsized project of this sort. The town of Groveland, for example, is an obvious choice where public water and sewer services can be negotiated. Impacts to the livelihoods of the current	The commenter states a concern regarding the location of the project. The Draft EIR evaluated an Alternate Location Alternative

Comment #	Comment	Response
	residents of Groveland should also be considered strongly in any proposed project. The fact that there are no services — fire, police, water, and sewer — anywhere near this site should be unacceptable to Tuolumne County.	which determined that an alternate location would yield relatively similar results as the proposed project with reduced impacts in regard to noise, public services, parks and recreation, and utilities and service systems. Refer to Chapter 6, Alternatives, of the Draft EIR, for more information. Please also see Master Response 7.
PUB59-05	5. Traffic — There are already miles-long traffic jams of cars trying to get into Yosemite. Tuolumne County should be interested in ensuring that the experience of going to Yosemite is a pleasant one, so that visitors have a positive memory of the county. The experience of being stuck in a traffic jam next to an overbuilt, high-end resort for the wealthy is not going to endear the county to the thousands of visitors who come through daily.	The commenter expresses concerns regarding traffic but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. Traffic is evaluated in Chapter 4.15, Transportation, of the Draft EIR.
PUB59-06	In sum, a project such as this should never have gotten past the trial balloon stage. That the developers have already spent a lot of money on this project should not deter you and the county supervisors from doing the right thing. Just say no to this project.	The comment serves as a summary of the above comments. Please see Responses PUB59-01 through PUB59-05.
PUB60	**Jerry Cathey, July 29, 2020**	
PUB60-01	Attached please find Jerry Cathey's comment letter regarding the Terra Vi DEIR. Please confirm receipt of this email. I am writing to you today to voice my concerns and contest the building of the hotel development by Hansji Hotels Corporation on the Manley property, located on Saw Mill Mountain Road. My family has a long history in the Sierra Nevada's and my Grandfathers settled Cathey's Valley. It is my lineage and love of the beauty that drew me to Tuolumne County. In the 1970's, I had the opportunity to purchase a piece of land off Saw MillMountain *[sic]* Road. I worked hard and saved every penny I could as well as borrowing, to finally purchase this land in 1974. While I was not able to build right away, my family and I, put a trailer on the property. Every spare moment I had was spent working my land and preparing an area for a future cabin. Our home away from home was built in the 80's. My wife, who was a local to the area as a child, our friends, family, all have enjoyed the beauty, peacefulness and safety of our cabin and surrounding area for many years now . We have been blessed to have an amazing assortment of wildlife which we have always respected and enjoyed seeing. From bears, deer, foxes to various	The comment is noted. The comment does not address the adequacy of the Draft EIR.

Comment #	Comment	Response
	species of birds. All have been on our land and at peace with the quiet, non-traffic of human intervention. The folks that have land on Saw Mill Mountain Road are all very neighborly. We all look out for and take care of one another. Generation after generation, our children, Grand Children , Great Grandchildren, extended family and friends, even our pets, we all take care of one anot her. We respect the land, take great care in how we approach what we do and any impact we may have on nature and the environment. This is our HOME and we cherish the peace this area brings us. We have all suffered great loss of loved ones, for myself, my wife, who loved th is *[sic]* place as much asI *[sic]* do and like others here, want those memories and surrounding areas to remain as they are today, free of excess population, traffic and the pollution caused by all these components. We all still suffer from the impact from rim fire, both emotionally and financially, however the peace and beauty still remain and the re-growth of vegetation is a blessing for all of us. We are all terrified of the all of impacts this proposed hotel development would inevitability bring. We all have countless stories from generations past and present and all feel concerned what impact this proposed hotel will bring for our future generations to come. While I am not the young man I once was, I still enjoy spending time at my cabin and enjoying family and friends who also gather there as well. I have worked all my life to have this, it is my hearts desire and I cherish this land more that words can express. I implore you to please hear the many voices on Saw Mill Mountain Road that are very clear in "NOT" wanting this hotel here. The impact that Hansji Hotel would have on the locals, many of which are my friends, would be detrimental. The small family owner/operator hotels would lose precious revenue which even on a small scale, would impact them significantly and possible put them out of business. These folks have families, children that depend on this to survive. Winter months are hard enough here for these folks however, Hansji Hotel would cripple them and devastate their livelihoods.	
PUB60-02	Consider this: • The building of the hotel will bring destructive big machinery; operators, pollution impacting land and wildlife.	The commenter expresses concerns regarding the project's GHG emissions and impacts on wildlife but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. These topics are evaluated in Chapter

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
		4.8, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, and Chapter 4.3, Biological Resources, of the Draft EIR.
PUB60-03	• Sewage & water infrastructure will affect all of us on Saw Mill Mountain Road. Compromised well water supply of surface water from reservoir, lake, river.	The commenter expresses concerns regarding the project's sewer and water impacts but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. These topics are evaluated in Chapter 4.16, Utilities and Service Systems, and Chapter 4.10, Hydrology and Water Quality, of the Draft EIR. Please also see Master Response 2.
PUB60-04	• Staff to support the hotel operations will increase traffic which means an increase on pollution not only from vehicles, but from the people.	The commenter expresses concerns regarding the project's traffic impact and GHG emissions but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. These topics are evaluated in Chapter 4.15, Transportation, and Chapter 4.8, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, of the Draft EIR.
PUB60-05	• Guests also equal increased traffic which equals additional pollution.	The commenter expresses concerns regarding the project's traffic impact and GHG emissions but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. These topics are evaluated in Chapter 4.15, Transportation, and Chapter 4.8, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, of the Draft EIR.
PUB60-06	• Increased population equals potential crime. Curious visitors will innocently trespass (which will not be warmly received by residents) onto private lands and will cause the Tuolumne County Sheriff's Department an influx of activity for which they are not equipped to handle.	The comment is noted. The comment does not address the adequacy of the Draft EIR.
PUB60-07	• Increased population causes damage to the environment and directly impacts wildlife. We will not be able to enjoy the peace and ability to see this wildlife as the result of the increase of humans that will push the wildlife out.	The commenter expresses concerns regarding wildlife in the vicinity of the project site but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. Wildlife is evaluated in Chapter 4.3, Biological Resources, of the Draft EIR.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
PUB60-08	• Hansji Hotels plans to bring prefabricated buildings. This in my view sets the precedent that they are not thinking if the impact to local's but instead, cutting costs to drive revenue. I understand this concept as a business owner (now retired) however this is a small local community of folks in the middle of God's county, so assisting in supporting the locals should be paramount.	The comment is noted. The comment does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR.
PUB60-09	• Hansji Hotels is also using a 27 year old land study which should not have any bearing on any reporting as the report is outdated and not relevant due to the rim fire.	The Draft EIR provides citations for the information used to develop the baseline (existing conditions) setting used in the EIR analysis. The comment does not specify what the "27 year old land study" is to which the commenter is referring. Therefore, a more detailed response cannot be provided.
PUB60-10	• The DEIR did not accurately assess/mitigate the presented issues. Many conclusions have not been based on actual evidence via proper analysis.	The comment states that the Draft EIR does not accurately assess and mitigate the concerns mentioned in comments PUB60-02 through PUB60-09 but does not provide evidence to support the claim.
PUB60-11	In closing, I do not envy your position on having to weigh future tax revenue for the community verses the added cost to our fire, sheriff and other government agencies. We are asking you to put yourselves in our shoes and both see and feel how this proposed hotel will negatively impact our environment, our families and friends. With all that I am, I will stand with my neighbors and community and fight against Hansji Hotels building in our area.	The comment provides a summary of the comments above. Please see Responses PUB60-01 through PUB60-10.
PUB61	**Matthew Chapman, July 29, 2020**	
PUB61-01	The Draft EIR (DEIR) submitted for development project Terra Vi proposed on Hardin Flat LLC lands is inadequate, as it conceals and ommits *[sic]* NOP comments inoring *[sic]* relevant issues and facts of CEQA "environmental law" set forth within the body of that NOP submittal. The NOP issues set forth within the NOP "Notice of Preparation" were incomplete, in relation to issues and facts known to the Lead Agency. Those known issues and facts revealed incident to the development project (without CEQA initial Study) entering a Stakeholder Notification process for purpose of a CEQA Negative and or Mitigated Negative Declaration. The Lead Agency upon determining to full EIR processing, notified, for a second time, the requisite persons and Agency, etc.. This Respondent, and others, expressed the necessity to include all Stakeholder Responses, within, as part and parcel of the subsequently requested NOP	The commenter states a concern that the Draft EIR did not adequately include and evaluate all comments received by the public in response to the NOP but does not provide information on specific comments. As stated on page 2-2 of the Draft EIR, "the County circulated the Notice of Preparation (NOP) of an EIR for the proposed project to and interested agencies and persons on May 2, 2019 for a 30-day review period. Due to a clerical issue, the NOP was reissued and submitted to the Office of Planning and

Comment #	Comment	Response
	comments, feedback from the Lead Agency let known, that, that in fact would occur. This Respondents Stakeholder comments were concealed and omitted, from DEIR documentation, issues and facts therein asserted were ignored, and not addressed as relevant CEQA "environmental law", moreover they were not designated as relevant NOP issues for EIR analysis, despite the Lead Agency's Full knowledge of their existance *[sic]*. CEQA process has been inadequately conducted, in bias manner to conceal and omit. issues and facts that would jeapodize *[sic]* the Lead Agencies predetermined effort to approve the development project. issues and facts they know, can't be refuted, so they are dismissed and ignored within the DEIR, even though noted within the minutes of the public scoping meeting.	Research State Clearinghouse on November 15, 2019 for an additional 30-day review period." Appendix A, NOP Comments, of the Draft EIR, contains the complete set of comments received during both NOP scoping periods. Prior to deciding to prepare an EIR for the proposed project, on December 10, 2018, the County sent a notice of the proposed project to interested stakeholders to invite comments on the planning process. Any comments received in response to this notice are not part of the official scoping period for the Draft EIR, as they were submitted prior to the decision to prepare an EIR and the issuance of the NOP. Nevertheless, these comments were reviewed and considered by the County, and were provided to the EIR preparers, and were taken into account when preparing the Draft EIR. These letters are included in this Final EIR as Appendix Q.
PUB61-02	Predominant among those issues and facts, concealed and omitted was the issue of the lawfulness of the 4 Hardin Flat LLC parcels involved in simultaneous development of the 2 proposed projects, Terra Vi and Under Canvas.. The Stakeholder Response, of this commentator, relates the submittal of: 1) CFIP Contract 8GG14302 Gregory Robert Manly 28 pgs. 2) COMPLAINT UNLAWFUL LAND DIVISION (Points 1-23) 3) CODE OF FEDERAL REGULATION 36 §251.50 That Stakeholder Response ending with the statement; ", •. all parcels being derived from the patently	The comments previously submitted by the commenter were submitted outside of the scoping period for the Draft EIR but had previously been received and considered by the County and EIR consultant. Regarding the CFIP contract, please see Response ORG9-28. Regarding the commenter's assertion that the project site was previously a part of an unlawful subdivision, as noted in previous

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
	unlawful land division, the CK zoning of those unlawful parcels equally unlawful. The unlawful land division must be rescinded, the lodge development project put in abeyance until if and/or when a lawful land division process is undertaken and the result of that lawful process is there to contemplate." The above statement should have been heeded by the Lead Agency, instead a process of concealment and omission resulted. There is no indication within the DEIR, that the above Stakeholder submittals relating the Land Use/Planning Topical issues of CEQA recognized "environmental law" (referenced within this commentator's NOP response) was in any manner considered. Nor is the existance *[sic]* of the 23 point Unlawful Land Division Complaint presented as a NOP submittal within the noted NOP response Appendice *[sic]*, It would appear also, that there is no reference to the Code of Federal Regulation related above.	correspondence from the County Surveyor to the commenter, the County Surveyor has previously considered the commenter's concerns and has determined that the previous lot line adjustments were properly executed. Regarding 36 CFR 251.50, please see Response ORG6-14, which addresses the project's proposed use of the forest route.
PUB61-03	Additional responses to a second public CEQA scoping meeting occuring *[sic]* in early October of 2019, addressing CEQA Hydrogeo logical *[sic]* study, were omitted, and concealed from the DEIR. Those responses go to the legitimacy of that Hydrogeological study, and is necessary to put the Hydrogeological analysis in proper perspective, and relate it's limitations to adequate analysis, as well as overall neglect by the Lead Agency in recognizimg *[sic]* the Unlawful Land Division Complaint's ramifications in being concealed and ignored.	The scoping meeting for the Draft EIR was held on May 13, 2019. The meeting that occurred in October 2019 was a voluntary, informational meeting and was not a CEQA scoping hearing.
PUB61-04	The act of wanton, omissiom *[sic]* and concealment of relevant CEQA "environmental law" and other facts, jeopardize full and fair CEQA process review; that a full and fair process otherwise provide. A full and fair process requires disclosure, recognition and adequate response by the Lead Agency within the DEIR, a public document, the veracity of which fully informs the appropriate interested parties, persons, agency, whom otherwise are left ignorant of facts and issues the Lead Agency and/or the preparors *[sic]* determines to censor. That tactic forecloses redirect response within the DEIR to omitted NOP issues of law and fact left concealed. Forcing again the presentation of those omissions within DEIR comment, seeking an initial Lead Agency response, rather than a progressive 2 step analysis. In correcting the omission and concealment of the above cited issues and other facts and comments generated by this Respondent, they are inserted in this text to ensure they are not further concealed by the Lead Agency and/or the preparors *[sic]* of the EIR, within further documents to be prepared; that they are properly acknowledged, presented, and adequately responded to, in the remaining EIR processing.	Please see Response PUB61-01, which explains that previous comments submitted by the commenter as part of the planning process, prior to the initiation of the Draft EIR process, were received and considered by the County and the EIR consultant but are not considered part of the formal scoping process for the Draft EIR.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
PUB61-05	In order, will be presented the following documents 1) Terra vi Stakeholder comments of December 27 2018	The comment refers to comments previously submitted to the County as part of the planning process for the proposed project application. Please see Response PUB61-01.
PUB61-06	2) Unlawfull *[sic]* Land Division Complaint (23 points), Cover Letter and Table of Content referencing Record File A-F; submitted in Addendum to Item (1) above	The comment refers to comments previously submitted to the County as part of the planning process for the proposed project application. Please see Response PUB61-01.
PUB61-07	3) Code of Federal Regulation 36 §251.50; submitted in Addendum to item (1) avobe *[sic]* presented as commentary in text.	The comment refers to comments previously submitted to the County as part of the planning process for the proposed project application. Please see Response PUB61-01.
PUB61-08	4) October 14, 2019 response to request to participate in CEQA Hydrogeological well testing.	The comment refers to comments previously submitted to the County as part of the planning process for the proposed project application. Please see Response PUB61-01.
PUB61-09	Additional correspondence, included as PDF attachement, *[sic]* will accompany the whole of this document, to be described within email upon submittal, to confirm its existance *[sic]* and presentation in fact.	The comment is noted. The comment does not address the adequacy of the Draft EIR.
PUB61-10	Following the documents, related above, will be presented comments relating relevant law explaining the duties of the Lead Agency and/or the preparors *[sic]* of the CEQA EIR, in relation to the therein described scope of CEQA "environmental law." to be recognized under CEQA. Those comments were prepared for the "Under Canvas" component of the Hardin Flat LLC lands, they are applicable as well to the Terra Vi component of Hardin Flat LLC land development, as the currently recognized 4 parcels manifest themselves thru that common origin, tho *[sic]* the Terra Vi western parcel's situation in relation to the law is distinguishable, as has been, and will be articulated following that commentary	The comment serves as an introduction to the comments to follow. Please see Responses PUB61-10 through PUB61-19.
PUB61-11	The date therein referenced July 18, 2019, relating that applicable submittal, should be read to recognize the December 27 Stakeholder Comments of this respondent, a Response omitted from the Terra Vi DEIR Appendix, in which the actual incident of the Land Division Complaint was delivered to the Lead Agency	The comment refers to comments previously submitted to the County as part of the planning process for the proposed project application. Please see Response PUB61-01.
PUB61-12	*Attachment: Stakeholder comments of December 27, 2019*	The comment provides an attachment including stakeholder comments from a

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
		December 27, 2019 meeting. No response is required.
PUB61-13	*Attachment: Unlawful Land Division Complaint*	The comment provides an attachment including information on unlawful land division complaints. No response is required.
PUB61-14	*Attachment: October 14, 2019 Response to Request to Participate in Hydrogeological Well Testing*	The comment provides an attachment including a response to a request to participate in hydrogeological well testing. No response is required.
PUB61-15	*Attachment: CFIP Contract*	The comment provides an attachment including an application for a California Forest Improvement Program. No response is required.
PUB61-16	*Attachment: Comments Related to the Scope of Environmental Law Prepared for the Under Canvas Project*	The comment provides an attachment including comments related to the scope of environmental law for the Yosemite Under Canvas project. No response is required.
PUB61-17	*Attachment: Correspondence with County Surveyor*	The comment provides an attachment including correspondence with a County supervisor. No response is required.
PUB61-18	*Attachment: Site Photos*	The comment provides an attachment with site photos. No response is required.
PUB61-19	*Attachment: Photos of Views from Homes*	The comment provides an attachment with site photos. No response is required.
PUB62	**Shawn Conlan, July 29, 2020**	
PUB62-01	With all that I am, I will stand with my neighbors and community and fight against Hansji Hotels building in our area.	The comment is noted. The comment does not address the adequacy of the Draft EIR.
PUB62-02	Mr. Cathey's well was included in the hydrology tests for the Draft EIR. During those tests Mr. Cathey and his brother in Ron Morgan were at the cabin. Both of them observed a bad taste in the water during the tests. In addition Mr. Cathey's well stopped pumping water while the tests were being done. It's obvious that a project this size will draw down Mr. Cathey's well. I request that you read the attached well log from Mr. Cathey's well and notice that the water in this area is in very small 1' Granite Fractures.	Equipping the well for testing required removal and reinstallation of the existing pumping equipment. It is the understanding of Geoscience that the manner in which the pump was reinstalled caused some issues with flow that were resolved during the source capacity testing. Testing the Terra Vi wells production at more than four times the

Comment #	Comment	Response
		calculated demand resulted in typical drawdown in nearby wells.
PUB62-03	In addition to water availability the sewage disposal system for this large project will impact the neighboring properties, their *[sic]* is simply not enough room to treat and or dispose of the sewage from that many toilets, sinks, showers and the proposed commercial uses in this small area.	The commenter expresses concerns regarding water and sewage but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. These topics are evaluated in Chapter 4.10, Hydrology and Water Quality, and Chapter 4.16, Utilities and Service Systems, of the Draft EIR. Please also see Master Response 2.
PUB62-04	Lastly, this small rural area cannot absorb the additional traffic generated by this project with out *[sic]* significant impacts including safety and noise.	The commenter expresses concerns regarding traffic and noise but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. These topics are evaluated in Chapter 4.15, Transportation, and Chapter 4.12, Noise, of the Draft EIR.
PUB62-05	For the above reasons I request that you deny the proposed development application for the Terra VI lodge SDP18-003 based on the above and the information in the Draft EIR.	The comment requests denial of the proposed project due to the environmental concerns listed in the comments above but does not address the adequacy of the Draft EIR. The comment is noted.
PUB62-06	*Attachment: Letter from Jerry Cathey, December 27, 2018*	The comment provides an attachment including a stakeholder response. No response is required.
PUB62-07	*Attachment: Well Log*	The comment provides an attachment including a well log. No response is required.
PUB62-08	*Attachment: Stakeholder Response from Jerry Cathey, December 21, 2018*	The comment provides an attachment including a stakeholder response. No response is required.
PUB63	**Dan Courtney, July 29, 2020**	
PUB63-01	Hello Supervisor Gray and CCD Quincy Yaley, I would like to add my voice to those who are requesting a short, two week, extension for the submittal of comment letters on the Terra Vi DEIR. My property is adjacent to and below the site, receives the run-off and my meadows, spring and	The comment requests an extension of the public review period of the Draft EIR. Please see Master Response 1, which explains the County's decision not to extend the public review period of the Draft EIR.

Comment #	Comment	Response
	well is directly below their proposed leech field. It was a struggle to submit comments on the Under Canvass DEIR last week which was what, 2,200 pages long? And now, right on the heels of that momentous effort, it's completely impossible to digest this even more massive DEIR and submit intelligent and comprehensive comments. Without question my property will be greatly impacted by this development and it's only fair for the County to give me, and the other neighbors and interested parties, a reasonable opportunity to review and comment. Please consider and advice as to whether a fourteen (14) day extension to Thursday, August 13th can be accepted.	
PUB64	Megan Delaye, July 29, 2020	
PUB64-01	I am writing because I am in opposition of the development of the Terra Vi Lodge Project. I have a number of reasons for not being in support of this project. I have concerns about wildfire risk, emergency evacuation response, water quality impacts, and transportation. First, the DEIR's Analysis of and Mitigation for Wildfire Risk, and Emergency Evacuation and Response Impacts is inadequate. The DEIR largely relies on the implementation of Project features (such as separation between buildings, fire-resistant building materials, a vegetation management plan, employee training and a helipad) to suggest that the Project's wildfire-related impacts would not be significant level. The DEIR provides no evidence that these features would be sufficient to protect people and structures from the threat of a wildland fire. The DEIR fails to evaluate any evacuation scenarios. It assumes evacuation via SR-120 will be feasible, but does not consider whether SR-120 could accommodate the Project's traffic together with the traffic from other evacuees during a wildfire event, or whether SR-120 might be blocked during a wildfire. This is a concern with the number of wildland fires increasing each year due to climate change.	Please see Master Response 4 regarding emergency evacuation.
PUB64-02	Next, the DEIR'S Analysis of and Mitigation for the Projects Water Quality Impacts is inadequate. The DEIR provides no analysis in support of its conclusion that the Project's wastewater treatment system and leach field would not harm water quality. Instead, it wrongly claims that any water quality impacts from the wastewater treatment system would be less than significant simply because the Project's wastewater treatment would comply with applicable regulations.	Please see Master Response 2. The project proposes an on-site package wastewater treatment system.

Comment #	Comment	Response
PUB64-03	The DEIR fails to analyze cumulative impacts on water quality. It concludes that the Project, in combination with the Yosemite Under Canvas project, Thousand Trails/ Yosemite Lakes RV Expansion, Berkeley Tuolumne Camp Restoration project, and Mountain Sage Conditional Use Permit project, would result in less-than-significant cumulative impacts on hydrology, water quality, and groundwater. However, it contains no analysis in support of this conclusion, instead relying on Project features and regulatory compliance to claim impacts would not be significant. It is critical to consider the long term impact this Project will have on the watershed in Tuolumne County.	Please see Response ORG6-37.
PUB64-04	Also, the DEIR's Transportation Analysis fails to adequately analyze or mitigate impacts relating to roadways hazards. The Project would require construction of a new eastbound receiving lane on SR-120 to handle increased traffic from the Project, but this lane would be too short for traffic to merge safely. The DEIR fails to identify this deficiency as a significant roadway hazard. Another concern is the DEIR fails to adequately analyze safety risks to bicyclists. It wrongly concludes that bicycle safety impacts are insignificant because cyclists would supposedly only travel a short segment of SR-120 between Sawmill Mountain Road and Hardin Flat Road. It ignores other bicycle traffic along SR-120, including traffic between the Project and other more distant points such as Yosemite National Park, and the Project's safety impacts on these cyclists.	Please see Response ORG6-63 regarding the design of improvements to the Highway 120/Sawmill Mountain Road intersection. As shown in Table 1-1 and Chapter 3, Revisions to the Draft EIR, of this Final EIR, encroachment permit approval for these intersection improvements would be required prior to the start of construction of the Terra Vi project. Please see Response ORG6-67 regarding regional bicycle activity.
PUB64-05	As you can see there is plenty of evidence which shows the DEIR did not accurately assess and/or mitigate the issues of wildfire risk, emergency evacuation response, water quality impacts, and transportation. For these reasons I strongly oppose the Terra Vi Lodge Project.	The comment states an opinion that the Draft EIR did not adequately assess and mitigate impacts related to wildfire, emergency evacuation and response, water quality, and transportation, but does not provide specific information to support the claim. These topics are evaluated in Chapter 4.17, Wildfire, Chapter 4.14, Public Services and Recreation, Chapter 4.10, Hydrology and Water Quality, and Chapter 4.15, Transportation, of the Draft EIR. Please also see Master Responses 5 and 6.
PUB65	**Bill Flanery, July 29, 2020**	
PUB65-01	First off I would like to express my disappointment that the EIR review extension was not granted to the property owners during these trying times. It is obvious that everyone is dealing with issues and personal struggles that have never been experienced. This denial of an extension leaves me with the feeling of the County and Builders trying to push this project thru regardless	The comment expresses concern that the public review period of the Draft EIR was not extended. Please see Master Response 1, which explains the County's decision not to

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
	of the environmental impact. I understand that the new Property is being touted as a Green environmentally friendly property and my concern is to what degree is this Terra Vi project is willing to go to really be a Green LEED property. Please respond that this was received and address concerns below.	extend the public review period of the Draft EIR.
PUB65-02	< Water Availability and usage: The report stated that the area has enough water to sustain the new projects. Obviously this is a huge concern as water is scarce and the property will be depleting the wells much more rapidly than the area can handle. Please address these points. 1. Is the property planning on having a rain water reclamation system to be used for all gray water usage as well as needed irrigation?	The commenter expresses concerns regarding water supply but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. Water supply is evaluated in Chapter 4.10, Hydrology and Water Quality, of the Draft EIR.
PUB65-03	2. Is the building going to have a Black water treatment plant as part of their plumbing system in order to recycle all water used on the property? Meaning 100% Potable water after treatment?	Please see Master Response 2. The project proposes an on-site package wastewater treatment system. The system would utilize a micro membrane reactor treatment and disposal wastewater system that provides disinfected tertiary treated effluent.
PUB65-04	3. What steps are being taken to assure that the septic system / Leach field will not end up polluting any near rivers or creeks? " Will this be treated prior to entering the septic system"?	Please see Master Response 2. The project proposes an on-site package wastewater treatment system.
PUB65-05	4. Under full summer usage at capacity how many gallons of water will be used in a day? According to the EIR it seemed grossly under realistic usage.	Please see Response ORG5-04. The water usage used for the analysis in Chapter 4.16, Utilities and Service Systems, of the Draft EIR is based on full capacity.
PUB65-06	5. Are all boilers / Heaters High efficiency units to have reduced carbon entering the atmosphere, if so what % will the proposed equipment be?	As stated on page 3-22 of the Draft EIR, "Buildings would incorporate energy-efficient design, including energy-efficient windows, doors, insulation, roofing, and heating and cooling equipment. Buildings would include skylights to reduce use of lights, managed occupancy smart thermostats, lighting control systems, and LED (light-emitting diode) lighting. The proposed project would also include installation of roof-mounted solar photovoltaic and solar thermal panel systems with battery storage. Mechanical

Comment #	Comment	Response
		infrastructure would include low flow plumbing fixtures, high efficiency equipment such as heat pumps (for air conditioning) and boilers." All heating and cooling equipment will be energy efficient.
PUB65-07	6. Will the property have enough solar and storage batteries in order to run on its own?	Although the proposed project would involve the installation of solar panels, electrical service to the proposed project would be provided by PG&E. The proposed project is not designed to run off the grid but rather the solar panels would supplement PG&E's supply.
PUB65-08	< Traffic Concerns / Needed in depth Traffic Study: 1. What are the properties plans for guest to enter the property on a two lane highway?	Project vehicular access would be via Sawmill Mountain Road. As described on page 3-28 of the Draft EIR, the project includes improvements along the Highway 120 frontage at the intersection with Sawmill Mountain Road to provide a left-turn lane on eastbound Highway 120, a right-turn pocket on westbound Highway 120, and improved sight distance. As shown in Table 1-1 and Chapter 3, Revisions to the Draft EIR, of this Final EIR, encroachment permit approval for these intersection improvements would be required prior to the start of construction of the Terra Vi project.
PUB65-09	2. In case of a natural disaster “Fire” the evacuation plan to remove over 610 guest at Terra Vi and 425-500 Glampers at Under Canvas, as well as the campers on the river not to mention property owners. This seems unrealistic with no infrastructure to support a mass staged exit with critical timing.	Please see Master Response 4 regarding emergency evacuation.
PUB65-10	3. A great concern is the number of guest exploring the area around the Terra Vi property, while I know the answer will be that private property postings will keep everybody out in reality this is not always the case. Does the property have a plan to address this issue? “At check in make it a known situation to guest stressing the approved property lines”	The comment is noted. The comment does not address the adequacy of the Draft EIR.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
PUB65-11	< Fire Danger: 1. With more people comes more danger of another fire in the area there is really no resolution to this, it's only a fact. The likelihood of guest hiking or exploring around will greatly increase the chances of an accidental fire. Does the property have 24/7 fire truck and crew on site, not near but on site to address this issue?	Please see Master Response 5.
PUB65-12	2. Does the property plan on outdoor fire pits? . We have had our property for over (30) years with a well-protected outside fire pit. We also have adequate protection in case a emergency occurs. My family has a rule during high fire danger months and we restrict family and guest from using the outside pit; please note this is private property.	As stated on page 3-24 of the Draft EIR, "Fire pits would be located in public areas and would be operated and maintained by hotel staff only."
PUB65-13	Title 24 California restrictions: What are the specifics of the mechanical equipment being installed?	As stated on page 3-22 of the Draft EIR, "Mechanical infrastructure would include low flow plumbing fixtures, high efficiency equipment such as heat pumps (for air conditioning) and boilers."
PUB65-14	Fire department arrival time when a fire occurs?	As described in Appendix I, Fire Impact Analysis, of the Draft EIR, a GCSD fire station is an approximately 22-minute drive from the project site (17 miles); a TCFD station is an approximately 57-minute drive from the project site (40 miles); and a Tuolumne County volunteer fire station is an approximately 47-minute drive from the project site (34 miles). For GCSD's comments on the Draft EIR, please see Comment Letter GOV4 from GCSD and the associated responses.
PUB65-15	Properties Fire on site plan. How many hydrants are on site?	The proposed project would be required to comply with all applicable fire safety and prevention regulations in order for project approval, including for on-site fire suppression materials.
PUB65-16	How much fire water storage will the property have?	Please see Response ORG6-43.
PUB65-17	How will the property insure that the water source in conjunction with storage can meet demands needed for firefighting i.e. 200 PSI for 4 Hours ?	Water for firefighting would be provided in accordance with applicable regulations and standards. As stated on page 4.17-31, "Fire

Comment #	Comment	Response
		flow for the buildings would be provided by the potable water storage tanks. The quantity of water storage, pressure of water supply, and maintenance of the storage tanks would be designed to comply with State Responsibility Areas Fire Safe Regulations, CFC, Tuolumne County General Plan policies, and Tuolumne County Code of Ordinances Chapter 15.20, Fire Safety Standards."
PUB65-18	How much on site fire fighters and equipment will be on property?	Mitigation Measure PS-1 would require the project to provide enough staff to ensure that two emergency staff are on the premises and available to respond to emergencies at all times. The project must also provide personal protection equipment (PPE) and positive communication equipment for all emergency staff. As described on pages 3-24 to 3-25 of the Draft EIR, "The project proposes construction in compliance with the National Fire Protection Association's fire protection system and would include fire sprinkler and standpipe systems. [...] Water supply would be provided by a storage system and augmented with wildland fire hoses. An emergency helipad would be located on the western side of Sawmill Mountain Road, within the western project site parcel." Please also see Master Response 6.
PUB65-19	How many trained firefighters on each (24) hour shift?	The commenter asks a question regarding emergency staff but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. Emergency service and response is evaluated in Chapter 4.14, Public Services

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
		and Recreation, of the Draft EIR. Please also see Master Response 6.
PUB65-20	And my number 1 concern is that if the EIR said none of this is needed, it puts the entire corridor in eminent danger. We have all dealt with the droughts as well as extreme wind; this is a dangerous combination. This property, or any projected future property should be held to the highest standard and latest Mechanical approved codes , regarding fire suppression systems. In such a high hazard area this feels like a blatant disregard not only for the air quality but actual human lives. In Closing I feel that the EDR did not truly take into account the negative impact that this project is going to have on the areas environment as well as overall safety. If the in depth traffic survey is not completed and a resolution achieved, there is no doubt in my mind this will result in accidents and possible deaths. The increased fire danger seems a blatant disregard for the entire 120 corridor.	The commenter expresses concerns regarding wildfire but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. This topic is evaluated in Chapter 4.17, Wildfire, of the Draft EIR. Please also see Master Response 5.
PUB66	**Ben Gardella, July 29, 2020**	
PUB66-01	My name is Ben Gardella and I represent Save Sawmill Mountain. The attached response letter was already sent to Quincy Yaley from the law firm Shute, Mihaly & Weinberger LLP. But I wanted to make sure it reached the rest of you.	The comment is noted. The comment does not address the adequacy of the Draft EIR.
PUB67	**Rosalina George, July 29, 2020**	
PUB67-01	I would like to provide comments for the draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) prepared for the Terra Vi Hotel. Overall, it seems that the DEIR has understated the significance of environmental impacts that the project would bring to the Sawmill Mountain area. Key concerns that need to be addressed for the proposed Terra Vi development: WILDFIRE AND EVACUATION The DEIR does not accurately assess the serious threat of wildfire, especially in a location that has burned multiple times, most recently in the 2013 Rim Fire. We are located in a “Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone” remote area without a nearby fire department, ambulances, or healthcare facilities. Bringing so many people to Terra Vi on Sawmill Mountain and allowing over 100 camp fires and wood burning stoves at the nearby Under Canvas project would be a detriment to the surrounding neighboring forest. These developments increase the fire hazard to nearby homes and local residents of Sawmill Mountain, Hardin Flat, Buck Meadows, Groveland, as well as Yosemite National Park.	Please see Master Response 4 regarding emergency evacuation and Master Response 5 regarding wildfire.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
	The DEIR fails to provide evidence that the project would not exacerbate the risks of wildfire and would not expose the area to the uncontrollable spread of wildfire. Tuolumne County has a responsibility to protect the safety of our community and our forest. Supporting project development within a VHFHSZ area without water or nearby emergency services is irresponsible. By negligently approving or allowing a fire-trap to be constructed at the entrance/exit to our private properties, the County is subjecting our homes and lives to significant risk, loss, and death due to fire. Project features such as a vegetation plan, fire-resistant building construction, building separation, employee training, a helipad, and prohibitions against "risky behavior" are suggested as protection from a wild land fire. These features would not protect people, structures, or wildlife from the destruction of an imminent fast moving wind-driven fire.	
PUB67-02	The DEIR fails to evaluate evacuation scenarios and has made a fatal flaw in the project layout by suggesting Forest Route 1S03 as the main circulation and access for the Hotel. Forest Routes are not warranted for commercial use; they are meant for forest use only. There is only one narrow, one-lane dirt and gravel driveway from an old skid trail off Forest Route 1S03 that leads to and from my family cabin of 60 years. My (15) neighbors and I have no other way to escape Sawmill Mountain in the event of an emergency. If thousands of people are suddenly evacuating the area, or if fire is blocking the road, my only exit route to Highway 120 may become inaccessible. Safety Hazard: The use of Forest Route 1S03 poses additional problems for commercial use or large quantities of vehicles because if someone in a panic turns the wrong way, they could drive straight into the possible fire danger rather than away from it. The forest routes are difficult terrain, sparsely maintained, and zig zag throughout the mountain with no signage or clear direction. Tourists with no special knowledge of the area, and spotty to nonexistent wifi service could inadvertently put themselves in harms way. Code requires the exits from Terra Vi must be clear, unobstructed, and lead directly to the path of egress, which is Highway 120. The DEIR does not evaluate what will happen when everyone attempts to evacuate onto Highway 120. This is a two lane scenic highway that leads to Yosemite in one direction and toward the small town of Buck Meadows in the downhill direction. Where would all of the evacuees go? Highway 120 cannot accommodate thousands of tourists from Terra Vi, Under Canvas, Hardin Flat, Sawmill Mountain, and Yosemite all trying to escape a disaster at the same time.	Please see Response ORG6-14 regarding Forest Route 1S03. Please see Master Response 4 for more details on evacuation.
PUB67-03	In addition, the DEIR is inaccurate to state that the development is not dividing an established neighborhood. It is literally placing an obstacle between Sawmill properties and our exit to Highway 120. Our ONLY safe route for evacuation is encumbered by over 1,000 tourists and	An example of a project physically dividing an established community could be the construction of a major roadway through an

Comment #	Comment	Response
	emergency responders and a helicopter on the same road. Fire regulations require two safe exits from every site and the Sawmill residents only have one. We need to reach the Highway and if the fire is directly in the path of egress, we are trapped in a dead-end situation.	existing community. Proximity to other development does not physically divide an existing community, and the proposed project's location at the entrance to Sawmill Mountain Road does not position it in a location that divides the residential area to the north of the project site.
PUB67-04	To further exacerbate this problem, the neighboring UC project is proposing a secondary means of access/ egress from Forest Route 1S09 which is directly across the highway from the Sawmill exit. Again, the Forest Routes are not for commercial use. Moreover, a “site for future development” is located adjacent to the Sawmill exit in the midst of this already over-populated and dangerous intersection. All of these conditions create a terribly unsafe intersection on the 120 corridor stretch between Hardin Flat and Sawmill Mountain. With the serious bottleneck in the evacuation route and the danger posed to the public and residents of the area, the evacuation scenarios and exits must be evaluated; Terra Vi and Under Canvas would require an alternate access location to alleviate congestion and danger. The proposed developments would create a disastrous fire-trap and jeopardize public safety. Unbelievably, the DEIR fails to evaluate any evacuation scenarios.	Please see Response ORG6-14 regarding the forest route. In addition, Chapter 4.15, Transportation, of the Draft EIR discusses traffic impacts. Please see Master Response 4 regarding emergency evacuation.
PUB67-05	The DEIR fails to analyze the cumulative effects on emergency access and response. It is important to note that there are no emergency water sources proposed at the Under Canvas project directly across the street: no sprinklers, no fire hydrants or water storage. Likewise, the Terra Vi project has not established how much total water is required or whether there is enough water to supply fire sprinklers and fire hoses/ hydrants from two groundwater wells on unreliable fractured granite aquifers.	Water for firefighting would be provided in accordance with applicable regulations and standards. As stated on page 4.17-31, "Fire flow for the buildings would be provided by the potable water storage tanks. The quantity of water storage, pressure of water supply, and maintenance of the storage tanks would be designed to comply with State Responsibility Areas Fire Safe Regulations, CFC, Tuolumne County General Plan policies, and Tuolumne County Code of Ordinances, Chapter 15.20, Fire Safety Standards." The Hydrogeology Study conducted for the proposed project included a cumulative analysis. As stated on page 4.10-16 of the Draft EIR, "pump testing on the project site was conducted during the

Comment #	Comment	Response
		period when the Yosemite Under Canvas wells were also being tested to ensure that the source capacity assessment would include the potential long-term influences of nearby off-site wells operating at the same time." In addition, the Yosemite Under Canvas project proposes an on-site firefighting water truck. Please also see Master Response 6.
PUB67-06	The Terra Vi project conflicts with the Tuolumne County General Plan because it increases the exposure to risk of wildfire, it interferes with evacuation (especially for Sawmill and Hardin Flat residents), and burdens the fire protection services. The proposed project also results in significant cumulative impacts with respect to land use and planning due to exacerbation of land use conflicts by placing high occupancy Hotels and Glampsites within the neighborhood. Placing commercial sites immediately adjacent to rural residential properties amplifies the serious evacuation deficiencies and problems. The DEIR fails to recognize these issues as significant impacts.	The commenter does not specify General Plan policies with which the project, in the opinion of the commenter, conflicts. Chapter 4.17, Wildfire, of the Draft EIR contains a detailed evaluation of the project's potential wildfire impacts consistent against CEQA standards of significance. Regarding evacuation, please see Response ORG6-15. Regarding land use conflicts, land use compatibility is not, in itself, a CEQA area of impact. However, this EIR evaluates several potential impacts related to compatibility and quality of life concerns, such as lighting, glare, noise, and air quality. Please also see Master Response 5.
PUB67-07	PUBLIC SERVICES, SAFETY, AND TRAFFIC I am very concerned about the distance to emergency services and the lack of adequate emergency responders to the Sawmill Mountain area. Our home is at least a half hour drive from Groveland and about an hour from Sonora. Groveland Community Services District submitted a letter with concerns about the ability to adequately provide fire and emergency response services to the proposed project site. The GCSD explains problems with the distance of the project from GCSD resources, concern about being able to respond to two remote places at the same time, wear and tear on vehicles, increased fire risk concern, impact on evacuation efforts, inadequate water supply for wells, fire sprinklers, fire fighting, sanitation, and evacuation through Groveland. The DEIR fails to adequately address these many significant	Please see Response PUB16-03. Please also see Master Responses 4, 5, and 6 regarding evacuation, wildfire, and public services, respectively.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
	impacts. The DEIR acknowledges the fact that firefighters would not be able to reach Terra Vi within established response times, but does not evaluate how the inability of emergency responders to access the site in a timely manner would affect the risk of wildfire.	
PUB67-08	I am concerned about the safety of pedestrians or bicyclists crossing the highway in this dangerous stretch of 120 to visit a store, bar, or restaurant at the other resort, which will occur if the YUC and Terra Vi projects become a reality. The DEIR brushes off this safety risk as being "relatively infrequent," and misses the mark by deeming "access to the site is adequate" and the "project's impact to these modes is less than significant." This significant safety impact cannot be denied and must be addressed.	Please see Response ORG6-67 regarding pedestrian activity across Highway 120.
PUB67-09	The project would definitely increase noise, pollution, safety concerns, and traffic to the existing, surrounding community because there is nothing in the location currently. Impacts would be potentially significant and need to be studied, rather than ignored. DEIR statements have not been substantiated.	The commenter expresses concerns regarding the project's noise, pollution, and traffic impacts but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. These topics are evaluated in Chapter 4.12, Noise, Chapter 4.2, Air Quality, and Chapter 4.15, Transportation, of the Draft EIR.
PUB67-10	Again, it is imperative that traffic flow and evacuation routes be thoroughly reviewed in this Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone and to learn from the tragic Camp Fire where people died while trying to flee their homes. The problem was only one road for egress and our Sawmill /Hardin Flat neighborhood is faced with the same dangerous dead-end situation. The DEIR fails to evaluate evacuation plans. It is frightening to think that this critical issue has been overlooked; the entire Sawmill/Hardin Flat area and 120 corridor need to be evaluated for safe evacuation.	Please see Master Response 4 for more details on evacuation.
PUB67-11	NOISE The introduction of noise related activities such as construction, amplified music and events, human voices, barking dogs, vehicular traffic, truck and bus circulation, loading docks, waste disposal and garbage service trucks, outdoor generators, HVAC systems, and helicopters will cause distress to the local wildlife, as well as the peaceful surrounding environment for local residents. However, the DEIR fails to disclose the particulars of the noise producers or the intended event activities, especially amplified music or announcement systems and incorrectly concludes that noise impacts would be less than significant. How would these noise generating activities and noise levels impact wildlife and humans? Have quiet hour restrictions been proposed, as a minimum? How can the impact be insignificant if the noise producing culprits have not been identified?	Please see Response ORG6-46 and Appendix L, Supplemental Noise Analysis, of this EIR. As stated on page 3-16 of the Draft EIR, pool use would not be permitted during designated quiet hours.

Comment #	Comment	Response
	I am particularly concerned about these issues because the quiet solitude creates the beauty of the mountain. We enjoy the abundant wildlife (especially the deer) on our property and surrounding forest. Sound travels easily on the mountain and the neighbors on Sawmill are respectful of each other with a mutual desire to maintain the quiet solitude. It is so beautifully quiet on our property and the silence of the forest is powerful: I can hear the silent bat fly above my head, the crack of a snapped twig when a deer walks by, the high pitched buzz of a mosquito, and can actually determine the exact location of a woodpecker quite a distance away.	
PUB67-12	The DEIR fails to determine the residential properties (sensitive receptors) that will be affected by the project. Noise impacts cannot be evaluated without this basic information. In fact, the DEIR does not address the impacts to the many homes within the Sawmill and Hardin Flat area and therefore fails to provide adequate mitigation for these impacts. The conclusion that the noise impacts would be less than significant cannot be substantiated when there is no understanding of what or where the sensitive receptors are located in relation to the project and how they will be affected. We are just several hundred feet away from the project and will easily hear noises, especially amplified sounds, music, people and vehicles generated in close proximity. These noise producers cannot be mitigated in the peaceful forest. Furthermore, there are already two large hotels with enclosed venues and several other better-situated sites available that could better absorb the influx of additional tourists looking for lively parties and entertainment.	Please see Response ORG6-46 and Appendix L, Supplemental Noise Analysis, of this EIR.
PUB67-13	The DEIR also concludes that construction related noise would be less than significant because the impact would be “short-term.” There is nothing short term about a two year construction period that will wreak havoc on our peaceful surroundings.	The Draft EIR conclusion under impact discussion NOI-1 that the project's construction noise impacts would be less than significant were based primarily on the facts that the construction activities must adhere to the County's requirements (as noted in the Draft EIR), and due to the fact that predicted construction noise levels would be in the range of sound levels currently experienced at the nearest receptors. Although the construction phase of the project is estimated to be two years, the construction phase will be a temporary condition prior to project operation. In addition, construction activities will not

Comment #	Comment	Response
		occur continuously at the areas of the project site nearest the sensitive receptors for the entire 2 years. Instead, construction activities will progress at various locations on the project site. At some times during project construction, construction will occur largely within project structures and noise generated will be largely contained within those structures.
PUB67-14	The impacts related to the day and nighttime use of the helicopter and related noise, wind, and visual disturbances have not been adequately analyzed. The local residents would be greatly impacted by such a nuisance to the area. The helipad is unnecessary, yet the report calls out for twice daily usage. Installing the pad will lead to inevitable abuse and use of helicopters in the area that are not justified. When or if an emergency occurs, a helicopter can land anywhere and does not need a designated pad on Sawmill Mountain. Such noise does not belong in the forest and cannot be mitigated.	The Draft EIR utilized an assumed number of flights per day (2) - 1 daytime, 1 nighttime. This assumption was made to provide a conservative (i.e. worst case) analysis; the project does not propose to use the helipad with this frequency. Actual use would be very infrequent, as discussed in the Draft EIR, the project helipad is proposed to be used for emergency services only. Further, operations information for the emergency helipad is unknown at this time. Based on the analysis provided in the Draft EIR under impact discussion NOI-3, noise levels associated with those emergency operations would likely result in substantial temporary increases in ambient daytime and/or nighttime noise levels at nearby existing sensitive uses. Because there are no identified feasible mitigation measures, this impact was conservatively identified as being significant and unavoidable. Please see Response ORG6-58 for additional information related to potential helipad noise impacts. Please also see Master Response 3, which explains that an alternate helipad location has been identified and

Comment #	Comment	Response
		would be a preferred location for reducing noise impacts. Mitigation Measure NOI-3.1 has been revised, as shown in Table 1-1 and Chapter 3, Revisions to the Draft EIR, of this Final EIR, to require the project applicant to relocate the helipad to another area of the project site that is further from residential properties (such as the alternate location shown in Figure 5-1), if feasible.
PUB67-15	WATER The DEIR repeatedly says that all impacts are less than significant without thorough review and supporting evidence to address public concerns that have been brought forward. Supply: There is no public water supply on the site and Terra Vi has not indicated their total water usage estimations. The DEIR indicates well tests but does not provide evidence to support that the groundwater supplies can simultaneously supply the project without threatening private well water supplies. The well testing does not take many years of drought into consideration and the DEIR has not proven that there would be sufficient water supply in dry years. The future availability and quality of water will be adversely affected, yet the DEIR dismisses these impacts as "less than significant." The DEIR is inadequate.	Please see Response ORG6-39 and ORG6-42.
PUB67-16	Quality: There is no acknowledgment in the DEIR about contamination of the water supply to existing homes and cabins in the surrounding neighborhoods. Terra Vi has proposed a location for septic tanks and leach lines that may contaminate the known watercourse that feeds our meadows, my well, and neighboring wells. In addition, the proposed leach fields for both Terra Vi and Under Canvas will potentially pollute the Tuolumne River. The DEIR has rejected the request to relocate the leach fields and rejected the opportunity to review alternatives because they said there were no significant impacts. That is precisely the problem that needs to be addressed! The impacts must be evaluated. Simply stating that the system will meet all applicable codes does not erase the problem. We need to be protected from contamination of our wells from raw sewage and septic leaching from both Terra Vi and Under Canvas projects. If the leach system is compromised in any way, private properties, wet-lands, and US Waters will be contaminated. Wildlife that depend on these water sources will be harmed. The leach fields are currently located directly above my property on wetlands and ephemeral drainage that leads to my meadows and well.	Please see Response ORG6-32. Please also see Master Response 2.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
	Pine Mountain Lake residents have been experiencing toxic sewage gas problems for 15 plus years. The foul smell is hydrogen sulfide, a gas that originates from decaying organic matter, aka sewage. Hydrogen sulfide is the primary component in sewer gas and is dangerous even at low levels. Different gases contribute to the odor: sulfides, ammonia, methane and the other compounds in the sewage combine to create the awful smell. Sulfides and ammonia are toxic to humans, causing organ damage or death. The septic tanks and leach lines must be relocated AWAY from our meadow and water supply.	
PUB67-17	Additionally, the DEIR reports that the water tested at the site contained arsenic, iron, turbidity, and maximum contaminant color levels. No evidence supports the conclusion that proposed water testing and treatment measures would be effective in mitigating contamination found in the drinking water supply.	Please see Response ORG6-34.
PUB67-18	ALTERNATE LOCATIONS I was dismayed to read in the DEIR that some of the alternative locations for the project that were discussed at the Town Hall meeting and suggested in public comment letters were disregarded without given a fair chance. The first alternative to consider which locates the main Hotel access on 120 rather than 1S03 was dismissed because of “lack of significant impacts.” This conclusion is inaccurate because the use of Forest Route 1S03 is an obstacle and an alternate access must be reviewed.	CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6 states that "An EIR shall describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the project, or to the location of the project, which would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project." Since the Draft EIR did not identify significant impacts related to relocating the main hotel access, the Draft EIR does not need to analyze an alternative for this. Please see Response ORG6-14 regarding Forest Route 1S03.
PUB67-19	The “No project” and “Scar” alternatives are both viable. The conclusion that the “Reduced Footprint” alternative is the next best option is flawed, again because this option assumes unwarranted commercial use of Forest Route 1S03. Therefore, the “Scar” would be the next feasible alternative.	The Environmentally Superior Alternative is selected based on the total impacts analyzed throughout all environmental impact categories (see Table 6-1 of the Draft EIR for a summary of the comparison of impacts for the alternatives). Please see Response ORG6-14 regarding Forest Route 1S03.

Comment #	Comment	Response
PUB67-20	Based on the concerns mentioned in this letter and my previous letters, it is evident that the issues with increased wildfire risk, lack of adequate and safe evacuation, lack of water, septic contamination, traffic, noise, visual-scenic impact to the Highway 120 corridor, threats to cultural and biological resources, dangerous vehicular access-circulation, and strain on public services such as law enforcement, fire, and ambulances, that the Terra Vi proposed project is proposed for the wrong location. Alternatives must be thoroughly and seriously examined, rather than omitted from analysis. CONCLUSION The cumulative impacts from projects proposed in this area are significant. It is vital that the County officials and other agencies review the "big picture" to determine the overall impact on the environment well into the future. I respectfully urge the County to slow the process down and take the necessary time to thoroughly evaluate the serious risks and huge environmental impacts that Terra Vi and other projects in this area would create. Reckless, poor decisions will affect Sawmill Mountain FOREVER.	The commenter expresses concerns regarding the project's wildfire, evacuation, water, septic, traffic, noise, and visual impacts, but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. These topics are evaluated in Chapter 4.17, Wildfire, Chapter 4.14, Public Services and Recreation, Chapter 4.10, Hydrology and Water Quality, Chapter 4.16, Utilities and Service Systems, Chapter 4.15, Transportation, Chapter 4.12, Noise, and Chapter 4.1, Aesthetics, of the Draft EIR. Please also see Master Responses 2, 5, and 6.
PUB68	**Kathleen K. Haff, July 29, 2020**	
PUB68-01	Thank you for the opportunity to submit comments for the Terra Vi Lodge Project. As a former Senior Analyst for the County Administrative Office and the Emergency Services Coordinator for Tuolumne County (2007 - 2011) I have a clear focus on fire safety. As a Supervisor-Elect (beginning in January 2021) I will have the added responsibility to County residents to highlight areas of concern which may have a negative impact now or in the future. It appears that many areas of negative impact have been addressed and mitigated in this Draft EIR. Thank you to Placeworks and Sycamore Environmental Consultants for treating this project seriously and with due consideration. However, there are still some matters of concern which I consider noteworthy, as highlighted below. Most of my comments arise from familiarity with issues due to positions I have held previously with the County. From Table 1-1: Here are the impact areas that I see which may require further mitigation. Included in the sections below are also comments and suggestions made for consideration and implementation:	The comment serves as an introduction to the comments below. Please see Responses PUB68-02 through PUB68-18.
PUB68-02	AES-4: Photovoltaic (PV) Array The significant factor, glare from this array, can range from being a nuisance to an outright safety issue depending upon where it is sited and at what angle it is placed. The full annual	The Draft EIR includes Mitigation Measure AES-4, which requires solar panels to be

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
	range of sun cycle angles should calculated, not only for maximum generation, but also for avoidance of glare to guests and motorists, on the property or off site. It is requested here that the siting of the PV array and calculations for the its placement be fully outlined in the Final EIR	sited, angled, and of a materials to reduce glare effects.
PUB68-03	BI0-2: Invasive Plant Species As this Draft EIR has stated elsewhere, the planting plan should not only ensure that all plantings are non-invasive species, but they should be native to California and fire retardant, as well.	The commenter expresses concerns regarding planting of invasive plant species but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. Wildlife is evaluated in Chapter 4.3, Biological Resources, of the Draft EIR.
PUB68-04	BI0-3.3, 3.4: Degrading Water Quality Through Construction Activities Mitigation measures suggest obtaining coverage or an exemption from the requirements. The responsible thing to do it to obtain coverage, and no exemptions.	The commenter expresses concerns regarding water quality impacts as a result of construction activities but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. Water supply is evaluated in Chapter 4.10, Hydrology and Water Quality, of the Draft EIR.
PUB68-05	BI0-3.3, 3.4: Degrading Water Quality Through Construction Activities Mitigation measures suggest obtaining coverage or an exemption from the requirements. The responsible thing to do it to obtain coverage, and no exemptions.	The comment is a duplicate of comment PUB68-03.
PUB68-06	B10-4.lb: Dogs on Leash Comment: This is in the Tuolumne County Ordinance Code, and is to be followed during the construction phase through to managing the day-to-day operations of this project. And yes, it should be posted as such.	The comment is noted. The comment does not address the adequacy of the Draft EIR.
PUB68-07	HAZ-6, TRANS-4: Emergency Evacuation Plan; Inadequate Emergency Access This project would definitely impact and possibly impair any evacuation from the general area. Were a wildfire to break out in or around this development, which is miles away from the County seat of operations or even the closest fire station, having a plan for mass evacuation is deemed necessary. With only one main 2-lane artery out of the development (Highway 120) the roadway would be greatly impacted and swollen with Terra Vi guests and other developments' tourists leaving en masse from the general location. This matter needs to be worked through, fully. It is highly suggested that project principals meet with County OES, Fire and Law Enforcement personnel to come up with a reasonable plan to address and solidify an evacuation plan, before occupancy is granted. • It is not apparent from the project description, but it appears that there is only one dedicated	The commenter expresses concerns regarding inadequate emergency access on the project site but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. This is evaluated in Chapter 4.9, Hazards and Hazardous Materials and 4.17, Wildfire, of the Draft EIR.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
	access to this resort. Having 2 options for vehicular ingress and egress into/from the property will most certainly be required. In evacuating a full resort of between 290-400 guests, it will be necessary.	
PUB68-08	HAZ-7: Exposing People and Structures to Significant Risk Involving Wildland Fires This is NOT a "Less than Significant" risk or impact area, and should have many mitigation measures listed rather than stating the matter is non-applicable. This project site is located in a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone and in a previously burned area of the 2013 Rim Fire. Two other fires previous to the Rim Fire have also burned here. To say that mitigation is not applicable is unconscionable. Here are my thoughts on this significant issue: • At a minimum, Terra Vi should provide laddered fuel breaks throughout the entire property and have a plan to maintain the property, including all defensible space on an annual basis. Consultation with the Highway 120 Fire Safe Council and CAL FIRE to satisfy this goal is highly advised.	Please see Chapter 4.17, Wildfire, of the Draft EIR for additional wildfire impacts analysis, including project features for fire prevention and mitigation measures. Please also see Master Response 5.
PUB68-09	• To ensure adequate fire-fighting capability for the construction phase of the project and beyond, a water system should be developed first1 *[sic]* complete with fire-fighting grade water flow and a huge capacity water tank that meets fire safety/ wild fire-fighting standards. The tank capacity needs to be substantial to begin fire-suppression activities immediately due to the remote location of this project and the time it will take for the nearest fire protection personnel to arrive on-scene. The appropriate fire agency and/or CAL FIRE should weigh in on the specs for the capacity of the water tank. This water system should be available during the construction phase, and not developed at the end of the project. The Terra Vi property resides in somewhat of a "no man's land" as far as fire protection goes, so the exposure for guests, neighboring residents and/or structures is great and responding promptly is imperative. (See PS-1, and PS-2, for more on this.)	The commenter expresses concerns regarding water availability in the event of a fire on the project site but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. This is evaluated in Chapter 4.10, Hydrology and Water Quality, Chapter 4.14, Public Services and Recreation, and Chapter 4.17, Wildfire, of the Draft EIR.
PUB68-10	HYD-1: Post Project Runoff I think it is prudent not only to have a drainage plan, but also a two-year inspection and certification program in place after the project is final to address and mitigate any unintended consequences that mayarise where negative water quality affects those (local residents) offsite and thus, can be remedied by Terra Vi.	The commenter expresses concerns regarding drainage and stormwater runoff but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. Water supply is evaluated in Chapter 4.10, Hydrology and Water Quality, of the Draft EIR.
PUB68-11	HYD-2, UTIL-2 & UTIL-5: Groundwater Supplies/Engineered Septic The groundwater supply issue is a significant one, not less than significant. There is no groundwater table in this area, no hidden underground lake. All water in this region comes	Please see Responses ORG6-32, ORG6-39, and ORG6-42.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
	through fractures in the granite. • There are concerns for water capacity in the general area - meaning is there enough water to satisfy the needs of not only the Terra Vi guests and staff, but the residents in the area who rely on their wells for their daily living needs? Is there enough water capacity to provide for fire-fighting flow as mentioned previously? Has the amount of water necessary for proper septic operations been taken into consideration to calculate the full amount of water needed per day, per guest? How will the project guarantee sufficient water for the site without depleting underground resources for the people who live nearby? I have read the hydrology study and think that most of the water quality issues have been addressed, but still question the sheer volume of water necessary to run a resort of this type, and to have enough water storage for fire-fighting capacity on site. Please revisit the 16,636.4 gallons per day assessment as it seems artificially low when considering all of the above needs and assuming maximum occupancy.	
PUB68-12	• There are also concerns for cross contamination from the septic system leaching into the ground water su pply. This has the potential to impact the water quality of private residence wells that are located nearby. What type of measures will be taken to ensure adequate septic system capacity and proper functioning of the engineered system that will be built? How will it be monitored, and who will do the monitoring? Water is also necessary for an engineered septic system. This matter needs to be fully addressed in the Final EIR.	Please see Response ORG6-32.
PUB68-13	NOl-3.1: Noise Associated with Emergency Helipad Use It is admirable and forward thinking to use medi-flight services for emergency medical services, as the response time will bedecreased substantially and the choice of hospitals available, due to severity and condition of the injured person will be better paired, all resulting in improved outcomes for the party who suffers a medical emergency. • It is noted that the offer to provide the resort's helipad to surrounding residents for their emergency medical needs is a good neighbor and good-will gesture. This will not negate the noise levels from the helicopter arriving or taking off, but may help soften the ill feelings the noise creates for locals, who live there and will hear medi-flight helicopters year-round.	The commenter expresses concerns regarding noise generation from the proposed helipad but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. Noise is evaluated in Chapter 4.12, Noise, of the Draft EIR. Please also see Master Response 3.
PUB68-14	POP-3: Population and Housing Impacts The DEIR lists this impact area as less than significant. Any Groveland resident or employee of the greater Groveland business area knows that housing is a significant issue. Many of the month-to month home rentals have been converted into vacation rentals, thus leaving a void in the housing market where full-time rentals are needed. This has become a significant issue County-wide. There is not enough affordable housing for our population or workforce. Thus, the problem exists. It is important to know this and to come up with a viable plan to address how and where Terra Vi will find staff and secure housing for their employees.	The project would provide enough on-site housing for 20 of its employees, plus its managers. Therefore, only 18 employees would be unable to be accommodated on-site. As described in detail in Response ORG9-63, the project proposes an operational model that would result in a lower employee rate than that of other

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
	• For a resort the proposed size of Terra Vi, with a public market, general lodge with dining, indoor and outdoor areas with dining, a pool and spa, and other activities, 100 guest rooms, seven guest cabins (26 guest rooms therein), 2 manager suites, 20 staff rooms, and up to 400 guests - is it really practical to suggest the need for only 40 jobs to satisfy all the work that must be conducted to become a successful resort? Two other resorts in this region similar to Terra Vi each have well over 100 staff members each during peak season. I would like to see a more realistic staffing plan.	standard hotels. Thus, the project is not expected to result in a substantial increase in demand for local housing or affordable housing. Please see Response PUB77-04 for more detail on proposed employee housing and the county's available housing supply.
PUB68-15	PS-1, PS-2: Public Services for Fire and Law Enforcement The DEIR rightly concludes that this is a significant impact area. Having trained and certified emergency staff, personal protection and communication equipment is a commendable first step. There needs to be some sort of cost recovery system built in to this development to help the County, and its partner Groveland Community Services District (GCSD), recover costs when responding to emergencies outside of the official response area. • This project is suggested for a very remote part of the County. In fact, it is outside of the Automatic Mutual Aid Agreement area that the GCSD has with the County. That means, officially, there is no coverage for fire or other emergency services. There needs to be some sort of sanctioned agreement established, a sustainable mechanism for cost recovery, for all types of emergency response services in the far reaches of the County, which is where this project lies. This may take the form of creating a Community Facilities District to mitigate service impacts to the County and GCSD, or some other mechanism. County residents and/or GCSD should not have to subsidize these services or experience a reduction in service level because County and/or GCSD resources are responding to a call outside of the mutual aid area.	Please see Response GOV4-06.
PUB68-16	The nearest County fire station is an hour away in Jamestown. Currently, even Groveland residents can experience long response times for Emergency Medical Services (EMS), Law Enforcement (LE) or Fire. To add a singular significant development or one in conjunction with other significant projects not only taxes the County's emergency response equipment and personnel, but adversely impacts response times for those services in the Groveland area should they be required by the Groveland/ Big Oak Flat population.	The comment is noted. The comment does not address the adequacy of the Draft EIR.
PUB68-17	It is suggested that the developers of this project work closely with County staff to address this issue to the County's and GCSD's satisfaction for all three of these public services.	The commenter suggests the coordination between developers and County staff on public services but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. Emergency service and response is evaluated in Chapter 4.14, Public Services

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
		and Recreation, of the Draft EIR. Please also see Master Response 6.
PUB68-18	Finally, it does seem that much thought and attention has been put forth in designing this project to be sustainable and environmentally friendly. It would certainly benefit the County and those tourists wanting to have a memorable experience, here in our area. There are still, however, significant issues left to address and resolve. I hope the Hanji Corporation takes the suggestions made during this draft environmental review process to heart and is able to resolve the major grievances that have been voiced.	The comment provides a conclusion for the comments above. Please see Reponses PUB68-01 through PUB68-17.
PUB69	**John Bissell, July 29, 2020**	
PUB69-01	Regarding the Draft Environmental Impact Report ("DEIR") dated June 2020 as prepared by Placeworks for the County of Tuolumne, please review the following responses and corrections. These comments relate only to Section 6, "Alternatives". We may have other comments related to other parts of the DEIR.	The comment provides an introduction to the comments below. Please see Responses PUB69-02 through PUB69-26.
PUB69-02	6.5.2 Alternate Location Alternative The report describes the Big Oak Flat site as a potential alternative location for the proposed Project. We do not think it is appropriate for a public agency to consider alternate locations that are not owned by the applicant. However, even assuming such a review were appropriate, the suggested location is infeasible for the following reasons: I. Physical Characteristics The Alternative Location ("Scar Property") is located in Big Oak Flat, approximately 3 miles west of Groveland, California. I have physically inspected the property and reviewed the records provided by the County GIS mapping system. The Scar Property is comprised of eight (8) parcels surrounding an interior public access road parcel (Parcel 9), and bordering SR 120. (See "Exhibit 1") The combined gross acreage for the parcels is approximately 30 acres. A. Ownership: The property is not on the market. It was recently acquired by a different developer who is assembling a development application. Even if the property were on the market, it is infeasible as it would be prohibitively more expensive and undesirable for the resort.	Page 6-27 in Chapter 6, Alternatives, of the Draft EIR acknowledges that "the ability of this alternative to provide a financially viable project similar to the proposed project is not known, as the alternate site was chosen for analytical purposes in this EIR and has not undergone any detailed technical analysis or fiscal review." In addition, page 6-11 of the Draft EIR states that "the project applicant does not own this alternate site, and the feasibility of acquiring it is unknown."
PUB69-03	B. Zoning: The alternate site is zoned C-1 (Commercial). This is economically undesirable for a resort hotel making the location economically infeasible. The purpose of the general commercial district is to provide for a variety of sales establishments which serve the residents and traveling public. While a hotel is a permitted use, so are mortuaries (across the street) professional offices, repair garages, self-storage and other commercial uses that are not consistent	As described in Chapter 6, Alternatives, of the Draft EIR and as the commenter states, a resort hotel is a permitted use in C-1 zoned parcels, per Tuolumne County Ordinance Code Section 17.34.020.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
	(aesthetic, acoustic, density) or compatible with a recreation resort. In contrast, the purpose of the Commercial Recreation District (C-K District) is to encourage "well planned" and "integrated" resort and vacation-oriented commercial complexes. These are two distinct Zoning Districts because they have substantial and distinct General Plan objectives in the way the land is to be used (See "Exhibit 2").	
PUB69-04	C. Parcel Orientation: The alternative site is comprised of eight (8) separate parcels surrounding an access road parcel (Parcel 9) that is zoned as a Public Area. This configuration prevents the parcels from being joined and creates design restrictions without a zoning amendment. In contrast, the proposed site is comprised of two (2) contiguous parcels with the proper zoning designation. The increased costs and delay associated with obtaining such approvals would reduce the economic viability of the Project.	The Alternate Location Alternative site is comprised of nine parcels. Chapter 6, Alternatives, of the Draft EIR acknowledges that "The ability of this alternative to provide a financially viable project similar to the proposed project is not known, as the alternate site was chosen for analytical purposes in this EIR and has not undergone any detailed technical analysis or fiscal review." Please also see Master Response 7.
PUB69-05	D. Adjoining Properties: The adjacent, neighboring properties of the alternative site are privately held on three sides, with the frontage being SR 120. (See "Exhibit 3") The proposed site abuts the Stanislaus National Forest on three sides, sharing a portion (50%) of the northern property line with three (3) residential (RE-2) parcels and one (1) residential (RE-5) parcel. The southern property line borders a parcel owned by the State of California. A key Project objective is to provide diverse recreational and wellness experiences.through outdoor recreation activities. The lodging facility is to serve as a "portal" to the Stanislaus National Forest and U.S. Forest Service lands for hiking, trail running, biking, and other outdoor activities. The alternate site is bordered by private and state property with no direct access to the SNF or U.S.F.S lands. A second key objective is to create open space combined with aesthetic and acoustic minded setbacks from adjoining property improvements. With the alternate site being more than 50% smaller than the proposed site and not knowing what the future improvements of the neighboring property might be, this would not meet this objective.	It is acknowledged in Chapter 6, Alternatives, of the Draft EIR that the Alternate Location Alternative would not achieve all of the project objectives. However, the project serving as a "portal" to the nearby Stanislaus National Forest and U.S. Forest Service lands could relate to proximity, rather than adjacency. Please also see Master Response 7.
PUB69-06	E. Property Size: The combined acreage of the alternative site is approximately 30 acres, although in its current parcel and zoning form, is not contiguous. The proposed site is comprised of two (2) contiguous parcels which total 63.38 acres. A key Project objective, and undoubtedly the most important for the Terra Vi brand, is to develop and operate a lodging facility at a scale sufficient to support diverse accommodations, amenities and "on-site" recreation. This is a paramount feature to meet the guests' expectations and to ensure financial viability. The alternate site size is less than 50% of the proposed site. Even with zoning and parcel	It is acknowledged in Chapter 6, Alternatives, of the Draft EIR that the Alternate Location Alternative would not achieve all of the project objectives. Please also see Master Response 7.

Comment #	Comment	Response
	adjustments, the success of which are unknown at this time, the open space area requirements of the Project can never be achieved.	
PUB69-07	F. Site Elevation to SR 120: Most of the alternate site elevation is at or below SR 120. The proposed site elevation is an average of 20' above SR 120. A key Project objective is to create a one-of-a kind resort with amenity areas that have open connections to nature, "both visually and physically." The alternate site, being at or lower than SR 120, would create an aesthetic and acoustic impact that cannot meet this objective.	As described in Chapter 6, Alternatives, of the Draft EIR, the Alternate Location Alternative site location does not provide the same far-field mountain views that the proposed project site provides, and the design and layout of the project would need to be modified to be compatible with the alternative site layout. Please also see Master Response 7.
PUB69-08	G. Utilities: A requirement of the C-1 District zoning requires that the project be served with public water and sewer. The County infrastructure to support the development of the alternate site is not in place and is not planned. The schedule, development and operating costs for these improvements could be substantially greater than those of the planned development likely making the alternative site economically infeasible.	As described in Chapter 6, Alternatives, of the Draft EIR, site-specific study of the alternate site would need to be conducted to ensure adequate water supply and pressure, and adequate capacity for wastewater treatment; this alternative would utilize water and sewer utilities provided by GCSD. The project would incorporate the same features for solid waste disposal as the proposed project, and the electrical service demands and energy conservation efforts would also remain the same. Similar to the proposed project, construction of the project at the alternate location on largely undeveloped land would increase post-project runoff and result in construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities. Overall, with water and sewer services provided through the GSD, as opposed to stand-alone “package” systems for the proposed project, impacts to utilities and service systems are considered slightly

Comment #	Comment	Response
		lessened under this alternative to those of the proposed project.
PUB69-09	H. Location: The alternate site is approximately 28 miles from the Big Oak Flat entrance to Yosemite National Park. A key Project objective, and certainly one of the most important for operation and financial viability, is the location to Yosemite National Park, being within 10 miles of the Big Oak Flat entrance. The alternate site is 28 miles from this entrance. This is nearly three times the distance of our Project objective, and from a travel time consequence, is much greater because of the traffic restrictions through Groveland. From an environmental perspective, the alternate site could have a significantly greater impact on VMT and GHG as well. 70% percent of our target guest sales would enter from either the Tioga, South or Arch Rock entrances. (See "Exhibit 4") These guests would be required to drive an additional 36 miles each day the visit the park, and an additional 18 miles to return home. This could cause significant impacts to the Groveland traffic and especially to the already distressed Ferretti Road/ SR 120 issue.	It is acknowledged in Chapter 6, Alternatives, of the Draft EIR that the Alternate Location Alternative would not achieve all of the project objectives. Please also see Master Response 7.
PUB69-10	I. Site Environmental Hazards: The alternate site has an abandoned gas station. It is unknown if any issues exist related to subterranean tanks and/or soil contamination. In any case, this would increase the cost and development time of the Project.	As described in Chapter 6, Alternatives, of the Draft EIR, the Alternate Location Alternative site is not listed as a hazardous materials site on the GeoTracker (maintained by the SWRCB), EnviroStor (maintained by the Department of Toxic Substances Control), or EnviroMapper (maintained by the United States Environmental Protection Agency) online databases. However, further site specific assessment would be required if this site was to be developed, outside the scope of this EIR. Please also see Master Response 7.
PUB69-11	II. Environmental Impacts There are no substantial environmental benefits in using the Alternative Location over the proposed site. As the report defines, there are no environmental improvements to 6.5.2.1 Aesthetics, 6.5.2.2 Air Quality, 6.5.2.3 Biology, 6.5.2.4 Cultural Tribal and Cultural Resources, 6.5.2.5 Energy, 6.5.2.6 Forestry Resources, 6.5.2.7 Geology and Soils, 6.5.2.8 Greenhouse Gas Emissions, 6.5.2.9 Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Hydrology and Water Quality, 6.5.2.11 Land Use and Planning, 6.5.2.13 Population and Housing, 6.5.2.15 Transportation, and 6.5.2.17 Wildfire, and provides only "slightly lessened" impacts to 6.5.2.14 Public Services, and 6.5.2.16 Utilities and Service Systems. While the alternative site project does eliminate the Helipad and	The comment summarizes alternative project assessment provided in the Draft EIR, therefore no further response is required.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
	thus remove significant impacts to 6.5.2.12 Noise, it conversely removes a substantial public benefit. "that would aid in a wildland fire response."	
PUB69-12	III. Project Feasibility The utilization of the Scar Property as the alternative location for the Project is infeasible. The Project cannot be carried out at a reasonable cost or in a reasonable time, or even carried out at all. Notwithstanding the alternative property's diminished size, the ownership, parcel orientation, zoning, available utilities, and location create development barriers that the applicant cannot overcome. First, the site is not for sale, nor is there any reason to believe that the cost, if it became so available, would be economically feasible. Second, the zoning change required to combine the parcels, and the required environmental analysis, preparation and processing, would add substantial costs and significant time to the applicant schedule. Third, the extension of water and sewer utilities by GCSD is not developed or planned. The cost and time to extend these services, if even possible, are unknown and incalculable. Therefore, development costs and schedule cannot be determined, making it impossible to say if any hotel project can be developed at a reasonable cost and in a reasonable time. Lastly, the location of the Scar Property does not meet the applicant's most important Project objective; to be located within 10 miles of the Yosemite National Park, Big Oak Flat entrance. In order to compete with Rush Creek and Evergreen Lodge, it must be proportionate to, of similar accommodations, and be so similarly located. The alternative property is 28 miles from the intended premium market area, and is part of an entirely different market area and demand that cannot generate the occupancy load and average daily rate necessary to meet the profitability threshold required by our lender or investment partners, and is thus not economically feasible. The location of this alternative site, the lack of utility infrastructure, and poor market demand, may help to explain why it has never been developed.	The comment provides a perspective on one of the project alternatives analyses. The Alternatives section of the Draft EIR briefly compares potential alternatives for the proposed project; should an alternative be selected, it would need to go through separate applicable environmental review and project approval processes. Please also see Master Response 7.
PUB69-13	6.5.2 Reduced Footprint Alternative The reduced footprint alternative removes all of the Project's largest, most desirable accommodations (cabin rooms), together with other lodging and employee amenities. This significantly reduces the scale and variety of accommodations necessary to meet the applicant's objectives and reduces the operational revenue critical to remain both competitive and profitable. The report describes the Project being redesigned to reduce the development footprint and overall size of the Project. This is contemplated by eliminating all 26 guest cabin rooms, all 3 employee apartment buildings, reducing the lodge guestrooms by 10 to be instead used for employees, and the removal of the emergency services helipad. The operational and economic	The comment provides an opening statement for following comments, therefore no further response is required.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
	impacts prevent this reduced footprint from being considered a feasible alternative for the Project for the following reasons:	
PUB69-14	I. Project Characteristics One of the most important Project objectives is to develop and operate a lodging facility at a scale sufficient to support a variety of accommodations. The reduced footprint alternative does not meet this Project objective. To do this, the Project was carefully designed to both address the unique needs of our guests, as well as providing accommodations that are similarly offered in the competing area market. With the impacts of the current coronavirus pandemic, having a variety of accommodations, that can provide guests with special needs the ability to maintain greater social distancing is not only an important market demand, but certainly must be contemplated as a matter of public health safety.	It is acknowledged in Chapter 6, Alternatives, of the Draft EIR that the Reduced Footprint Alternative would not achieve all of the project objectives.
PUB69-15	I. Guest Reduction The removal of the guestrooms, of which provides very limited environmental effect, has a substantial effect on the scale of guest participation: The report incorrectly interprets this metric, and only addresses the difference between the lodge rooms (100 vs 90) and associated number of guests (360 vs 400) and neglects to address the loss of guests caused by the elimination of the cabin rooms. The correct guest impact is not -40, but rather -196 (360 vs. 556) shown below: Reduced Footprint - 90 Lodge rooms: up to 360 guests (360 Total) Planned Footprint - 100 Lodge rooms: Up to 400 guests 26 Cabin rooms: Up to 156 guests (556 Total) The net effect of this reduction is a loss of up to 196 guests daily, and not 40 that the report indicates. This loss of guest participation would have a significant negative revenue impact effecting the activity programs, equipment rentals, and the food and beverage operations that are required to make the Project economically feasible.	In Chapter 6, Alternatives, of the Draft EIR, the Draft EIR states that "The main lodge would include 10 employee suites, resulting in a reduction of 10 guest rooms for a total of 90. This alternative assumes that the project would accommodate up to 360 guests, compared to 400 guests." This has been revised, as shown in Chapter 3, Revisions to the Draft EIR, of this Final EIR, to clarify that the alternative assumes that the project's "main lodge would accommodate up to 360 guests, compared to 400 guests." [Emphasis added.] In addition, potential revenue is not analyzed as a part of CEQA.
PUB69-16	III. Room Reduction In addition to the substantial loss of daily guest participation, the elimination of the cabins and reduction of the lodging units also causes a dramatic effect, not just in the variety of products that can be offered, but also to the overall room nights available to be sold: The reduced plan provides for 90 guestrooms: 90 * 365 days = 32,850 annual room nights	Potential revenue is not analyzed as a part of CEQA.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
	The Project as submitted provides 126 guestrooms: 126 * 365 days = 45,990 annual room nights The loss of 13,140 annual room nights by itself creates a substantial revenue impact. This is, however, exacerbated as the deletion of the cabin units, being a larger space and detached location, generate a far greater occupancy and average daily rate. Moreover, this also eliminates our ability to offer the variety of accommodations necessary to meet the demand for larger families, those desiring more seclusion, and of course those needing to establish greater social distancing. Such a reduction would make the Project economically infeasible.	
PUB69-17	IV. Revenue Reduction The loss of rooms, food and beverage and other incremental revenue caused by the alternative reduced footprint is substantial. We compared the performance of the alternative 90 room project to that of the proposed 126 room model and determined a significant reduction in revenue and profitability. Our analysis projected stabilized revenue and net profit, as well as the net operating profit; the difference is shown belowl: *[sic]* 90 Room - Room Revenue (-44.6%) 90 Room - Net Operating Income (NOI) (-57.6%) 90 Room - Net Profit (-315%) l Since the operating numbers would fluctuate substantially in the first few years, we are using the forecasted values for a stabilized operation at year 5 The reduction in guest participation, variety of room types and rooms available for sale, create a clear and substantial loss in revenue that is not sustainable. Conversely, the cost to operate the property at the level of service expected, cannot be proportionately offset. Regardless of deleting the cabin rooms and employee housing, the lodge still operates over and maintains a 64 acre site, and must provide the same level of service programs for food and beverage, banquets, guest activities and recreation amenities, all of which are labor intensive and require nearly the same amount of labor cost, infrastructure, administration and overhead.	Potential revenue is not analyzed as a part of CEQA.
PUB69-18	V. Development Cost As mentioned above, the area to develop and maintain the Project, whether as planned or at the reduced footprint, remains at 64 acres. While some of the development costs will be	Development cost is not analyzed as a part of CEQA.

Comment #	Comment	Response
	reduced (construction costs, some consultant fees and building permits), still other site costs would be largely unaffected. These latter costs include virtually all mitigation measures, site grading and retaining structures, most landscaping, utility infrastructure for water, sewer, storm drainage and electrical services, offsite road improvements for Sawmill Mountain Road and improvements related to SR 120. The effect of reducing the footprint merely shifts the costs of these grading improvements, roads and utility infrastructure to a smaller number of rooms, creating a higher cost per unit than that of the applicant submittal. This is illustrated as follows: 90 Unit Model Development Cost: $ 37,481,606. Cost Per Unit: $416,462.00 126 Unit Model Development Cost: $42,680.306 Cost Per Unit: $338,733.00 While the cost of the overall Project is reduced by $4,778,700 (11%), the cost per unit is disproportionately increased by $77,729.00 (19%). The higher unit-cost, combined with the revenue reductions, create an additional negative impact which compounds the loss of profitability making the alternative infeasible.	
PUB69-19	VI. Environmental Impact As the report defines, there are no environmental improvements to 6.5.2.1 Aesthetics, 6.5.2.4 Cultural Tribal and Cultural Resources, 6.5.2.6 Forestry Resources, 6.5.2.7 Geology and Soils, 6.5.2.8 Greenhouse Gas Emissions, 6.5.2.9 Hazards and Hazardous Materials, 6.5.2.11 Land Use and Planning, and 6.5.2.13 Population and Housing.while changes to 6.5.3.2 Air Quality, 6.5.3.3 Biology, 6.5.3.5 Energy, 6.5.3.10 Hydrology and Water Quality, 6.5.3.15 Transportation, 6.5.3.16 Utilities and Service Systems are only "slightly lessened." The only substantial environmental improvement (6.5.3.12 Noise) is only achieved by removing the emergency services helipad, which conversely eliminates an important public safety feature of the Project and actually causes "greater" environmental impacts relating to wildfire protection.	The comment provides a summary of analysis provided in Chapter 6, Alternatives, of the Draft EIR, no further response is required.
PUB69-20	V. Project Feasibility To summarize, the Alternative Footprint is infeasible. To be economically viable, the Project must operate at a sufficient scale of rooms and include a variety of accommodations that must	The comment summarizes the previous comments. Project cost and revenue are not analyzed as a part of CEQA. No further response is required.

Comment #	Comment	Response
	include the cabin units. These units are critical to house larger groups and to provide the alternate guest experience that is demanded in this market space. This is even more important considering the coronavirus pandemic and dramatic changes our industry faces with social distancing and public safety. The reduction in guest participation, variety of room types and rooms available for sale, combined with higher unit cost and labor inefficiencies create a clear and substantial loss in revenue and profitability that is not sustainable. Moreover, the proposed reduction does not substantially improve the environmental impacts but rather increases the impact to wildland fire management and reduces public safety in the removal of the emergency services helicopter landing zone. The Project should be approved as submitted. We will be happy to provide any additional information that may be helpful in correcting the information in the DEIR.	
PUB69-21	*Exhibit 1 from John Bissell Letter*	The comment provides an exhibit to Comment Letter PUB69. No response is required.
PUB69-22	*Exhibit 3 from John Bissell Letter*	The comment provides an exhibit to Comment Letter PUB69. No response is required.
PUB69-23	*Exhibit 2 from John Bissell Letter*	The comment provides an exhibit to Comment Letter PUB69. No response is required.
PUB69-24	*See APN Search, ParcelQuest from John Bissell Letter*	The comment provides an exhibit to Comment Letter PUB69. No response is required.
PUB69-25	*See Tuolumne County Land Use Map in John Bissell Letter*	The comment provides an exhibit to Comment Letter PUB69. No response is required.
PUB69-26	*Exhibit 4 from John Bissell Letter*	The comment provides an exhibit to Comment Letter PUB69. No response is required.
PUB70	**Mary Hollendoner, July 29, 2020**	
PUB70-01	I am writing in response to the Terra Vi draft EIR that you recently published. The DEIR fails to justify by substantial evidence that they will mitigate the significantly increased fire risk; or that Groveland emergency services will be able to handle the enormous increase in visitors; or that there won't be problems with lack of water and/or quality of water due to their significant	The commenter states an opinion that the Draft EIR does not adequately address concerns regarding wildfire, water quality and supply, sewage, noise, light, wildlife, and

Comment #	Comment	Response
	consumption of water and excretion of sewer and grey water. There are also numerous other issues that do not appear to be sufficiently covered by the DEIR – noise, light, wildlife, traffic - to name just a few, but I will focus on the most significant.	traffic but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. These topics are evaluated in Chapter 4.17, Wildfire, Chapter 4.10, Hydrology and Water Quality, Chapter 4.16, Utilities and Service Systems, Chapter 4.12, Noise, Chapter 4.1, Aesthetics, Chapter 4.3, Biological Resources, and Chapter 4.15, Transportation, of the Draft EIR. Please also see Master Responses 2 and 5.
PUB70-02	One general point: the DEIR suffers from a significant flaw in that it does not analyze the cumulative impact of YUC, Terra Vi, Berkeley Family Camp, and the planned expansion at Yosemite Lakes/NACO. These four developments represent about 500 lodging units, which likely means more than 1,000 new visitors daily, as well as employees which increases that number much more. Each development alone may try to argue that it could just barely get by with enough water, but this is in the absence of the other 3 developments. The impact on our water, emergency systems, and fire risk must be considered cumulatively.	Table 4-1 on page 4-4 of the Draft EIR describes the projects included in the cumulative analysis in the Draft EIR. As shown in Table 4-1, the cumulative analysis includes the three cumulative projects referenced by the commenter (i.e., Yosemite Under Canvas, Berkeley Tuolumne Camp Restoration, and Thousand Trails/Yosemite Lakes RV Expansion), as well as a fourth project, the Mountain Sage Conditional Use Permit.
PUB70-03	1. FIRE “It is not a question of will we have a catastrophic fire in Tuolumne County, but of when.” – Tuolumne County Fire Safety Report, June 2020 The DEIR significantly understates the fire risk from this project, erroneously deeming it less than significant. Inviting ~500 people into a “Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone” will undoubtedly cause a dramatic increase in the chance of fire. Careless smokers won’t always abide by the smoking area rules imposed by the hotel – we all know that people will sneak a cigarette at the woods on the edge of the property or outside their hotel rooms, or might throw a not-entirely-extinguished cigarette into a trash can. It just takes one small error like that to start a significant fire. The Rim Fire, which destroyed my property in 2013, was started by one man’s campfire that he didn’t entirely extinguish. This could so easily happen again if we allow this hotel to be built! It is wrong to consider building such a large hotel without also building a full firefighting system, eg. tanks of water – the well water is not nearly sufficient to fight a fire. The full EIR must properly address the issue of increased fire risk and how to reduce it.	Analysis of wildfire impacts can be found in Chapter 4.17, Wildfire, of the Draft EIR. Please also see Master Response 5.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
PUB70-04	2. PUBLIC SERVICES Closely related to the issue of fire, is the problem of our emergency services. The DEIR fails to justify that GCSD would be able to handle the significant increase in emergencies. Especially, when we consider YUC, Terra Vi, Berkeley Camp, and Thousand Trails together – we are looking at well over 1,000 visitors and staff every day. Even if you forbid the other projects, and only Terra Vi gets built, that is still about 500 extra people on Sawmill Mtn Rd, compared to the dozen or less who are currently there. It is a huge increase in people, and therefore on our emergency services in Groveland. In the best case scenario, we have a 25 minute response time from Groveland for fire or medical or police. But, in reality, the ambulance could be delivering someone to Sonora, meaning over an hour response time. The fire truck could be stationed on a fire already, meaning no response at all. Can you imagine a fire engulfing this area, and the Groveland fire truck driving up to our area, and being faced with many different large housing areas to try to save? What do you expect them to do? Do they go to the long-term families on Sawmill Mtn Road and Hardin flat to save the handful of homes there? Do they go to YUC? To Terra Vi? To Berkeley Family camp? ToThousand Lakes? If you are seriously considering allowing 1000+ new visitors to stay here, then please ensure those developers pay for increased resources in the way of fire & ambulance & police. The EIR does not provide any mitigation for this problem. It simply pretends it's not an issue. Please address this properly and listen to your taxpayers! My property tax bill on Sawmill mountain road is not getting any smaller, year after year, but I don't see that money going to fire and ambulance.	Impacts to public services including fire protection and police services are addressed in Chapter 4.14, Public Services, Parks, and Recreation, of the Draft EIR. Under Impact PS-1, the Draft EIR acknowledges that "the proposed project has the potential to increase demand for fire protection services [including those provided by GCSD] to the project site. The construction or alteration of fire protection facilities to meet the increase in demand could cause significant environmental impacts." The Draft EIR provides Mitigation Measure PS-1 to reduce the demand on existing emergency services. Similarly, under Impact PS-3, the Draft EIR acknowledges that "the proposed project has the potential to increase demand for police services to the project site. The construction or alteration of police facilities to meet the increase in demand could cause significant environmental impacts." The Draft EIR provides Mitigation Measure PS-3 to also reduce the demand on existing emergency services. In addition, cumulative impacts are addressed in Impacts PS-2 and PS-4 for fire protection and police services, respectively, for which Mitigation Measures PS-1 and PS-3 would also reduce demand on emergency services. Regarding fire protection services, it should also be noted that response times from GCSD are emphasized since it is the closest station to the project area, however, GCSD is also assisted by the TCFD and Mariposa County Fire Department through mutual aid agreements, as well as by CAL

Comment #	Comment	Response
		FIRE for fire response in the area. The proposed project is technically within the TCFD service boundaries, but closest to the GCSD station. Please also see Master Response 6.
PUB70-05	Closely related to the issue of emergency services, is that of traffic and road safety. The EIR doesn't address the response time for accidents on the road. YUC and Terra Vi are just over the rim of a hill for those driving to Yosemite from the west, not to mention there may now be people walking across 120 to get between the 2 proposed restaurants.	Response time from local fire departments to the proposed project site is included in Chapter 4.14, Public Services, Parks, and Recreation, of the Draft EIR. Please also see Master Response 6.
PUB70-06	There would be a significant increase in road accidents in this area – particularly since most visitors staying in a hotel like Terra Vi are most likely not locals familiar with the mountain roads. It is unrealistic to say this is not significant in the EIR! If you build Terra Vi you are causing a significant increase in the likelihood of accidents on highway 120 near the intersection with Sawmill Mtn Rd. Ambulances are, at best, 25 minutes away.	There is no evidence offered to support the commenter's opinion that a significant increase in collision will occur since most visitors who would be staying at the resort would be unfamiliar with mountain roads. The County has reviewed vehicle collision data and has found that incident logs do not indicate whether collision incidents were made for local residents versus tourists.[29] The project includes improvements to the Highway 120/Sawmill Mountain Road intersection that would be designed to Caltrans standards and would be appropriate for this location. As shown in Table 1-1 and Chapter 3, Revisions to the Draft EIR, of this Final EIR, encroachment permit approval for these intersection improvements would be required prior to the start of construction of the Terra Vi project.
PUB70-07	The EIR should propose the mitigation of creating a separate, dedicated entrance/exit to Terra Vi, further along highway 120, in the direction of Yosemite, where there is more visibility on a straighter section of 120.	The project proposal includes improvements to the existing Highway 120/Sawmill Mountain Road intersection to provide turn

[29] CAL FIRE, Resource Response Report by Location, June 2016 to June 2019. Sent via personal correspondence from Josh White, Unit Chief, Tuolumne County Fire Chief, CAL FIRE Tuolumne-Calaveras Unit to Elizabeth Peterson, Tuolumne County Office of Emergency Services Coordinator, June 19, 2019.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
		lanes and create adequate sight distance. With those improvements the intersection will be safe and construction of a new intersection elsewhere on the highway is not required. As shown in Table 1-1 and Chapter 3, Revisions to the Draft EIR, of this Final EIR, encroachment permit approval for these intersection improvements would be required prior to the start of construction of the Terra Vi project. CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6 states that "An EIR shall describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the project, or to the location of the project, which would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project." Since the Draft EIR did not identify significant impacts related to relocating the main hotel access, the Draft EIR does not need to analyze an alternative for this. In addition, the eastern portion of the site lies within the O Zoning District and therefore the proposed development is clustered within the area of the site within the C-K Zoning District.
PUB70-08	Use of Forest Road 1S03 The EIR does not adequately analyze the proposal to use the forest road (Sawmill Mtn rd) as Terra Vi's primary access. This is a 20 foot wide road, with no lane markings, no shoulder – this was NOT designed for hundreds of people to drive in and out every day! My daughter safely practiced riding a bicycle on that road, we regularly see deer walking on that road, it is not supposed to be used as a major commercial thoroughfare for hundreds of people daily!	On a peak summer Saturday the project will increase the daily traffic volume on Sawmill Mountain Road to 1,770 vehicles per day in the area from Highway 120 to the first access. Between the first driveway and the second access point 675 feet from Highway 120, the total volume would be about 900 vehicles per day. Terra Vi's traffic contribution would be negligible on Sawmill Mountain Road north beyond the second site

Comment #	Comment	Response
		access. As indicated in the project transportation study, Table 4, page 15 contained in Appendix J of the Draft EIR, these volumes are far below the 5,760 vehicles per day accepted by Tuolumne County on a two-lane local rural road.
PUB70-09	In the event of an emergency evacuation, you would be putting us in danger by adding 500 people at Terra Vi all trying to use that forest road (Sawmill Mtn Rd) to escape. Compounding this, would be another roadblock when the forest road meets highway 120 – everyone would be trying to turn onto 120 and would be backed up all the way to our driveways. Compounding this even further – Yosemite Under Canvas (YUC) is proposing to have their emergency exit directly across from Sawmill Mtn Rod on the other side of 120, so there would also be hundreds of people trying to turn onto 120 from their side. This would be a disaster of a bottleneck during an evacuation putting everyone in danger! I am scared that we would be trapped in our driveway, unable to get onto the forest road and out to the highway! This is undue hardship for current residents of the area. The EIR does not address this danger you are putting us in. In the final EIR, please include the mitigation of moving Terra Vi's primary entrance OFF the forest road (Sawmill Mtn Road) – Terra Vi should instead create a direct access from 120 to their hotel. We all saw the terrible news of the Camp Fire in Paradise last year, where many people could not escape from their properties in time and lost their lives, partly due to there only being one road out. Please don't put us in that same situation, in a "very high fire" zone! It is wrong for the DEIR to discount this as insignificant. The final EIR must include a thorough evacuation analysis, that includes YUC residents.	Please see Master Response 4 regarding emergency evacuation.
PUB70-10	Helicopter: Related to the topic of traffic – I am appalled to see the DEIR state that they will have a helicopter in use twice a day, landing right next to the driveway of one of the family homes, and that it will cause "unavoidable, excessive, and significant noise". You say you are mitigating this by putting upgraded doors on Terra Vi's cabins to protect your guests from the noise – what are you going to do to protect the current families from the noise? Can you imagine a helipad being built immediately next to your driveway that would be used twice a day?	As described in more detail in Response PUB67-14, the Draft EIR utilized an assumed number of flights per day (2) - 1 daytime, 1 nighttime. This assumption was made to provide a conservative (i.e. worst case) analysis; the project does not propose to use the helipad with this frequency. Please see Responses ORG6-58 and ORG6-61 for

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
		additional information related to potential helipad noise impacts.
PUB70-11	3. WATER The EIR is lacking in its conclusion that there would be no significant impact to our water supply. Terra Vi would need water for 500+ people for a sprinkler system, storage tanks, swimming pool, laundry facilities, maintenance facilities, special events, cleaning, water treatment, food preparation/ service waste water treatment, and most importantly fire suppression! The EIR does not provide sufficient evidence that they would have enough water without significantly impacting all the existing families' wells. During the well tests, they drew down the water level by 24' and 54' in two wells, and that was without the compounding effect of YUC across the road, and not during a drought year, and only for 10 days. The EIR needs to analyze a sufficient pump test that properly tests the full usage that Terra Vi would require. What guarantee do we have that Terra Vi will provide us water if our well supply is depleted when they use such a large amount of water from the mountain every day?	Please see Response ORG6-42. Testing showed significantly more flow than calculated demand.
PUB70-12	Nor does the EIR recognize the possibility of contamination of the water supply to existing residents. During the well tests, our neighbors on Sawmill Mtn Rd said their well water taste suddenly changed, and that they still now, months after the test completed, have residues that they never had before. (They've had this cabin for decades). Another neighbor also on Sawmill Mtn said the smell was so bad during the pump test that her whole cabin smelled inside – that had never happened before in 60 years of use. These are obvious signs that the proposed water solution is NOT an acceptable solution. The full EIR needs to address these two cases of water supply contamination.	Please see Response ORG6-32.
PUB70-13	Similarly, Terra Vi will increase runoff due to its many impervious surfaces (eg. parking lots), which "typically" includes pollutants such as oil and sediment from parking lots or pesticides from landscaped areas. This will run into our water courses, like the Tuolumne river below, polluting our well water and possibly harming wildlife who rely on the river as a source of drinking water.	Impacts of stormwater runoff to surface and groundwater are discussed in Chapter 4.10, Hydrology and Water Quality, of the Draft EIR. With the implementation of regulatory requirements and EIR mitigation measures, impacts would be less than significant. Please also see Response ORG6-30.
PUB70-14	Certified hydrologist Ken Schmidt has reported many issues with the pump tests. For example, he explains that your report does not tell us how the pumped water was disposed during the tests – if it percolated back to the groundwater, then that was not a valid pump test. He also	The discharge point is not discussed in the report because it has no significance to the test results. The discharge point was placed east of both pumping wells separated by a

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
	points out that the test you ran does not indicate long-term well yields in the foothills of the Sierra Nevada – constant head tests of 20 to 30 days are needed to determine long-term yields.	bedrock knob with the land surface draining away from the pumping wells. But regardless, the location would not impact pumping levels. Drillers logs from the on-site wells and monitoring wells indicate 54 to 104 feet of overburden consisting of silt loam, loam, and decomposed and weathered granite. The overburden in Well #3, the closest well to the point of discharge, is 83 feet and groundwater was not encountered until a depth of 220 feet. On-site percolation rates were tested at an average of 5.2 inches per hour. Therefore, water discharged at the surface would take 22 days to reach the groundwater table. The discharge from a 10-day test would have no impact on the groundwater levels. See Figure 1 in Appendix M, Supplemental Hydrogeology Information, of this Final EIR, showing location of discharge.
PUB70-15	<u>Sewer:</u> On a similar note, the proposed septic location is on a slope that flows into a known watercourse that provides well water to many of us on the mountain. Your drawings show an arrow pointing UPHILL, indicating that the sewage would magically flow uphill away from us. You don't have to be an expert to know that gravity works the other way, but here is an expert to confirm: Dr. Ken Schmidt, certified hydrologist, said the underground flow typically follows the surface terrain meaning it would be flowing down to us and our wells, as opposed to flowing uphill towards Hwy 120, as shown in your submittal, indicated by the arrow pointing south.	Please see Response ORG6-32.
PUB70-16	In summary, the EIR does not properly address many significant issues – most importantly, fire, public services, water, and use of the forest road as a primary access point. In the final EIR please address these issues and suggest mitigations such as: moving the primary entrance away from the forest road (sawmill mtn rd) to a dedicated entrance from 120 directly into Terra Vi; moving the septic drainage area from the west side to the east side of the property, so that it	The comment provides a summary of the comments above. Please see Responses PUB70-01 through PUB70-15.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
	flows away from the family residences on the mountain; and funding sufficient firefighting capabilities to address the dramatic increase in people who would be on the mountain.	
PUB71	**Bill Kelly, July 29, 2020**	
PUB71-01	I'm objecting to the Terra VI project for it's scope, the critical fire hazard that it entails and the lack of city services for water and waste. Did this project get an Environmental review?	The commenter expresses concerns regarding wildfire, water supply, and wastewater but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. These topics are evaluated in Chapter 4.17, Wildfire, Chapter 4.10, Hydrology and Water Quality, and Chapter 4.16, Utilities and Service Systems, of the Draft EIR. Please also see Master Response 5.
PUB72	**Eve Kelly, July 29, 2020**	
PUB72-01	I am writing to about my concerns specific to the Terra Vi project. I in no way oppose the new development of our county, but the method and placement of this one concerns me. One of my largest concerns is fire impact. The parcel is rated as being in a Very High Fire Hazard Zone, and I'm having trouble imagining in this time inviting over 400-600 guests and employees to this type of area without plentiful resources/evacuation ability. The CA PUC classifies the parcel as a Tier 2 Fire Threat, with that only becoming more pressing as we increase in multi year droughts and year round fire season.	The commenter expresses concerns regarding wildfire but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. This topic is evaluated in Chapter 4.17, Wildfire, of the Draft EIR. Please also see Master Response 5.
PUB72-02	This is related to my concern of traffic. Not only is adding to the stifling traffic of 120 a concern on any basic summer day, it's wild to think about the traffic concern if there were an emergency or a fire. Without a plan to better manage traffic in the area, and specifically on the 120 turn off that's a sharp and sudden turn, I cannot see this being anything but a burden on our community.	The commenter expresses concerns regarding traffic but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. Traffic is evaluated in Chapter 4.15, Transportation, of the Draft EIR.
PUB72-03	The issue of water is another important concern. The two wells that were drilled to test water on the property were done during a good rainfall year and cannot possibly be adequate during a drought year. And thus don't reflect the average years we have to come. Drawing the large amount of water needed to service this large project from the fractured underground water table will do damage to the neighbors' wells supplies. Short of a lawsuit will the neighbors be adequately compensated should this happen? What about the future generations they have bought this land to give to? I	Please see Response ORG6-42.

Comment #	Comment	Response
	have heard that Rush Creeek has found it necessary to truck in water during our frequent drought years.	
PUB72-04	The lack of public sewer cannot help but be concerning. With the leach field planned for what the neighbors describe as a wetlands or at best a wet meadow, what is the process to keep our local water and Tuolumne river safe?	Please see Response ORG6-32
PUB72-05	In many ways it seems like this type of development would be far better suited to Groveland. The location of the development, 25 miles from Groveland where emergency medical, law enforcement and ambulance service are located means that if there is a need for these public services in this remote location which is more likely with 400-600 people present, the people living close to the towns of Groveland and Big Oak Flat will be left uncovered.	The commenter states a concern regarding the location of the project. The Draft EIR evaluated an Alternate Location Alternative which determined that an alternate location would yield relatively similar results as the proposed project with reduced impacts in regard to noise, public services, parks and recreation, and utilities and service systems. Refer to Chapter 6, Alternatives, of the Draft EIR, for more information. Please also see Master Response 7.
PUB72-06	I've heard from a number of dear friends who live in the neighboring area about the significant zoning concerns with this spot. Without addressing these fully and finding a new place to base the resort from, or properly compensating your residences I don't know how we can feel heard moving forward. There are so many natural fire disasters and drought impacts on our land, it feels very important to be choosey about what we allow. Why not watch out for the long term effects in our community and listen to our residents? Thank you for your time considering my comments.	The commenter expresses concerns regarding zoning on the project site but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. Zoning regulations are discussed in Chapter 4.11, Land Use Planning, of the Draft EIR.
PUB73	**Lisa Kelly, July 29, 2020**	
PUB73-01	I am very concerned about the proposed Terra Vi. It seems like an unsafe intersection, an extreme fire danger, and an environmental disaster. I hope you will do whatever you can to keep this site from being developed in this manner.	The commenter expresses concerns regarding traffic and wildfire but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. Traffic and wildfire are evaluated in Chapter 4.15, Transportation, and Chapter 4.17, Wildfire, of the Draft EIR. Please also see Master Response 5.
PUB74	**Craig Konklin, July 29, 2020**	
PUB74-01	I am writing this regarding the Draft Environmental Impact Report for the Terra Vi Lodge Yosemite, specifically the impacts this project will have on County's the public safety sector.	Mitigation Measures PS-1 and PS-3 would provide on-site resources to reduce but not

Comment #	Comment	Response
	While the report acknowledges that the project will create a significant impact on fire and police resources, the mitigations it outlines for those impacts (4.14-8 and 4.14-12) are entirely inadequate. The idea of training two employees to Tuolumne County Fire Department standards does not address the consequences of one of those employees being absent or leaving their job. Training new employees can to the standard outlined could take months and no mention is made of who would provide that training. OHSA standards also require a total of four trained firefighters to be on the scene of a building fire before interior firefighting operations can begin.	eliminate the need for off-site emergency services personnel in some situations. Emergencies requiring firefighting operations would typically still require the assistance from public fire protection services. However, assistance from local fire departments is often requested in minor or non-emergency situations. On-site staff would help to assist with these types of situations, therefore not eliminating, but reducing, the burden on outside resources.
PUB74-02	Additionally, any fire or medical emergency will still require a fire department and ambulance response, depriving existing residents of their current level of protection. The time it takes for a piece of fire equipment to travel from Groveland to the Lodge's location is significant.	Response time from local fire departments to the proposed project site is included in Chapter 4.14, Public Services, Parks, and Recreation, of the Draft EIR. In addition, under Impact PS-1, the Draft EIR acknowledges that "the proposed project has the potential to increase demand for fire protection services [including those provided by GCSD] to the project site. The construction or alteration of fire protection facilities to meet the increase in demand could cause significant environmental impacts." Please also see Master Response 6.
PUB74-03	A similar situation extends itself to the law enforcement impacts. Even with a strong security force, a response from the sheriff's office will still be required for reported crimes. There is no provision to increase the number of deputies available in the area.	As described in Chapter 4.14, Public Services, Parks, and Recreation, under Impact PS-3, the Draft EIR acknowledges that "the proposed project has the potential to increase demand for police services to the project site. The construction or alteration of police facilities to meet the increase in demand could cause significant environmental impacts." The Draft EIR provides Mitigation Measure PS-3 to reduce the demand on existing emergency services.

Comment #	Comment	Response
PUB74-04	I saw no mention of the Emergency Medical transportation system and how the impacts that the increased call volume will be mitigated. There is one ambulance in the community of Groveland.	The Draft EIR analyzes public services according to the CEQA Guidelines; public services analyzed include fire protection, police, schools, libraries, and parks. Medical transportation is not typically analyzed separately; however, fire protection services often include emergency medical staff, and the impacts regarding fire protection services are included in Chapter 4.14, Public Services, Parks, and Recreation, of the Draft EIR. Please also see Master Response 6.
PUB74-05	I am personally supportive of this and other projects in the Hardin Flat area. The cumulative impacts of these projects however must be correctly weighed and mitigated. If we do not, the well-being of our existing residents as well as our area's visitors will be compromised. I strongly urge the creation of a County Service Area to fund and manage the public safety element of this heretofore relatively undeveloped area of the county before any of the proposed projects are approved.	The commenter expresses concerns regarding cumulative impacts. Refer to Chapters 4.1 through 4.17 of the Draft EIR, which each include a discussion of cumulative impacts related to each CEQA discussion topic.
PUB75	**Bill Nickell, July 29, 2020**	
PUB75-01	Re: Hardin Flat LLC/Hansji Corporation Site Development Permit SDP18-003 Assessor's Parcel Numbers: 068-120- 060 and 068-120-061 As 44 year residents and property owners on Hardin Flat Road, we are neighbors of the Sawmill Mountain property owners. We have serious concerns regarding this proposed development that have not been shown to be mitigated: The location of the proposed lodge would have a major impact on the adjacent homeowners, some of whom have been there for generations, whose properties are valued not so much by the structures, but by the peaceful solitude this natural setting offers. This does not appear to be of concern to the developer. Area impact: Numerous projects in close proximity must be considered collectively. Reconstruction of the Berkeley Camp is underway, Yosemite Lakes (aka NACO Thousand Trails) is adding 125 additional sites/units, the new Yosemite Under Canvas 'glamping' campground proposal across the highway from the 'Terra Vi', and possibly a new KOA in Buck Meadows. A rough estimate of the increase in visitors to the immediate area in peak season is somewhere in	The commenter expresses concern regarding the project location. The Draft EIR evaluated an Alternate Location Alternative which determined that an alternate location would yield relatively similar results as the proposed project with reduced impacts in regard to noise, public services, parks and recreation, and utilities and service systems. Refer to Chapter 6, Alternatives, of the Draft EIR, for more information. Please also see Master Response 7.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
	the neighborhood of 2200 people per day! This does not include workers. Imagine how this mass of people will impact this beautiful, peaceful area, as well as the highway. The developer does not seem to be concerned with the environment, nor the quality of life that we all value here in Tuolumne County. With increased AirBNB travel and the recent addition of Rush Creek Lodge, there is plenty of lodging in the area, and most are rarely filled to capacity.	
PUB75-02	In addition, all of these proposed developments will be bringing more visitors to Yosemite. The highway and park entrance are already seriously overburdened, as is Yosemite Valley.	The comment is noted. The comment does not address the adequacy of the Draft EIR.
PUB75-03	The county is already struggling to meet the needs of the current residents/taxpayers and visitors/TOT payers. How can further burden on the infrastructure even be considered? For instance, it is clear the county is already struggling to maintain our crumbling county roads.	The comment is noted. The comment does not address the adequacy of the Draft EIR.
PUB75-04	Other local business: The impact of this new lodge on existing businesses has apparently not been considered! The variety of natural disasters in our area have already put stress on these local businesses, including 'Yosemite's newest lodge'. There is no actual need for further lodging in the area, and the potential for putting other local businesses out-of-business is unwarranted and would result in reduced TOT revenue.	The comment is noted. The comment does not address the adequacy of the Draft EIR.
PUB75-05	Water: The current wells on individual Sawmill Mountain properties are largely inadequate for many of these single-family dwellings. There is clearly not enough water for a huge development such as this, particularly in view of our changing/dryer climate. There is no 'historical data' for well output, since the 'existing' wells on the Manly property were only drilled within the last 2 years. Does the project take into account project expansion in the future? How is it that current site wells "exceed anticipated requirements for full buildout" when the septic plan is only intended for 50 rooms? The amount of water required for this large-scale development would be enormous, and would reduce, or completely dry-up neighboring wells.	Please see Response ORG6-42.
PUB75-06	Sewage: Why is the sewage for a 240 room lodge designed for only 50 units? The lack of a proper sewage treatment facility means that the massive amounts of grey and black water will go back into the ground, potentially polluting the surrounding area including neighboring wells. This whole water shed drains into the Wild & Scenic Tuolumne River.	Please see Response ORG6-32.
PUB75-07	Employees: Where will all the staffing come from? Groveland does not have enough willing/available workers as it is. Housing for transients moving to the area for this type of seasonal business is not readily available. The document states it will create 'sustainable' employment. How is this possible in a seasonable business?	The commenter expresses concerns regarding staffing but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. Staffing is evaluated in Chapter 4.13, Population and Housing, of the Draft EIR.
PUB75-08	Wildlife: The project site as well as the surrounding Sawmill Mountain area is the winter grounds for our local Mule deer herd, this massive development would be very disruptive to the wellbeing of the herd.	The commenter expresses concerns regarding wildfire but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. This

Comment #	Comment	Response
		topic is evaluated in Chapter 4.17, Wildfire, of the Draft EIR.
PUB75-09	Withstanding disasters: Even if they have a bullet-proof fire prevention and response system for the lodge, how does this company plan on handling the now 'normal' business-disrupting disasters of area forest fires, nocuous smoke, flash floods, heavy snows, bone-chilling temperatures, landslides, road washouts and road closures sometimes lasting weeks or months? Not just possibilities, but actual events in just the past 6 years.	The commenter expresses concerns regarding wildfire but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. This topic is evaluated in Chapter 4.17, Wildfire, of the Draft EIR. Please also see Master Response 5.
PUB75-10	Safety: How would visitors cross the highway safely, from one development to the other (taking into account the Glamping project across the highway)? The Sawmill Mountain Road turn off is already a dangerous 'blind' curve. Will the helipad be available to support all the additional highway emergencies that these developments will bring? There are simply too many serious issues that the developer is apparently unable to mitigate.	The commenter expresses concerns regarding traffic safety but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. Traffic is evaluated in Chapter 4.15, Transportation, of the Draft EIR.
PUB76	**Lauren Nickell, July 29, 2020**	
PUB76-01	We are 44 year residents and property owners on Hardin Flat Road, and neighbors of the Sawmill Mountain property owners. We have serious concerns regarding this proposed development: 1. The location of the proposed lodge would have a major impact on the adjacent homeowners, some of whom have been there for generations, whose properties are valued not so much by the structures, but by the peaceful solitude this natural setting offers. This does not appear to be of concern to the developer.	Please see Response PUB75-01.
PUB76-02	2. Area impact: Numerous projects in close proximity must be considered collectively. Reconstruction of the Berkeley Camp is underway, Yosemite Lakes (aka NACO Thousand Trails) is adding 125 additional sites/units, the new Yosemite Under Canvas 'glamping' campground proposal across the highway from the 'Terra Vi', and possibly a new KOA in Buck Meadows. A rough estimate of the increase in visitors to the immediate area in peak season is somewhere in the neighborhood of 2200 people per day! This does not include workers. Imagine how this mass of people will impact this beautiful, peaceful area, as well as the highway. The developer does not seem to be concerned with the environment, nor the quality of life that we all value here in Tuolumne County. With increased AirBNB travel and the recent addition of Rush Creek Lodge, there is plenty of lodging in the area, and most are rarely filled to capacity.	Please see Response PUB75-01.
PUB76-03	In addition, all of these proposed developments will be bringing more visitors to Yosemite. The highway and park entrance are already seriously overburdened, as is Yosemite Valley.	Please see Response PUB75-02.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
PUB76-04	The county is already struggling to meet the needs of the current residents/taxpayers and visitors/TOT payers. How can further burden on the infrastructure even be considered? For instance, it is clear the county is already struggling to maintain our crumbling county roads.	Please see Response PUB75-03
PUB76-05	3. Other local business: The impact of this new lodge on existing businesses has apparently not been considered! The variety of natural disasters in our area have already put stress on these local businesses, including 'Yosemite's newest lodge'. There is no actual need for further lodging in the area, and the potential for putting other local businesses out-of-business is unwarranted and would result in reduced TOT revenue.	Please see Response PUB75-04.
PUB76-06	4. Water: The current wells on individual Sawmill Mountain properties are largely inadequate for many of these single-family dwellings. There is clearly not enough water for a huge development such as this, particularly in view of our changing/dryer climate. There is no 'historical data' for well output, since the 'existing' wells on the Manly property were only drilled within the last 2 years. Does the project take into account project expansion in the future? How is it that current site wells "exceed anticipated requirements for full buildout" when the septic plan is only intended for 50 rooms? The amount of water required for this large-scale development would be enormous, and would reduce, or completely dry-up neighboring wells.	Please see Responses ORG6-32 and ORG6-42.
PUB76-07	5. Sewage: Why is the sewage for a 240 room lodge designed for only 50 units? The lack of a proper sewage treatment facility means that the massive amounts of grey and black water will go back into the ground, potentially polluting the surrounding area including neighboring wells. This whole water shed drains into the Wild & Scenic Tuolumne River.	Please see Response PUB75-06.
PUB76-08	6. Staffing: Where will all the staffing come from? Groveland does not have enough willing/available workers as it is. Housing for transients moving to the area for this type of seasonal business is not readily available. The document states it will create 'sustainable' employment. How is this possible in a seasonable business?	Please see Response PUB75-07.
PUB76-09	7. Wildlife: The project site as well as the surrounding Sawmill Mountain area is the winter grounds for our local Mule deer herd, this massive development would be very disruptive to the wellbeing of the herd.	Please see Response PUB75-08.
PUB76-10	8. Withstanding disasters: Even if they have a bullet-proof fire prevention and response system for the lodge, how does this company plan on handling the now 'normal' business-disrupting disasters of area forest fires, nocuous smoke, flash floods, heavy snows, bone-chilling temperatures, landslides, road washouts and road closures sometimes lasting weeks or months? Not just possibilities, but actual events in just the past 6 years.	Please see Response PUB75-09.
PUB76-11	9. Safety: How would visitors cross the highway safely, from one development to the other (taking into account the Glamping project across the highway)? The Sawmill Mountain Road turn off is already a dangerous 'blind' curve. Will the helipad be available to support all the additional	Please see Response PUB75-10.

Comment #	Comment	Response
	highway emergencies that these developments will bring? We 'count' on our 'county' (pun intended) officials to act on our behalf to preserve and protect our precious way of life. This is your mandate. There are simply too many serious issues that the developer is apparently unable to mitigate. This is not a feasible project.	
PUB77	Thomas E. Parrington, July 29, 2020	
PUB77-01	I have reviewed the draft EIR (DEIR) for the Terra Vi project (Project) which underestimates the significant adverse impacts by failing to treat both the Project and the Under Canvas project as essentially one, both on property owned by the same owner even though the developers may differ.	The commenter expresses concerns regarding cumulative impacts. Refer to Chapters 4.1 through 4.17 of the Draft EIR, which each include a discussion of cumulative impacts related to each CEQA discussion topic.
PUB77-02	Water System. Reliance on wells and a septic system for development will only result in future failures and problems of contamination of natural resources. As you are aware, there is no underground aquifer in Tuolumne County, only fractured rock and fissures containing water which can easily be drained and only slowly recharged, if ever, when overdrawn. As stated in the DEIR under Section 4.10, Hydrology and Water at page 4.10-6: "The County stretches from the foothills to the higher elevations of the Sierra Nevada, where the subsurface material consists primarily of impervious granitic and greenstone bedrock, which generally produces a low or unpredictable groundwater yield. The general hydrogeology of Tuolumne County is typical of granitic mountainous terrain, where groundwater is controlled by the weathering and structure of the bedrock." (Emphasis Added) At least the DEIR, acknowledges that ground water yield is unpredictable. The hydrology analysis that was performed only tested for a ten day period in one year. Testing should be required for much longer than one year to reflect drought years such as the protracted drought years which may have ended only a few years ago. Water recovery from pumping existing wells on site required 8 days to return to within 2 feet of pre-testing levels. The testing took place toward the end of 2019, an above average rain year at 47.95 inches. Compare that amount to between 10 inches and 25 inches during last drought years of 2013, 2014 & 2015.	Please see Responses ORG6-32 and ORG6-42.

Comment #	Comment	Response
	See figure 7 of the Technical Memo from Geoscience dated March 30, 2020. The amount of water allowed to be pumped under State regulations for each of two wells is 265 gallons per minute or 38,160 gallons per day according the DEIR. The proposed water usage during operation of the Project after completion is only projected to be 16,638 gallons per day. The Under Canvas project assumes 7,755 gallons per day for its operation. Compare this water usage with that of Rush Creek Lodge which uses approximately 20,000 gallons per day with far fewer facilities and rooms than the proposed Project according to its letter dated July 17, 2020 commenting on the Under Canvas Project. The County's General Plan requires that a water system for a proposed development be reliable for present and future demands. See General Plan Policy 3.B.2. Without testing over more than a short period of only 10 days within one year combined with longer testing for the Under Canvas, there is no way of knowing whether the water supply will be adequate in drought years for these combined projects which likely share the same geology of fracture rock and fissures for their respective water supplies. Well pumping at the rates estimated for both this Project and the related Under Canvas project may have a substantial adverse impact on existing wells used by neighboring residences. Nowhere in the DEIR is mention made of mitigation for such possible impacts on the neighbors should water shortages occur. The depth of the adjoining wells is not stated but likely shallower than the Project wells.	
PUB77-03	Waste Water Treatment Plan. The Project proposes an engineered septic system for the treatment of waste water as does the Under Canvas project directly across Highway 120, both of which are proposed to have leach fields that will be above the fractured rock and fissures containing the water for the wells that are proposed to provide the water for each development. Some portion of such waste water can be expected to infiltrate the ground water source and may do so as well in the area of the Under Canvas development, either from the Under Canvas septic system or that of the Project. While drinking treated waste water may be safe in public water systems in major metropolitan areas, such as Orange County, which have the staff and expertise to monitor such treated water, small water systems such as proposed by both Under Canvas and the Project will not have such monitoring on a daily basis. Infiltration will be a risk to	Please see Response ORG6-32 and Master Response 2.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
	the drinking water for visitors, employees and adjoining residential properties. However, I could find no discussion of such infiltration into ground water or how it would be monitored in the DEIR. At least the Draft EIR for the Under Canvas project discusses this issue at Impact 3.5-5 at page 3.5-20 which reads in part: "The construction and operation of the onsite wastewater treatment and disposal system would ensure that groundwater quality would not be adversely affected, which would be consistent with the Basin Plan. In addition, because wastewater would be treated onsite and routed to two leach fields, some portion of the water used onsite would be infiltrated back to the aquifer after treatment". The Under Canvas analysis quoted above incorrectly refers to a Basin Plan which does not exist for Tuolumne County and to an aquifer which also does not exist in this County, but does address infiltration back into the water within the fractured rock beneath the site.. Reference is made at paragraph 3.3.8, Wastewater, page 3.2-6 of the DEIR to a future leach field system for the Project. No explanation is given as to why it is only a future system or why is not construction part of the initial Project. If a fully engineered a full waste treatment system was required for the Rush Creek development, why is only septic system proposed for the Project?	
PUB77-04	Population and Housing. At paragraph 4.13.1.2 titled Existing Conditions, page 4.13.3, the DEIR cites a 29% vacancy rate for all housing units in the County at 31,624 units, of which 9% is considered multi-family. This information conflicts with the County's own 2019 update of the Housing Element of the General Plan as adopted by the Board of Supervisors on September 3, 2019, months before this DEIR was released for public comment. The Housing Element shows total housing units as of 2018 as 29,103, of which approximately 1,047 or 3.6% could be considered multi-family. Most multi-family units are concentrated in the Sonora and Jamestown areas of the County with few apartments in the Groveland area. In contrast to the DEIR, the Housing Element shows only a 5.2% vacancy rate for rental units County wide.	Sources for the data in Chapter 4.13, Population and Housing, are noted as footnotes in the chapter. As shown in footnote #6 on page 4.13-3, the Draft EIR uses annual Department of Finance Data. The Housing Element cites data from the Department of Housing and Community Development and the 2016 American Community Survey.[30] Page 3-54 of the County's Housing Element cites at 31.2 percent overall vacancy rate in

[30] Tuolumne County, 2019, County of Tuolumne Housing Element Update, page 3-54, https://www.tuolumnecounty.ca.gov/DocumentCenter/View/13316/County-of-Tuolumne-Housing-Element-2019-Update-Adopted-9-3-2019, accessed September 2, 2020.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
	By comparison, the draft EIR for Under Canvas recognizes that the higher vacancy rate was for vacation homes located at higher elevations within the County where winter weather is severe such as the Twain Harte area. When recreational homes are subtracted from the vacancy rate, that draft EIR for Under Canvas uses a 2016 vacancy rate of 5.2% for the rental housing in the area consistent with the Housing Element. The number of proposed employees is now included in the DEIR at 40. However, that number appears low in comparison to staff employed at peak season at Evergreen Lodge and Rush Creek Lodge. Although limited on-site housing is being provided for the Project, 20 rooms are insufficient since employees are likely to exceed 40 at any one time. For example, at paragraph 3.3.2, Circulation, there are 30 parking spaces for employees, and another 40 spaces for employee housing. Although all employees are not likely to be on duty at any one time, there will still be more employees for the Project than the 40 listed in the DEIR. Similar to the draft EIR for Under Canvas, the expectation stated in the DEIR is that employees will be drawn from the local community thus reducing the need for on-site housing. However, most of the possible employee pool will be from the Sonora and Jamestown area more than 25 miles away. As you are well aware, the County is suffering from a lack of affordable housing of all types . Little new housing is being proposed currently and certainly not affordable housing for employees of the hospitality industry which pay lower wages than many other employers. The cost of construction in many cases precludes affordable rental housing as the rents required to provide a reasonable return on investment exceed what most low and moderate income persons and families can afford. As a result, the shortage of such housing imposes a great burden on existing businesses and public agencies. Both the Forest Service and the National Park Service are hampered by the lack of available housing in trying to recruit necessary staff for their respective areas. According to the website City Data. com, for Zip Code 95321 which includes Groveland and surrounding rural communities, there are approximately 399 renter occupied apartments. Using	unincorporated Tuolumne County, which is similar to the rate of 29 percent cited in the Draft EIR. The County's Housing Element also notes, as cited in the Under Canvas Draft EIR, that when excluding vacation rentals at higher elevations of the county, the county's overall vacancy rate drops from 31.2 percent to 3.3 percent. The Under Canvas Draft EIR cited the data in the County's Housing Element to demonstrate that the County's rental vacancy rate is between that of the California statewide vacancy rate and the national vacancy rate. The Under Canvas Draft EIR found that, therefore, the county's housing supply could absorb any new indirect population growth created by the Under Canvas project, and that the Under Canvas project would not create a population and housing impact.[31] It is unknown how many employees would be current residents of the region; it can be reasonably expected that some of the 40 employees would be current residents. Based on the 2016 American Community Survey data presented in Figure 36 of the County's Housing Element, the unincorporated county has 9,019 vacant housing units, of which 7,281 are seasonal vacation homes. Excluding these vacation homes, the unincorporated county has 1,738 vacant

[31] Tuolumne County, 2020, Yosemite Under Canvas Draft Environmental Impact Report, page 3-17.

Comment #	Comment	Response
	the County's 2018 vacancy rate of 5.2% results in only 20 units available for rent. The demand for such units will come not just from the Project but from Under Canvas, the Forest Service, Yosemite Park employees, the Thousand Trails expansion, and other proposed projects. Clearly there is inadequate off site housing. If the project is to proceed, there is no reason other than its financial impact to the developer that on-site employee housing is not built at the same ratio as Rush Creek Lodge has provided. The DEIR for the Project should include an analysis of available housing within a reasonable commuting distance of the Project site which was not done and which used an incorrect vacancy rate of 29% referenced above. If such housing is not provided by the developer on site or in close proximity, employees commuting long distances will add to congestion and air pollution as there is no other feasible way of travel to the Project than by automobile.	housing units. As noted in the Draft EIR, the proposed project includes employee apartments for 20 employees, plus lodge rooms for its managers. The available supply of vacant homes in the unincorporated county far exceeds the number of employees (18) who would not be accommodated on-site. Regarding the employee population, please see Responses ORG9-63 and ORG9-64. The comment states that the project site is only accessible via automobile. The project proposes an on-site YARTS stop, which could be utilized by project employees.
PUB77-05	Transportation. As others have commented, the location of the Project across Highway 120 from the proposed Under Canvas development will create a significant impact to through traffic from vehicles entering and exiting the respective projects. Also guests and staff of the Under Canvas site can be expected attempt to cross over to and back from the Project which will have more amenities than the Under Canvas development, either by car or on foot. The analysis at page 5.15-15, second full paragraph, reads: "The safety of possible pedestrian activity across SR 120 has been considered. Looking east towards Yosemite National Park from Hardin Flat Road the highway curves to the right but roughly 650 feet of sight distance is available. As noted earlier this satisfies HDM Table 201.1 requirements for travel at more than 60 mph. The view is unobstructed to the left (i.e., towards Groveland). While a formal crosswalk could theoretically be installed, pedestrian activity at this location would be relatively infrequent. The introduction of a marked crosswalk on a high-speed road could actually lead to safety conflicts if pedestrians gain a false sense of security from the marking. A marked crosswalk is not recommended."	Please see Response ORG6-67 regarding pedestrian safety.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
	One could question the frequency of pedestrian crossings between the two developments but no mention is made of at least a flashing yellow light even without a crosswalk to alert drivers of the hazards of cars entering and exiting the driveways as well as possible pedestrian traffic.	
PUB77-06	Fire Protection Services. The location of the Project within the County is designated as a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone by CalFire. It is primarily served by CalFire under contract with the County. Groveland Community Services District (GCSD) also contracts with the County. Both the County and GCSD are under great financial strain given the slow growth of revenues compared to the escalating cost of obtaining services from such providers as CalFire, even before the impact on revenues caused by Covid-19. Unless and until County and GCSD voters are willing to approve an increase in taxes or fees, there can be no expectation that fire servvices *[sic]* will expand to meet the needs of this Project or nearby proposed projects such as Under Canvas. The closest fire station is that of GCSD in Groveland over 18.8 miles away by road. As noted under Public Services paragraph 4.14, page 4.14-3, that station cannot meet its own 7 minute response service standard and has old equipment in need of replacement. Similarly the Toulumne *[sic]* County Service District (TCSD) cannot provide adequate service to the Project site. At the same page it is acknowledged that CalFire cannot meet its standard of containment of a 10 acre fire 95% of the time at this location. As pointed out in other comments, the limited availability of fire trucks and crew to serve this remote location will put both visitors and employees at great risk in the event of another major wildfire. Training Project staff in fire protection is a poor substitute for adequate public fire service and will do nothing for other projects proposed for the area.	Please see Master Response 6.
PUB77-07	Police Services. The reference above is to the Toulumne *[sic]* County Sheriff Office which is based in Sonora. The substation in Groveland is not currently manned on a full time basis. The main office is in Sonora, a 45 mile drive and nearly an hour away by car. I have personally heard the Sheriff state that there are only four deputies available on patrol duty at any one time for the entire County with a total area of 2,274 square miles . With the additional budget constraints on the County budget, due in part to Covid-19, one cannot anticipate any increase in the number of deputies available for patrol duties. At least the DEIR acknowledges the problem. At paragraph 4.14.24 under Cummulative *[sic]* Impacts, p age 4.14-12 it reads in part:	Current deficiencies in police service staffing are an existing condition, and not a result of the proposed project. While the Draft EIR acknowledges, as the commenter includes, that the proposed project would result in increased activity and population in the area and therefore could exacerbate existing response time and staffing deficiencies, Mitigation Measures PS-3 and PS-4 serve to reduce calls to public service responders to counteract the project's impact. The project

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
	"…. the proposed project could exacerbate existing response time and staffing deficiencies. This could result in future construction or expansion of police facilities that could have potentially significant environmental impacts. Therefore, the proposed project would have a potential significant impact with respect to the need for new or physically altered police protection facilities." The DEIR proposes on site training of staff in security. Such attempt at mitigation is a poor substitute for adequate Sheriff service and will do nothing for other projects proposed for the area. That this mitigation measure will reduce the impact to less than significant is ludicrous. Adequate funding is required to provide Sheriff service to this remote area but none is offered by this Project. There is not adequate increased funding projected by the County in the near future, even if an increase in the Transient Occupancy Tax rate should be approved by the voters.	is not required to provide resources to accommodate Sheriff response to other projects proposed for the area.
PUB77-08	Project Alternatives. As I noted in my prior letter of May 19, 2019, regarding Notice of Preparation, of the alternatives studied for future growth in preparation of the revised General Plan, the concept of growth concentrated around already developed communities was chosen as the most desirable choice to preserve the beauty and historic character of this unique foothill County. However, rather than focus new tourist facilities within the greater Groveland area, the proposed Project will be built in a remote area without services and without access to water and sewer service. Such water and sewer services are available in the Groveland area provided by the GCSD. The DEIR does not consider alternative locations which may be closer to developed communities other than one west of Groveland in Big Oak Flat. The Big Oak Flat location should be considered a environmentally superior alternative since it could be served by GCSD water, sewer, fire, and recreation facilities, avoiding the time and distance constraints of the present Project site. In addition, this alternative site would have no impact on the Yosemite deer herd discussed in the DEIR. The claim in the Alternatives discussion as page 6.18 that the wild fire risk would be the same as at the Project site ignores the closer proximity to the Groveland fire station and other emergency services. The Buck Meadows alternative location is summarily dismissed as an alternative since it is iocated *[sic]* in Mariposa County, not Tuolumne County. I could find no justification for excluding this alternative location simply because it is located in an adjoining county and would appreciate a legal citation for this exclusion. Buck Meadows is a location much closer to existing services in the Groveland community and of sufficient size to accommodate the facilities proposed by the	Chapter 6, Alternatives, of the Draft EIR acknowledges that utilities impacts under the Alternate Location Alternative would be reduced; however an environmentally superior alternative is chosen based on the analysis of impacts taken together from all environmental issue areas. Therefore, the Reduced Footprint Alternative is chosen as the environmentally superior alternative, after the No Project Alternative. Wildfire impacts under the Alternate Location Alternative are considered similar to that of the proposed project because they are both located in Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones, and would both include similar building features to reduce wildfire risks. The Casa Loma (Buck Meadows) site was not analyzed as an alternative. It was listed as an alternative considered, due to proximity to the proposed project and the site's

Comment #	Comment	Response
	Project. The Federal ational *[sic]* Environmental Pol icy does al low consideration of alternatives located outside the jurisdiction of the reviewing agency. Thank you for your consideration of these comments.	potentiality to support the proposed project, but rejected due to the location, as Chapter 6, Alternatives, of the Draft EIR, and the commenter states, being outside of the lead agency's jurisdiction. Please also see Master Response 7.
PUB78	James Plouffe, July 29, 2020	
PUB78-01	I would like to register my strong opposition to the Terra Vi development proposal at the gates of Yosemite National Park. This proposal never should have gotten as far as it has, and it needs to be ended now. Here are my reasons: 1. Extreme Fire Danger — For this reason alone, this property should not be developed. This property has already been overrun by wildfire once. It is clearly vulnerable to additional massive wind-fueled wildfires that have become routine in our state.	The commenter expresses concerns regarding wildfire but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. This topic is evaluated in Chapter 4.17, Wildfire, of the Draft EIR. Please also see Master Response 5.
PUB78-02	2. Lack of water — With no access to public water service and no aquifer beneath the property, relying on a couple of wells for such a massive development is foolhardy. The neighbors' wells are sure to be negatively affected, and how will those neighbors be compensated? The loss of the reasonable use of their property is not an acceptable tradeoff.	The commenter expresses concerns regarding water supply but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. Water supply is evaluated in Chapter 4.10, Hydrology and Water Quality, of the Draft EIR.
PUB78-03	3. Lack of sewer — Without access to public sewage services, the plan to treat all sewage on the property sounds dubious at best. What evidence do you have that the developers can actually pull this off? Has this technology been proven to to *[sic]* public water service and no aquifer beneath the property, relying on a couple of wells for such a massive development is foolhardy. The neighbors' wells are sure to be negatively affected, and how will those neighbors be compensated? The loss of the reasonable use of their property is not an acceptable tradeoff.	The commenter expresses concerns regarding the project's lack of a sewer but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. Wastewater is evaluated in Chapter 4.16, Utilities and Service Systems, of the Draft EIR. Please also see Master Response 2.
PUB78-04	3. Lack of sewer — Without access to public sewage services, the plan to treat all sewage on the property sounds dubious at best. What evidence do you have that the developers can actually pull this off? Has this technology been proven to work at such a large scale? It is more likely that the property will become one giant, smelly cess pool *[sic]* at the GATEWAY to Yosemite. John Muir would be horrified.	This comment is a duplicate of comment PUB78-03.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
PUB78-05	4. Terrible location — There are clearly identified, better locations for a greatly scaled down, right-sized project of this sort. The town of Groveland, for example, is an obvious choice where public water and sewer services can be negotiated. Impacts to the livelihoods of the current residents of Groveland should also be considered strongly in any proposed project. The fact that there are no services — fire, police, water, and sewer — anywhere near this site should be unacceptable to Tuolumne County.	The commenter states a concern regarding the location of the project. The Draft EIR evaluated an Alternate Location Alternative which determined that an alternate location would yield relatively similar results as the proposed project with reduced impacts in regard to noise, public services, parks and recreation, and utilities and service systems. Refer to Chapter 6, Alternatives, of the Draft EIR, for more information. Please also see Master Response 7.
PUB78-06	5. Traffic — There are already miles-long traffic jams of cars trying to get into Yosemite. Tuolumne County should be interested in ensuring that the experience of going to Yosemite is a pleasant one, so that visitors have a positive memory of the county. The experience of being stuck in a traffic jam next to an overbuilt, high-end resort for the wealthy is not going to endear the county to the thousands of visitors who come through daily. In sum, a project such as this should never have gotten past the trial balloon stage. That the developers have already spent a lot of money on this project should not deter you and the county supervisors from doing the right thing. Just say no to this project	The commenter expresses concerns regarding traffic but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. Traffic is evaluated in Chapter 4.15, Transportation, of the Draft EIR.
PUB79	**Pat Skeels, July 29, 2020**	
PUB79-01	I am opposed to the Terra Vi development proposal in Yosemite National Park. First, there is no public water or aquifer at the development site. Next, what about drought years which are happening?	The commenter expresses concerns regarding water supply but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. Water supply is evaluated in Chapter 4.10, Hydrology and Water Quality, of the Draft EIR.
PUB79-02	Also, this area has been overrun by wildfires, whih *[sic]* have become more frequent in California.	The commenter expresses concerns regarding wildfire but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. This topic is evaluated in Chapter 4.17, Wildfire, of the Draft EIR. Please also see Master Response 5.
PUB79-03	As a young college student in the 70's,I worked in Yosemite Park When I returned to the park last year, I could not believe how crowded it had become. So, there is the added traffic issue.	The commenter states a concern regarding the location of the project. The Draft EIR

Comment #	Comment	Response
	I am asking you to stop this project in Yosemite Park. I suggest that these developers put their project outside of the park.	evaluated an Alternate Location Alternative which determined that an alternate location would yield relatively similar results as the proposed project with reduced impacts in regard to noise, public services, parks and recreation, and utilities and service systems. Refer to Chapter 6, Alternatives, of the Draft EIR, for more information. Please also see Master Response 7.
PUB80	John Stanfield, July 29, 2020	
PUB80-01	After reading the DEIR and consulting our legal experts, hydrologists and independent advisors to the land owners on Sawmill mountain road (off Forest route 1S04) I want to object to the Terra Vi Lodge development due to inadequate impact studies and hazard mitigation planning for the above mentioned areas. I hope that mine and other letters written by tax paying landowners will be taken into account by the county and other entities that are making decisions about this development. I feel that the DEIR has NOT taken into account the voices of the public in the planning meetings and should evaluate these concerns prior to allowing this development to continue. Here are some of my concerns. Ground water usage The development depends on wells in a very unstable fractured granite type groundwater environment. This is a very unpredictable way to get water and will end up stressing the wells for the private homes in the area. I see NO remedy or mitigation proposal in the very likely event that I or other landowners run out of water in the near future. The Proposed developments will consume enormous amounts of water and have not been adequately tested for stress and drought and do not consider the amount of water needed to fight a forest fire realistically.	The commenter expresses concerns regarding water supply but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. Water supply is evaluated in Chapter 4.10, Hydrology and Water Quality, of the Draft EIR.
PUB80-02	Groundwater Contamination: A project of this size is an incompatible use on a remote forest site without public water or public sewer. The septic location which is located on a slope flowing into a known watercourse that provides well water to many neighboring homes is a disaster for the homeowners in the area that depend on small private wells for potable water. This known watercourse leads through meadows, several wells, and empties into the stream, the creek and ultimately the Tuolumne River. The CFIP contract describes the project site as located in the Big Creek planning	Please see Response ORG6-32.

Comment #	Comment	Response
	watershed (calwater 2.2 #6536.800201) that is classified as high risk by the FRAP (Fire and Resource Assessment Program) team. The 14,197.1 acre watershed is part of the broader Tuolumne River watershed that is also classified as high risk. The South Fork of the Tuolumne River runs ¼ mile south of the property. The DEIR does not offer mitigation or ample testing and does not even release the results of the minimal testing that was done on the site!	
PUB80-03	Evacuation in the event of an emergency Another oversight is that Under Canvas is proposing the use of Forestry Route 1S09 directly across from the Sawmill exit which would create an additional "intersection" choke point during evacuation. This is a cumulative problem that has not been addressed by Terra Vi or UC. The infrastructure and basic layout of the two-lane Highway 120 corridor lacks two separate distinct exits required by fire safety code. Both exits from the site lead to 120! Many people died in the Camp Fire in Paradise last year as they were trying to evacuate their homes. They only had one road in and out of the area; the residents of Sawmill Mountain and Hardin Flat are in the same terrible predicament. Why would the County knowingly place a highly hazardous property use such as Terra Vi and Under Canvas in a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone without contemplating safe exits and evacuation?	The commenter expresses concerns regarding emergency evacuation but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. Emergency evacuation is evaluated in Chapter 4.9, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, and Chapter 4.17, Wildfire, of the Draft EIR. Please also see Master Responses 4 and 5.
PUB80-04	Land Use Agriculture and Forestry Resources, Zoning The proposed project area meets the definition of "Timberland" pursuant to Public Resources Code 4526. Mr. Gregory Robert Manly entered into a Forest Improvement Program contract agreement with California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CFIP) in June, 2015. According to this contract, the participant (Mr. Manly) certifies that the parcel of forestland will not be developed for uses incompatible with forest resources management within 10 years following recordation date. The property has undergone reforestation efforts and CalFire has been monitoring the forest improvement work. The DEIR asserts that the CFIP has now been annulled but there is no evidence of this statement. Per the CFIP agreement signed by Manly, he declared the property was zoned AE Agricultural and that the current zoning is Rural. The DEIR talks in circles about the fact that this is Timberland, that it isn't Timberland, that it would not result in the loss or conversion of forest land and that impacts would be less than significant. Let's resolve these issues once and for all. Please provide all pertinent information and compliance criteria regarding the rezoning, the CFIP, and the land conversion for public review and comment.	Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines evaluates Public Resources Code Section 4526 by considering whether a project would create a significant impact associated with the following standard of significance: "Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code Section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))." As described on page 4.6-4 of the Draft EIR, the project site is within the Commercial Recreation and Open Space zoning districts and therefore would not conflict with existing zoning, or require the rezoning of any land. Therefore, although the project site was previously entered into a

Comment #	Comment	Response
		CFIP contract, the project does not create a CEQA impact.
PUB80-05	Helicopter: Please provide the restrictions and required clearances. The current pad location is a nuisance and located next to our only driveway into and out of our homes. How will Sawmill residences evacuate when a helicopter is blocking our ONLY egress from Sawmill Mountain. Based on what the DEIR claims, the helipad will be used twice a day with "unavoidable, excessive, and significant noise" that cannot be mitigated. How is this ok to the people that own property, the wildlife of the area and to the guests in the lodge? Plus, one helicopter is absolutely inadequate for evacuation of 500+ guests. This is a joke?	The project does not propose that the helipad be used to evacuate the site. The emergency use helipad would be used for emergencies only by area emergency and medical responders on an as-needed basis. Review of the procedures required for approval of the proposed emergency use helipad are described in Chapter 4.9, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, of the Draft EIR. According to Federal Aviation Administration Advisory Circular 150/5390-2C, emergency helicopter landing facilities require a minimum of 12 feet of unobstructed area on all sides of the final approach and take off.[32] The final design of the helipad would be subject to a multi-agency review process involving the County, Tuolumne County Airport Land Use Commission, and Federal Aviation Administration. The assumption in the Draft EIR that the helipad would be used twice daily is extremely conservative (meaning it represents as "worst case scenario"), as it would be used only sporadically, for emergency purposes. As shown on pages 4.12-23 to 4.12-24, the Draft EIR acknowledges that the helicopter could create noise impacts to nearby residences,

[32] Federal Aviation Administration, 2012, Advisory Circular 150/5390-2C, page 175, https://www.faa.gov/documentLibrary/media/Advisory_Circular/150_5390_2c.pdf, accessed September 3, 2020.

Comment #	Comment	Response
		and identifies this as a significant and unavoidable impact. Please see Master Response 4 and Response ORG5-06 for more details on evacuation.
PUB80-06	Increased fire hazard Adding 500+ visitors to an already fragile and high risk wildfire area and claim (as the DEIR does) that the site will help to lower fire hazard is a slap in the face to all the wildland firefighters that serve in the USFS and other agencies. The DEIR has NO mitigation plan for lowering fire risks and no action plan for WHEN a fire happens in this sensitive area again. There must be more research, planning and action taken to seriously study the causes, effects and mitigations for fire hazards if this project is to be approved.	Project wildfire risk reduction features are listed in Table 4.17-2 in Chapter 4.17, Wildfire, of the Draft EIR. These include, among others, construction in accordance with applicable building codes and fire prevention regulations/policies; Vegetation Management Plan approved by Tuolumne County Fire Prevention Bureau; limitations on fire-prone behaviors; emergency communication plan; staff training; and emergency helipad. Mitigation measures for wildfire impacts include Mitigation Measure WF-2: Prior to issuance of building permits, the applicant shall submit a Wildland Fire Prevention Plan and Vegetation Management Plan to the Tuolumne County Fire Prevention Bureau for review and approval. The project site plan and landscaping documents shall be revised to conform to the Vegetation Management Plan.
PUB80-07	Property Access: Existing Conditions 4.11.1.2 (of the DEIR for the Terra Vi development) omits several easements that impact the proposed property: a) Existing driveways that leads off Forest Route 1S03 provides the only access to about half of the 80 acre homestead homes. The trail has been used continuously for 60 years as well as by the homesteaders who settled the land in the early 1900's. These easements have not been mentioned in the DEIR and should have been identified before designing the site. Knowing where the easements are located is crucial to understand before any planning should commence. The assumption that Forest Route 1S03 is the "primary access road	The description of easements in Chapter 4.11 of the Draft EIR are based on the land title survey conducted for the proposed project (shown on Sheet V2 in Appendix B, Project Site Plans, of the Draft EIR). The driveways that the commenter references are presumably the driveways that cross the project site at its northern edge; these are noted on topographic survey in Sheet V3 in

Comment #	Comment	Response
	for guests and employees of the lodge" and Terra Vi's main circulation." Forest Routes are not roads and are not meant for commercial access. These rudimentary trails are built and managed by the Forest Service, under control by the US Government, to access remote undeveloped areas for the purposes of the logging industry, forest management workers, and backcountry access. Furthermore, Forest Route 1S03 is the only dedicated access and egress for the 80 acre Sawmill Mountain area, residential neighborhood. The current proposed entrances/exits on the Forest Route cause undue and unfair hardship to the residents of Sawmill Mountain making it an immitigable situation. The firefighters who camped out in our meadow and saved the majority of the Sawmill structures during the Rim Fire warned that they would never be able to return to fight a fire in that area should one ever reoccur. They stated that they were trapped because there was only one exit out of the area and they were backed up to National Forest boundaries with no secondary means of egress. They had no safe way out! The dedicated Sawmill Forest Route access must be maintained for the Sawmill home properties and facilitation of forest maintenance only. These are just a few of the relevant concerns I have after reading the DEIR and talking to Hydrologists, noise pollution experts, environmental lawyers and transportation experts and wildland fire experts. It is my hope that through this study and the words of other landowners the county will listen to our voices and not ignore us in the pursuit of revenue over the needs of the tax paying landowners and the environmental needs of the land and the wildlife.	Appendix B of the Draft EIR and, as noted, no recorded easements were found for these driveways. The project does not propose any changes in this area of the project site. Existing trails are also noted on the surveys. The project proposes to keep the existing trail in the eastern portion of the project site. The comment does not provide evidence regarding its assertion that the proposed project entrances would cause hardship to nearby residents. The project would improve emergency access to the project area by providing an emergency use helipad and dedicated emergency vehicle access point on Highway 120. Regarding the use of the forest route, please see Response ORG6-14.
PUB81	**Gary Wesley, July 29, 2020**	
PUB81-01	The EIR must address environmental impacts in light of the coronavirus and the prospect of other contagions and epidemics in the future. I also incorporate into this objection to the (draft) EIR all other points timely raised by others concerning its inadequacy. Gary Wesley (gary.wesley@yahoo.com)	Please see Response PUB29-01.
PUB82	**Robert Asquith, July 30, 2020**	
PUB82-01	I have read the Yosemite Terra VI DEIR. While this document contains many words, it categorically dismisses items that I consider very relevant to the safety and well-being of people along the Highway 120 corridor in Tuolumne County. It does so while offering slim to scant evidence justifying the categorization of less than significant for so many items. For me, the principle items are: • Emergency services – fire, ambulance, law enforcement.	The comment provides an introduction to the comments below. Please see Responses PUB82-02 through PUB82-34.

Comment #	Comment	Response
	• Wildfires – substantially increased risk, available fire equipment, evacuation. • Public transportation – highway changes, emergency evacuation. • Water – Includes potable water, firefighting water, and septic discharge. • Biology – Great Grey Owl, Pacific Fisher, others • Cumulative impacts on the nearby area as well as in Groveland. In addition, there are numerous other items that are marked less than significant with little or no justification. Indeed, the supporting evidence in many cases is less than compelling and certainly not worth Tuolumne County risking future problems and/or lawsuits with such poor quality work from the consultant.	
PUB82-02	In addition, there are numerous other items that are marked less than significant with little or no justification. Indeed, the supporting evidence in many cases is less than compelling and certainly not worth Tuolumne County risking future problems and/or lawsuits with such poor quality work from the consultant. Emergency services. Here the authors of the DEIR indicate less than significant impact on fire response, medical response (fire +ambulance) and law enforcement. This conclusion is not substantiated in any way. • The nearest fire Department is located in Groveland and response time would be closer to 45 minutes. Further, during a fire response, Groveland/Big Oak Flat are left without fire protection for which they are taxed and pay extra every year. The authors clearly did not correctly determine first fire response. It is not Tuolumne County, rather it is GCSD and further, as a taxpayer within the GCSD district, under the DEIR, I will be paying for any emergency calls to Terra VI, NOT the project. More than 1/3 of all fire/medical calls responded to by the GCSD Fire Station #78 are already outside of District boundaries. This project will clearly increase that percentage. There is a possibility that a Groveland based fire engine may not be funded within several years. Thus, fire response may come from much further away, dramatically increasing the wildfire risk. How far would a wildfire spread in 45 minutes? The DEIR proposes to provide training to staff in fire fighting and perhaps medical assistance. It	As described in Chapter 4.14, Public Services, Parks, and Recreation, of the Draft EIR, under Impacts PS-1 through PS-4, the proposed project would result in significant impacts to fire protection and police services, which are only reduced to less than significant with mitigation. Regarding first fire response, as listed on page 4.14-4 of the Draft EIR, "Because GCSD and TCFD operate under a mutual aid agreement, the GCSD would provide the first response for most incidents that could occur at the project site." Please also see Master Response 6. Mitigation Measure PS-1 would provide on-site resources to reduce but not eliminate the need for off-site emergency services personnel in some situations. Emergencies requiring firefighting operations would typically still require the assistance from public fire protection services. However, assistance from local fire departments is often requested in minor or non-emergency

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
	is quite unbelievable that this is proposed as an alternative to professionals employed by local, state and federal agencies. This mitigation is bogus.	situations. On-site staff would help to assist with these types of situations, therefore not eliminating, but reducing, the burden on outside resources.
PUB82-03	• Likewise, the nearest medical response comes from Groveland, both fire and ambulance. Again, there is a 45 minute response time. Further, if medical transport is necessary, the ambulance would be unavailable for the Groveland/Big Oak Flat area for at least a half a day if not an entire day or longer, depending upon its hospital destination. Finally, the Groveland/Big Oak Flat residents pay annual taxes for the ambulance to be available to them, not Terra VI guests or employees.	EMS/medical response time is included in Appendix I, Fire Impact Analysis, of the Draft EIR, and included in fire protection services which are analyzed in Chapter 4.14, Public Services, Parks, and Recreation of the Draft EIR. Please also see Master Response 6.
PUB82-04	• The nearest Sheriff's Office is in Sonora making a response time of an hour or more to the Terra VI location. The DEIR incorrectly identifies a useful substation in Groveland. That facility is currently unmanned with no future date determined when it would be staffed. With recent tax increase ballot measures failing, the County Sheriff's Office is understaffed and responding to Terra VI would require at least two hours driving time plus on scene time. This exposes the rest of the County to undue risk.	The Draft EIR acknowledges the limitations of the Groveland substation that the commenter notes. As described in Section 4.14.2 of Chapter 4.14, Public Services, Parks, and Recreation, of the Draft EIR, "The substation has up to one patrol officer per shift, if available, and two additional volunteer community service officers. Due to a current lack of staffing at the TCSD, the Groveland substation is not permanently staffed with a full-time sworn in officer. This substation includes a small office with an alarm and existing equipment consists of a computer, phone, and one vehicle for volunteers. The Groveland substation does not meet the current demands for police services in the part of the county, which it serves, and there are no plans for expansion, hiring additional staff, or purchasing equipment at this time."
PUB82-05	Wildfires. The DEIR Authors dismiss wildfire risk without any evidence to indicate why. • The area to be developed into Terra VI was classified in 2007 as Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone by CAL FIRE (see DEIR). The catastrophic Rim Fire of 2013 clearly demonstrated this classification is appropriate. It actually burned part of the site.	Wildfire impacts are addressed in Chapter 4.17, Wildfire, of the Draft EIR. It is noted within this chapter that the project site is within a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone. Please also see Master Response 5.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
PUB82-06	• The likelihood of having any open fires on the site during high fire season cannot help but worsen the fire risk. Any conclusion that this would be a Less Than Significant fire risk his seriously flawed.	In Chapter 4.17, Wildfire, of the Draft EIR, it is noted that the project "could, due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks" however Mitigation Measure WF-2 would reduce the risk. In addition, project features as described in Section 3.3.6, Wildfire Hazard Reduction, of Chapter 3, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, are included to manage wildfire risk to an extent possible. Please also see Master Response 5.
PUB82-07	• The Camp fire in Paradise CA occurred in 2018. Subsequent evacuation studies have shown the high danger of a large population with only one or two evacuation routes out of the area. This is clearly the case with respect to the Terra VI site, particularly when combined with other nearby projects. (See Cumulative Impact below). The DEIR is silent on this issue. There could be as many as 1,500 people to evacuate the area.	Please see Master Response 4 regarding emergency evacuation.
PUB82-08	• The remoteness of the Terra VI site means that fire response is lengthy. This allows wildfires to be well developed long before crews are on scene to suppress.	Firefighting services response time is acknowledged in Chapter 4.14, Public Services, Parks, and Recreation.
PUB82-09	• The DERI is silent on providing adequate and dedicated firefighting water. There must be one or more tanks of dedicated fire water as there is no other source to fight fires. Further, the site must be plumbed with hydrants to distribute the water.	As described in Chapter 3, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, "fire suppression systems and site hydrants for fire protection would be provided using a combination of reclaimed and potable water storage."
PUB82-10	Public Transportation. The authors of this report clearly do not understand the issues of public transportation as they have labeled all the impacts less than significant . • In order to accommodate Terra VI as well as the Under Canvas project across the highway, significant widening of Hwy 120 would be required. Looking at the highway changes necessary for the Rush Creek Lodge located just up the highway that is much less complicated, At least four lanes and probably five would be required as: WB right turn, WB thru, Left turn (WB & EB), EB thru, and EB right turn.	The Transportation Impact Analysis conducted for the Draft EIR contained in Appendix J of the Draft EIR, identifies the level of improvements needed to satisfy the standards of the Tuolumne County General Plan and Caltrans. While the final design will be determined through the Caltrans encroachment permit process, no comments have been received from Caltrans indicating

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
		that additional improvements are justified. Please see Response GOV8-09.
PUB82-11	• The current entrance at Sawmill Mountain Road (for the Terra VI project) would have to be moved because the sight lines and distance from the crest of the hill to the west are too short for safe traffic. The DEIR calls for tearing the hillside of the present highway cut down to improve site lines. This would make a major impact on the aesthetics of the area and still not provide sufficient site lines as the highway crowns at that location. Note – this road is NOT a dedicate or maintained public road; it is a USFS forest access road that was never designed for constant traffic such as Terra VI plans. Imagine several EB large construction trucks stopped in the middle of the 2 lane highway waiting to make a left turn into the project. There is NO left turn lane and highway traffic is typically traveling 60+ mph. This is unacceptable.	Please see Responses ORG6-63, ORG6-64, and ORG6-66.
PUB82-12	• The presence of large trucks delivering food and supplies to both properties (Terra VI & Terra VI) as well as the YARTS buses require long acceleration and deceleration lanes at this location of Hwy 120 due to its steep grade. The changing of the highway must be accomplished before construction begins inasmuch as construction traffic on the highway (as noted above) would pose a clear and immediate danger to travelers.	Please see Responses ORG6-66 and PUB28-08 regarding trucks.
PUB82-13	• The DEIR expects to send lodge guests to Yosemite National Park using the YARTS bus system. It does so without increasing capacity. As records indicate, there are many days where there are NO seats available given the present route of the busses. Further, the cumulative impact of Terra VI and other projects in the vicinity would not be able to accommodate these riders. The Less Than Significant conclusion is wrong.	Please see Responses PUB28-07 and ORG9-75 regarding YARTS impacts.
PUB82-14	• In a weird turn, the DEIR proposed a YARTS parking lot of 30 cars meant to be a Park and Ride opportunity. This is either ignorant or crafty. There is absolutely no need for such a facility. The Groveland stop has public parking for more than 50 cars and the Buck Meadows stop has parking for more than a full bus load as well. There is NO reason why travelers would drive all the way to Terra VI just to park and ride YARTS.	The comment does not address the adequacy of the Draft EIR.
PUB82-15	• See Evacuation Route note under wildfires above. The only evacuation Route are either eastbound or westbound on Hwy 120. There are no other routes. The Camp fire of 2018 clearly demonstrated the danger of such a scenario. This project with others nearby would require as many as 1,500 people to be evacuated in the event of wildfire.	The comment provides a statement and does not address the analysis in the Draft EIR, therefore no further response is required.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
PUB82-16	Water. The authors have provided little evidence there is sufficient water for all the needs at the Terra VI site. Also, the possibility of groundwater contamination from sewage was never adequately explained. • There needs to be adequate fresh water supplies not only in wet years, such as the one cited in the DEIR, but in multiple dry years. This was not adequately covered by the authors. How would the water be supplied to a facility with as many as 500 people in repeated dry years?	Please see Response PUB16-08 for a discussion of sewage impacts on groundwater. Please see Response ORG6-42 for a discussion of fresh water supplies in multiple dry years.
PUB82-17	• Backup Water Supply is needed in very dry years should the promises put forth in the DEIR not be realized.	Please see Response ORG6-42 for a discussion of fresh water supplies in multiple dry years.
PUB82-18	• No mention is made of a dedicated firefighting supply of water. This is critical in a Very High Risk fire area. Without such a dedicated supply, firefighting resources have to be diverted to obtain water in an otherwise very dry region. Because of the long response time for County and State resources to arrive on scene, this stored water supply must be sufficient to fight a growing wildfire for several hours.	Please see Response ORG6-43.
PUB82-19	• The DEIR provided no explanation of how groundwater contamination was to be prevented from its septic systems during high water years with substantial runoff. In that there are many others downstream from these projects using Tuolumne River water, groundwater contamination further research during very wet years is critical.	Please see Response ORG6-32.
PUB82-20	• Considering this project is across the highway and above the Under Canvas project, negative impacts and remedial measures must be articulated in the event of groundwater contamination from the Terra VI septic system infiltrates the water supply of Under Canvas as well as further downslope at Berkeley Camp.	Please see Response ORG6-32.
PUB82-21	Biology. The DEIR does not provide sufficient information to ensure populations of endangered species will be protected. The Pacific Fisher and Great Grey Owl have been only lightly treated. Specifically, the Great Grey Owl's residence in Ackerson Meadow (Yosemite National Park) is buy 6 miles away from the project. This is the highest density of this owl in the entire Sierra Nevada. There must be further study of the impact on these birds to inform potential mitigation measures to protect them.	The project site lacks old-growth trees in proximity to a wet meadow that attracts the Great Grey owl (as is the case at Ackerson Meadow). The lack of the species' preferred nesting and foraging habitat makes it unlikely to occur on site or use the site for a critical stage of the owl's life cycle. Similarly, the nature of the on-site habitat is not consistent with breeding or sheltering habitat for the Pacific Fisher. The fisher would be most likely to occur on site as an accidental visitor attracted in response to trash left out during

Comment #	Comment	Response
		construction (i.e., not used by the species during a critical stage of its life cycle). Mitigation addressing incidental site visits by the fisher are included in Mitigation Measures BIO-1.2a, BIO-1.2b, BIO-1.2c, and BIO-1.2d of the Draft EIR.
PUB82-22	Cumulative Impacts. The DEIR all but ignores the cumulative impact of three other substantial projects nearby. Arguably the substantial cumulative impact of all of these projects render many of the less than significant conclusions listed in the DEIR as indefensible. These projects are: • Terra VI • Under Canvas • Yosemite Lakes RV resort existing and expansion • Berkeley-Tuolumne Camp • Existing Hwy 120 projects: San Jose Camp, Evergreen Lodge, Rush Creek Lodge, etc. as they impact emergency response already. Terra VI adds to this local burden.	Table 4-1 on page 4-4 of the Draft EIR describes the projects included in the cumulative analysis in the Draft EIR. As shown in Table 4-1, the cumulative analysis includes three of the projects referenced by the commenter (i.e., Yosemite Under Canvas, Berkeley Tuolumne Camp Restoration, and Thousand Trails/Yosemite Lakes RV Expansion), as well as a fourth project, the Mountain Sage Conditional Use Permit. The existing developments mentioned in the comment are part of the regional baseline setting included in the analysis throughout the EIR.
PUB82-23	Other Considerations. • Aesthetics – Presently, travelers to Yosemite are driving through forest lands for many minutes. To suddenly come upon a resort clearly alters the aesthetic in a very noticeable way. Further, the aesthetics as well as forest would be deeply disturbed should the tearing down of the cut just west of Sawmill Mountain Road be undertaken.	The commenter expresses concerns regarding aesthetics but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. Aesthetics is evaluated in Chapter 4.1, Aesthetics, of the Draft EIR.
PUB82-24	• Air Quality – It is difficult to imagine clean air in the vicinity of as many as 400 clients driving to and staying at Terra VI. However, the DEIR states less than significant impact.	The commenter expresses concerns regarding air quality but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. Air quality is evaluated in Chapter 4.2, Air Quality, of the Draft EIR.
PUB82-25	• Employee Housing – Completely delineating the housing for the maximum number of employees on site. Considering more than 400 guests may be staying at Terra VI during peak season, the estimates for onsite housing is grossly underestimated. The current housing situation has only been exacerbated by the Covid crisis. The number of	As described in detail in Response ORG9-63, the project proposes an operational model that would result in a lower employee rate than that of other standard hotels. Thus, the project is not expected to result in a

Comment #	Comment	Response
	house sales in Groveland has quadrupled in the past month. This removes them from potential home for employees not provided for onsite. Yosemite National Park does not have enough housing for its employees presently. Many are housed outside the Park. Currently, they have positions that are unfilled due to lack of housing. Terra VI only makes that worse as they plan inadequate onsite housing. The current supply of low cost housing within a 45 minute drive is extremely limited and 100+ employees would greatly exacerbate the local seasonal housing situation. Additionally, inadequate housing could increase highway crowding and air quality as employees drive long distances to and from work. This could mean employees would have to live in Sonora which is more than an hour's drive away.	substantial increase in demand for local housing. Please see Response PUB77-04 for more detail on proposed employee housing and the county's available housing supply.
PUB82-26	• Hydrology – Runoff from the Terra VI site with hardened streets and facilities necessarily must affect the hydrology. Recent experiences with Rush Creek Lodge indicate there will be significant runoff and it will contaminate groundwater. Special consideration needs to be enumerated for protecting runoff during construction.	The commenter expresses concerns regarding stormwater runoff but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. Water and stormwater drainage is evaluated in Chapter 4.10, Hydrology and Water Quality, of the Draft EIR.
PUB82-27	• Public Lands – The DEIR indicates there would be Less Than Significant impact on public lands. This is just not true. For example, Yosemite National Park has experienced significant crowding over the past few years. So much so, the Park Service has instituted measures to reduce the crowding. To suggest Terra VI would have no impact or even help is ludicrous.	The Draft EIR considers impacts to recreational facilities against the standards of significance listed in Section 4.15.5.2, which focus on whether the project would cause the physical deterioration of a recreational facility or require the construction of new or physically altered facilities. The use or crowding alone of a facility does not constitute a significance CEQA impact. As noted on page 4.14-22 of the Draft EIR, Yosemite National Park receives 4 million annual visitors; the number of daily visitors who might visit the park as guests of the proposed project is nominal compared to this level of annual visitation. In addition, it can be reasonably expected that the proposed project would largely

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
		accommodate visitors who are already planning to visit Yosemite National Park or other destinations in the region, rather than generate new visitors to the region, which would further reduce the proposed project's effect on Yosemite National Park's visitor levels.
PUB82-28	Conclusions. Tuolumne County must ensure the EIR contains mitigation for the above articulated and very significant, yet poorly addressed items. To that end, I propose the following conditions for the Terra VI County Permit to proceed. • An emergency services facility be built and staffed for fire, medical and law enforcement. This facility would be located between Sawmill Mountain Road and the Yosemite National Park boundary. Full funding for facility and staffing must be provided by the projects.	The commenter provides a suggestion regarding emergency services on the project site but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. Emergency services are evaluated in Chapter 4.14, Public Services and Recreation, of the Draft EIR. Please also see Master Response 6.
PUB82-29	• Adequate water supplies be identified including a very significant and dedicated firefighting supply and a supporting infrastructure be developed.	The commenter provides a suggestion regarding water supply for firefighting but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. Water supply is evaluated in Chapter 4.10, Hydrology and Water Quality, and Chapter 4.17, Wildfire, of the Draft EIR.
PUB82-30	• Water supplies, including backup supplies, must be clearly delineated. When such would be necessary, supplies for other developments as well as Groveland/Big Oak Flat would be likewise impacted and in short supply.	The commenter provides a suggestion regarding water supply but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. Water supply is evaluated in Chapter 4.10, Hydrology and Water Quality, of the Draft EIR.
PUB82-31	• Much better plans for onsite groundwater runoff during storms must be delineated during construction as well as daily operations so as to not contaminate Tuolumne River.	The commenter makes a statement regarding water supply but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. Water supply is evaluated in Chapter 4.10, Hydrology and Water Quality, of the Draft EIR.

Comment #	Comment	Response
PUB82-32	• Highway improvements must be recognized and provided for in conjunction with other nearby projects. These must be paid for by the Terra VI project and completed before construction begins.	The commenter provides a suggestion regarding highway improvements but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. Highway improvements are evaluated in Chapter 4.15, Transportation, of the Draft EIR.
PUB82-33	• Terra VI must be required to provide total employee housing onsite - this includes projected counts as well as room for future growth. Only in this way would there be a Less Than Significant on today's housing market.	The commenter provides a suggestion regarding employee housing but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. Employee housing is evaluated in Chapter 4.14, Population and Housing, of the Draft EIR.
PUB82-34	I am astounded that between the consultant that prepared this DEIR and Tuolumne County on whose behalf it was prepared, there were so many blatant errors and omissions. Some of the worst are in the area of wildfire risk, emergency response, and who would end up paying for all of the above. It is very disappointing that Tuolumne County released two very lengthy DEIRs at almost the same time, during summer months when many residents are unavailable, and during the Covid crisis. The lack of consideration for review extension could lead one to the conclusion the County was trying to minimize resident review and comment and rush approval. This is not the manner in which I expect Tuolumne County to act as guardians of the integrity of developments within our County.	The comment provides a summary of statements made in comments PUB82-01 through PUB82-33 and expresses concern that the public review period of the Draft EIR was not extended. Please see Master Response 1, which explains the County's decision not to extend the public review period of the Draft EIR.
PUB83	**Tricia Cline Brown, July 30, 2020**	
PUB83-01	Our family has owned a parcel adjacent to the proposed development since the mid-1940's. Our family and friends have been enjoying the South Fork, Middle Fork, Sawmill Mountain and the Groveland community for five generations. This letter is in response to the "Terra Vi DEIR," which included extensive appendices, well test reports, site plans, and past comments. This document dismisses items that are considered relevant to the safety and well-being of the neighboring communities and the general public that frequent the Highway 120 corridor in Tuolumne County.	The comment provides an introduction to the comment below. Please see Responses PUB83-02 through PUB83-07.
PUB83-02	The First Issue to address is the Parcel and Zoning Questions: This DEIR is doing a report on a parcel that was never legally subdivided in compliance with the	The commenter expresses concerns regarding zoning but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
	Tuolumne County Ordinance. As a property within the community of the Manly property we would like the County to follow the proper procedure and notification for a divide and rezoning.	EIR. Zoning is evaluated in Chapter 4.11, Land Use Planning, of the Draft EIR.
PUB83-03	The Second Issue to address is the Timberland Conversion: The matter of conversion of the site from commercial forest use to a non-forest use. The DEIR notes that the project could have a significant impact on the environment <u>if it results in the conversion of forest land to non-forest use.</u> The DEIR text clearly acknowledges that the project would result in a conversion of the project site from a focus on timber management to a focus on recreation. Over past decades, when projects affecting forest lands have been reviewed, Tuolumne County planning commissioners and county supervisors have historically strongly advocated for strict and thorough review of the impact of converting commercial timberlands to other uses.	Please see Responses ORG9-89 and PUB80-04.
PUB83-04	Third Issue is Fire Risk: The Grand Jury published a report on June 3, 2020 a Tuolumne County Fire Safety Report. (which can be found on the County's website: 2020 Grand Jury Report | Tuolumne County, CA - Official Website) The report states "Of the 20 most destructive Fires in California's History, 10 have happened within the last four years….Recent wildfires events in Tuolumne County include the 2013 Rim Fire that burned more than 257,000 acres over 68 days.." it continues to state that "A mass evacuation will always be difficult on neighborhood roads that are two lanes, winding and easily blocked by one fallen tree, power poles, or abandoned vehicles across a road." Adding a 250+ room hotel, employees, and the general public along with the properties already there, this project would cause a massive potential for disaster with hundreds of guests and employees attempting to evacuate along with the owners of properties adjacent to the proposed project.	The commenter expresses concerns regarding wildfire but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. This topic is evaluated in Chapter 4.17, Wildfire, of the Draft EIR. Please also see Master Response 5.
PUB83-05	The Fourth Issues is Water Supply: All properties currently get their water supply from wells. Terra Vi's well testing failed. With the indicated required draw on the water table, the project could and probably would leave the Sawmill Community with no water. The is no documented mitigation for this. The DEIR finding of Less Than Significant is based on just the minimum required tests that in no way confirm that any of the onsite wells have sufficient volume of recharge to be a permanent water source for the large scale of this development. All the other local, large hotels that are also in granite sub-strata have struggled to provide sufficient water.	Please see Response ORG6-42.

Comment #	Comment	Response
	The DEIR does not appropriately state that the water flow testing showed that the pump test was a failure in providing the appropriate water that would meet the demand of such a project. There is no mitigation for depriving the surrounding properties of their water supply.	
PUB83-06	The Fifth issue is Forest Service Road: Terra Vi is assuming they would have access from the Sawmill Mountain Road (Forest Route IS03). Their main circulation, access and egress is all planned for using this route. However, a Forest Route, such as IS03, is for forest administration and forest access. Also, Forest Route IS03 is the only access that the 15 cabins in the 80-acre homestead have. Considering that the planned site for Terra Vi has an alternative access approved by CalTrans 200 yards east along Highway 120, the alternative would be the most appropriate access to such a planned project.	As noted on page 6-5 of the Draft EIR, the County considered an alternative under which the project site access would be via Highway 120 but rejected this alternative from further consideration. The alternative was rejected because, as the project's access points do not create any significant CEQA impacts, consideration of this alternative is not warranted.
PUB83-07	The Sixth issue is Waste Water: The DEIR does not address the potential for system failure of the waste water treatment system. The failure of the system would result in contaminating the water supply for the 15 resident cabins, the Middle Fork of the Tuolumne River, and also could be in violation of the clean water act. The DEIR completely overlooks the negative impact of a waste water treatment failure. The USGS Ascension Mountain quad map (photo-inspected 1992) shows a spring located outside the project boundaries, 300± feet to the north (the same off-site aquatic feature shown in the NWI map). On the quad map, the spring flows into an unnamed perennial channel that flows northwest into the Middle Tuolumne River and, based on topography, EC-01 also would be expected to flow into the same off-site perennial channel 300± feet north of the project boundaries and subsequently to the Middle Fork Tuolumne River. What does this tell us? These concerns address only a few of the issues; as this DEIR is over 1,200 plus pages with a short time granted to review not only the Terra Vi DEIR but also the Under Canvas DEIR, the county is limiting the community's ability to adequately respond to all the misinformation and lack of facts this DEIR provides.	Please see Response ORG6-32.
PUB84	**Mary Beth Campbell, July 30, 2020**	
PUB84-01	As you know, the purpose of an EIR is to make the case for development of a project in regards to health and public safety and to prevent or minimize damage to the environment through development of project alternatives, mitigation measures, and mitigation monitoring. This DEIR is flawed and does not adequately make the case that this project should be built nor does it	Please see Master Response 4 regarding emergency evacuation.

Comment #	Comment	Response
	offer reasonable, effective or adequate mitigation measures in many areas. Following are the areas of greatest concern in regards to this DEIR: 1. FIRE The DEIR does not adequately address the Project's potential wildfire risks. The proposed Project is located in a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone, and the Project site itself has burned multiple times, most recently in the 2013 Rim Fire. Future wildfire is a likely possibility and, thus, adequate measures must be taken to address it. This EIR does not do that, instead it simply asserts "mitigations" but fails to make the case that those mitigations make the impact of the project "Less than Significant", specifically in regards to the following: A. EVACUATION: No Overall Plan: While there is reference to pre-fire evacuation plans and identifiable "evacuation triggers", there is no evacuation plan included in this DEIR. As such, it is impossible to evaluate the effectiveness and consider the pitfalls of any proposed evacuation plan because there is not one.	
PUB84-02	Unrealistic Protocol: The DEIR also states in table 4.17-2 on page 4.17-23, that the hotel would be able to keep guests safe through the "monitoring of both weather conditions and nearby incidents"; it then goes on to assert that guests "…would be notified to evacuate early to minimize peak traffic on Highway 120 in the event of an incident that requires evacuation." This assumes that 1) there is time to make such an assessment and, 2) guests would actually leave in a timely manner and 3) no one else is trying to evacuate the area at the same time. Given the rapid travel rate of the Tubbs Fire (2017) and the Camp Fire (2018) and the number of people who died because of its explosive escalation, simply having a plan to "monitor" any incidents is inadequate and does not fully address the very real potential of a fire moving so quickly, that the amount people who need to evacuate from, 1) Terra Vi, 2) the nearby residences on 1S03, 3) campsites, 4) Under Canvas, 5) Hardin Flat 6) Rush Creek, 7) Evergreen Lodge and, 8) Yosemite Park, would not be able to do so in an effective and safe manner.	Please see Master Response 4 regarding emergency evacuation.
PUB84-03	Highway 120 Access: Further conflating the problem is access to Highway 120 from 1S03 (Sawmill Mountain Road). For all the people that need to evacuate the hotel, the residences camping and other areas, a car needs to drive them out. Currently, 1S03 (Sawmill Mountain Road) is a two lane 22' wide US Forest Service road with only one ingress/egress to Hwy 120 and a dead end in the other direction. The DEIR states that there will be two other egress points added to the project; these are driveways off of 1S03 that go to Hwy 120. The DEIR concludes that this is adequate egress in case of an emergency but offers no supporting evidence for this	Amenities are designed to primarily serve guests only; while the hotel may serve as a venue for occasional public use such as use of meeting rooms, the restaurant would not be open to the public. Some public use of hotel amenities is typical for hotel uses and are therefore reflected in the trip generation

Comment #	Comment	Response
	assertion in regards to 1S03 or its capacity in such an event. There is no analysis of the number of cars that would need to evacuate the area in an emergency nor is there a proposed evacuation plan to review for efficacy and safety. The DEIR also seems to assume that the only people who would need to evacuate are the hotel's guests, but does not account for day visitors who would be eating at the restaurant or otherwise using the facility. Furthermore, the Under Canvas project across from Terra Vi on Hwy 120 proposes the use of 1S09, another forest service route directly across from 1S03, as their egress in case of an emergency. This complicates evacuation even more and creates greater potential for a significant log jam on Hwy 120 in the case of an emergency.	rates used in the transportation analysis. In order for building permits to be issued, the proposed project would be required to undergo thorough review by the County Building and Fire Department and be found in compliance with applicable codes, such as the CBC, CFC, and County Code requirements. The number, size, and design of access roadways are subject to these codes. Please see Master Response 4 for more details on evacuation.
PUB84-04	B. HEIGHTENED FIRE RISK: The introduction of the project, the construction and its guests substantially increase the potential threat of wildfire to the surrounding community. The DEIR offers no mitigation for this threat beyond vegetation management, training, some fire prevention protocol and building features. These attempts at mitigation do not remove the threat, and the EIR fails to prove with significant analysis that these efforts result in a "Less than Significant" impact. According to an LA Times article titled, "Human caused ignitions spark California's worst wildfires but get little state focus," published on January 5th, 2020, "Of the known causes of the state's 20 most destructive wildfires, all are human-related." Further it states that, "Researchers who analyzed two decades of U.S. records found that, from 1992 to 2012, human activity was responsible for 84% of the wildfires and 44% of the area burned nationally." For California, overall data suggests that, "…in much of California, more than 90% of the wildfires are started by people or their equipment." The construction, the guests, the day visitors to the lodge and the lodge itself (fire pits, barbeque areas, a commercial kitchen) all pose significant wildfire threat and yet, the DEIR suggests the project's features such as building locations, landscaping, etc. are mitigating measures that offer "Wildfire Risk Reduction" that would limit wildfires and keep people safe. One safety mitigation proposed is mentioned multiple times is a basement in the hotel where it is presumed guests and staff would go to shelter in place from a fire. Unless that basement is actually a certified "Fire Bunker" that meets all safety regulations, the guests who opt for this "safety measure" would have to withstand up to 2000 degree heat to survive. The DEIR suggests that this	Please see Response ORG6-04. Fire prevention features are focused on reducing fire risks. It is not practical for any existing or proposed project to be constructed or operated in a manner that would result in the complete elimination of those risks occurring. The Draft EIR acknowledges the inherit risks associated with introducing additional structures into a high fire hazard area. The Draft EIR states under Impact WF-2, "the project has the potential to, due to the increase of people and vehicles on the project site, exacerbate wildfire risks and expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or uncontrolled spread of wildfire" and includes Mitigation Measure WF-2.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
	"basement" would suffice for escape from fire, among other disasters. The DEIR offers no indication as to its size, egress/ingress, how many people it would hold or what its specific construction would be. Instead, in table 4.17-2 on page 4.17-21, it talks about air filtering and ventilation for the "people harbored" with no mention of the number it holds or level of heat resistance. It simply does not discuss any particular features that would be necessary to survive a wildfire while sheltering in place in a basement. Because the DEIR lacks such detail in regards to this feature, one is left to assume it is more of a standard basement which would, ultimately, be a deathtrap for anyone who sought shelter there during a fire. The DEIR offers no explanation of what this basement would provide in the way of safety from a fire and thus, it is impossible to determine if this mitigation would truly be effective in keeping people safe in the event of a wildfire. Further, the proposed basement and the other building features mentioned do not prevent a wildfire from occurring, nor do they mitigate the possibility of one happening; these mitigations simply aim to prevent a fire's rapid spread. Thus, the DEIR fails to prove that the project would not expose people and structures to significant risks in regards to wildfire.	
PUB84-05	C. WILDFIRE RESPONSE AND SUPPORT Public Services: While the DEIR acknowledges that the project will not be adequately served with existing fire services as the site is located 17 miles away (a 20-25-minute drive at best) from the nearest Fire Station, it fails to, however, prove that this will be a Less than Significant Impact. In the Executive Summary, Table 1-1, page 1-30 under "Public Services and Recreation", it acknowledges that this project could cause a potential increase in demand for fire protection services, especially when considered in combination with cumulative projects which would be considered "Significant"; it then indicates that with Mitigation Measure PS-1, the impact will be "Less than Significant". Mitigation Measure PS-1 amounts to volunteer firefighter training, two emergency staff on premises at all times and PPE for all personnel, and that is all. The DEIR fails to elucidate how any of these mitigation measures would be beneficial or effective in the case that a fast moving wildfire hits the area and immediate calls for service are needed. It fails to make clear how people would be safe and not harmed with these meager mitigations in place. It also does not consider the impact of multiple calls in the region should there be a widespread emergency. The DEIR must include clearer, more reasonable and effective mitigation measures in regards to public service and response times for fire safety.	Please see Response ORG6-20.
PUB84-06	D. GENERAL PLAN INCONSISTENCY IN REGARDS TO FIRE The DEIR is not consistent with the Tuolumne County General Plan in regards to Fire Protection and Risk Management as articulated in Goal 9G in the Tuolumne County General Plan which	In line with General Plan Goal 9.G.3, the Draft EIR analyzes the impact the proposed development would have on fire protection

Comment #	Comment	Response
	states: "Establish and maintain a codified fire protection risk management strategy which requires new development within Tuolumne County to incorporate or supply fire protection infrastructure and improvements necessary so that such development does not exceed the capabilities of the County's fire protection resources." While the DEIR addresses 9G by referring to policies and implementation text for 9.G.1, 9.G.2 and 9.G.4, it completely ignores 9.G.3, which also applies to this project: "9.G.3 - Determine the impact the proposed development will have on the provision of fire protection services and maintain the established level of service as outlined in the current Tuolumne County Fire Department Service Level Stabilization Plan." This project will, in fact, keep service from being maintained at the established level for the area and, further, it applies significant strain on the system. Because policy 9.G.3 was completely left out of the DEIR altogether, no mitigation measure is suggested. This gives the impression that this policy was passed over intentionally. The DEIR must more fully address and ameliorate this inconsistency between the DEIR and the Tuolumne County General Plan.	services. Maintaining an established level of service is a County-level goal and not necessarily an objective of any one project.
PUB84-07	2. UTILITIES AND INFRASTUCTURE A. GENERAL PLAN INCONSISTENCY In regards to water service, the DEIR is not consistent with the County of Tuolumne's General Plan, specifically in Goals 3A, 3B, and 3E as delineated on the following pages: "GOAL 3A: Establish standards for water service for new development and protect the quality and quantity of existing supplies of ground and surface water." The DEIR fails to indicate how Goal 3A is accomplished especially when considered in regards to the following Goal 3A policies, which were simply omitted from the DEIR: • <u>Policy 3.A.2: Require new commercial development to be served by public water systems, except for development in areas designated as Special Commercial on the General Plan land use diagrams.</u> • <u>Implementation Program</u> <u>3.A.a - Utilize the Special Commercial (SC) General Plan land use designation on property</u>	While it is the County's policy to site new commercial development in areas served by public water systems, the proposed project's commercial use is allowed on the project site per the existing General Plan land use designation (Parks and Recreation) and zoning (Commercial Recreation).

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
	suitable for commercial development of a neighborhood, rural or tourist-oriented nature but lacking service from a public water system. Development of a commercial nature on land designated SC is allowed with applicant permits without having service from a public water or sewer system, but only where service is not reasonably available." The DEIR clearly fails to address these General Plan policies and is, in fact, in direct contradiction to them. This commercial project is located well outside existing infrastructure, and yet, no requirement is being made for the project to be "served by public water systems", as is required per Policy 3.A.2. Further, Policy 3.A.2, goes on to define that a commercial development not served by public water is allowed "in areas designated as Special Commercial (SC)" in the General Plan Land Use Designations. The parcels for this project are not designated SC, so it is unclear how the project is able to develop its own water service infrastructure when it is clearly in defiance of the County's own General Plan policies. The implementation text in 3.A.a indicates how to accomplish this goal, stating that the County should utilize land designated Special Commercial for suitable commercial projects where a public water system is not present. Again, these proposed development parcels are not SC designated and the DEIR fails to address this inconsistency with the General Plan which could be considered a fatal flaw.	
PUB84-08	"GOAL 3B: Plan new development and water supply infrastructure in a cooperative fashion." While the term, "cooperative fashion" is vague, through the language of the goal, the policies set forth therein and the OAV3 statement on page 3-1, it can be assumed to refer to cooperating with known stakeholders in regards to water supply and infrastructure. The DEIR attempts to address this goal but falls short specifically in regards to this policy: "Policy 3.B.2: Consider whether the water system proposed to serve a new development has a reliable source of water, sized to serve their existing and future customer's' foreseeable demands. Projects shall only be approved where the water supply system has reliable sources of water capable of meeting present and future demands. " CEQA requires proof that a project has a reliable water supply to "serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years." The DEIR analysis does not substantially prove the water supply is reliable, and not only for Terra Vi, but for all neighboring residences and businesses under dry/drought conditions. The	The proposed project is consistent with Policy 3.B.2 because the Hydrogeology Study, contained in Appendix G of the Draft EIR, took several measures to account for the differences between the rainfall that had occurred as of the time of the study, and potential dry years, and the results of the study indicated sufficient water supply. Please see Response ORG5-03 for more details.

Comment #	Comment	Response
	groundwater pump test was done in October 2019 after a few years of heavy rainfall and it fails to analyze or estimate how dry/drought years would impact water availability. In fact, the DEIR offers no analysis whatsoever or evidence that the proposed project groundwater withdrawals will not have an adverse impact on consistent groundwater supply during dry year or multi-year drought periods. Operating in "cooperative fashion" would suggest that the project must take into account not only the reliability of its own water, present and future, but also the water of the surrounding community of residences, the existing businesses and the other new commercial developments being proposed. The DEIR fails in this regard.	
PUB84-09	"GOAL 3E: Maintain a healthy environment for the citizenry by setting standards for the types and methods of sewage disposal to be used by new development." Here again the DEIR and the project fails to comply with the General Plan: "Policy 3.E.a: <u>Continue to require</u> new urban and residential development with a density of three dwelling units per acre, or greater, and <u>commercial development, except that on land designated Special Commercial (SC) by the General Plan land use diagrams, to connect to public sewer."</u> In the General Plan, it's clearly stated that it is REQUIRED for new commercial development, unless designated SC, to be connected to a public sewer. In this regard, this DEIR fails to make the case that it is compliant with the General Plan. The DEIR does call out Policy 3.E.2 and acknowledges the need to "…successfully demonstrate that on-site underground sewage disposal can be accomplished with no lessening of quality to ground or surface waters." This is puzzling as it would seem the land needs to be designated SC to do such, but even in this attempt, the DEIR fails to make its case. Instead the DEIR asserts, without evidence, that the project's septic system would not harm water quality. Although the DEIR asserts that the project would meet the necessary regulations, this does not in any way prove that the groundwater would not be contaminated. The DEIR does not take into account nearby residential wells or analyze the potential impact on those wells. A more thorough study must be done to conclude with assuredness that wells in the project area, especially those down slope from the septic and leach fields, will not be contaminated. Overall, the DEIR fails to prove that ground water quality will not be impacted in a Less than Significant way.	The comment refers to Implementation Program 3.Ea of the General Plan; this implementation program applies to "new *urban* and residential development" [emphasis added] and does not apply to rural settings like the project area, where public sewer is not available. Policy 3.E.4 of the General Plan supports this interpretation: "Require development to connect to a public sewer system *if it is reasonably available*." [emphasis added]
PUB84-10	3. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY A. GENERAL PLAN INCONSISTENCY While the DEIR includes much of Goal 14C's objectives in the document, it completely leaves out	The policies referenced by the commenter pertain to urban development, and are not

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
	the goal itself, which states: *"GOAL 14C: Protect and improve the quality and quantity of the County's water resources, while protecting the rights of land owners."* The threat of the water supply diminishing for neighboring wells and groundwater contamination is real and is not at all addressed in this EIR, and while some of the policies of GOAL 14C are referenced, the following policies are ignored: *"Policy 14.C.2: Encourage new urban development to locate in areas where public water and sewer services are available or can be developed.* *Implementation Programs* *14.C.c - Continue to require new urban residential development with a density of one dwelling unit per two acres, or greater, and commercial development, except on land designated as Special Commercial by the General Plan land use diagrams, to be served with public water.* *14.C.d - Continue to require new urban residential development with a density of three dwelling units per acre, or greater, and commercial development, except that on land designated Special Commercial by the General Plan land use diagrams, to connect to public sewer.*	relevant to the more remote location of the proposed project.
PUB84-11	B. WATER DEMAND OF PROJECT UNDERESTIMATED The project underestimates its water demand in that it only calculates the demand for water in regards to hotel guest use and employee housing. It does not factor in other water uses such as cleaning, maintenance, dining and kitchen uses or the impact day guests would have on water demand. The DEIR must accurately calculate the project's TOTAL water needs taking into account all water need on the site; failure to do so violates CEQA.	Water demand calculation presented in Chapter 4-16, Utilities and Service Systems, of the Draft EIR. Revised water demand calculations have been prepared for the proposed project and are contained in Appendix M, Supplemental Hydrogeology Information, of this Final EIR.
PUB84-12	4. LAND USE AND PLANNING CONFLICTS As described by the DEIR: *"The project site is under the Parks and Recreation (R/P) General Plan land use designation, as shown below on Figure 3-2.1 The R/P land use designation is described in the General Plan as intended for recreational uses of commercial nature to serve the tourist industry, while also providing leisure activities for county residents. Typical land uses allowed in this designation include parks, camping facilities, recreational vehicle parks, ski and other resort facilities,*	The project has been designed to minimize visual impacts from Highway 120 and to use vegetation for visual screening when viewing the site from surrounding roadways and properties. Policy consistency is not considered under CEQA, except where related to physical impacts on the

Comment #	Comment	Response
	marinas, and commercial uses in support of such facilities and public utility and safety facilities. Surrounding General Plan land use designations include Rural Residential (RR) and Estate Residential (ER) to the north, Public (P) to the east and west, and Parks and Recreation (R/P) to the south.2" While the project is, indeed, in the R/P land use designation and the proposed use is within the acceptable uses, what the DEIR fails to adequately acknowledge and address is that this project creates an incompatible land use as the 80 acres of land directly adjacent is a combination of Rural Residential and Estate Residential. The DEIR makes an attempt to prove General Plan consistency by referencing one of the goals of General Plan Chapter 1: Community Development and Design in the Aesthetics Chapter of the DEIR, on page 4.1-2: <u>GOAL 1.B: Minimize conflicts between incompatible land uses.</u> The DEIR then indicates application of the following policies "*aimed at preserving the scenic quality of the county*" (pg. 4.1-2) would be in compliance with the General Plan: *"Policy 1.B.3: Require new commercial development to be designed to minimize the visual impact of parking areas on public roads and on public viewsheds.* *Implementing Program* *1.B.g: Require proponents of new commercial development to locate parking areas behind buildings or sufficiently screen them from public roads and public viewsheds, or, if locating behind buildings and screening are determined to be infeasible, provide other landscaping or design features to visually enhance the parking areas." "Policy 1.B.5: Preserve the existing nighttime environment by limiting the illumination of areas surrounding new development. New lighting that is part of residential, commercial, industrial, or recreational development shall be oriented away from offsite sensitive uses, and shall be hooded, shielded, and located to direct light downward and prevent glare."*	environment and as specified in standards of significance (such as in the environmental impact areas of aesthetics, biological resources, energy, GHG emissions, hazards, hydrology, land use, and transportation). Land use compatibility is not, in itself, a CEQA area of impact but conflicts between land uses are addressed as they relate to pertinent environmental topic areas, such as aesthetics (light and glare), air quality, and noise.
PUB84-13	However, the DEIR does NOT address the other elements in Chapter 1: Community Development and Design of the General Plan, including the introduction which states: *"The Community Development and Design Element encourages growth in areas where services exist, such as infrastructure, and directs development away from areas with limited growth*	The comment implies that uses allowed by the project site's General Plan land use designation conflict with General Plan policies regarding land use decisions. The commenter's opinion is noted. The Draft EIR

Comment #	Comment	Response
	potential due to the lack of adequate public services and facilities and/or are constrained by natural characteristics that do not lend themselves to development, such as steep slopes." (Chapter 1, pg, 1-1, Tuolumne County General Plan) As stated in the introduction of Chapter 1, the General Plan clearly discourages development where there is a lack of public services and yet, this fact is totally left out of the DEIR. Also in Chapter 1, under Goal 1B, there are other policy and implementation programs that clearly apply to this project and are flat out ignored in the DEIR, specifically: Policy 1.B.1: Protect existing land uses from the infringement of and impacts associated with incompatible land uses. Implementation Programs 1.B.a - Designate, where possible, land around existing non-residential land uses, such as agriculture, timberlands, mining preserves and industry, for new development that is compatible with these existing uses. 1.B.b - Designate, where possible, land around existing residential neighborhoods for uses that are compatible with residences. Designate areas for new urban residential development away from existing incompatible land uses, such as agriculture, mining, industry, solid waste facilities, airports and sewage treatment facilities. 1.B.c - Separate new urban residential development from land uses that potentially conflict with housing, such as agriculture, mining, industry, airports and sewage treatment facilities. (formerly 1.E.3) 1.B.d - Consider buffer areas around existing industrial land uses to protect them from infringement of new residential and other potentially incompatible land uses. These buffer areas may include building setbacks and/or limiting land uses within an established distance of these existing land uses. By ignoring these obviously applicable policy and implementation program elements, the DEIR also ignores the fact that this project is inconsistent with General Plan. The DEIR, in fact, cherry picks two General Plan policies (1.B.3 and 1.B.5) from Goal 1B to exhibit the	appropriately considers the proposed project in the context of the applicable General Plan land use designation and Zoning district, and found that the proposed project is consistent with both. The General Plan policies and implementation programs cited by the commenter generally refer to land use conflicts between residential and industrial-type uses that are more intensive than the proposed project. While the proposed project does include a package wastewater treatment plant, as described in Master Response 2, impacts associated with the facility were found to be less than significant.

Comment #	Comment	Response
	appearance of "compliance" with the General Plan but, in fact, these two policies only serve the needs of the project by creating more appealing viewsheds and nighttime lighting for the general public. The focus of the DEIR on those two policies does not address the entirety of Goal 1B and thus does not "minimize conflicts between incompatible land uses" with the surrounding area. The DEIR fails to address and apply all of the applicable policies and implementation programs of Goal 1B to the project and, thus, is not consistent with the County's General Plan.	
PUB84-14	5. TRAFFIC AND ROAD SAFETY A. EMERGENCY EVACUATION As discussed earlier, in the case of a massive wildfire, any evacuation would be chaotic and dangerous. This DEIR, however, addresses no evacuation plan whatsoever, not just for fire, but for any other type of emergency. Further, the DEIR suggests that because it does not "impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or an emergency evacuation plan" it is assumed to be of Less than Significant impact. However, there is no further analysis that actually proves this to be true. Simply because a project complies with a regulation, does not actually mean it is a feasible and safe measure. Further evaluation must be done and a reasonable plan developed for safe and effective evacuation in any circumstance.	Please see Master Response 4 regarding emergency evacuation.
PUB84-15	B. CONSTRUCTION IMPACTS The DEIR states that, "The number of trips made by construction vehicles . . . would not exceed the amount of traffic accessing the site during operation of the project." This might be true, but no support is provided in the form of a construction traffic volume estimate. DEIR, p. 1.45-15	The amount of vehicular travel occurring during construction by employees and trucks will vary from day to day based on the nature of construction activity occurring at given time. The project has estimated that during construction there would be 18 work trips for site preparation, 20 worker trips for grading, 181 worker trips and 70 vendor trips for building construction, 15 worker trips for paving, and 36 worker trips for architectural coating.
PUB84-16	C. VMT ANALYSIS The DEIR states that Tuolumne County had not adopted a standard of significance regarding VMT, stating that "Tuolumne County is in the process of establishing significance criteria based on VMT thresholds, and alternative criteria are under consideration within the context of OPR guidance." There is never any indication which (if any) of three alternative criteria was used in the analysis. This begs the question, if there is no adopted criteria, how can significance be credibly determined?	The Draft EIR describes that alternative approaches to developing significance criteria that were developed by the Tuolumne County Transportation Commission (TCTC) and were being considered by Tuolumne County when the Draft EIR was prepared. These alternatives are described in detail in the Transportation

Comment #	Comment	Response
		Impact Analysis contained in Appendix J of the Draft EIR, starting on page 29. The Draft EIR VMT analysis makes use of thresholds customized to specific regions of Tuolumne County, as noted below. • *Thresholds customized to specific regions of Tuolumne County based on sub-regional VMT forecasts under the General Plan. The third approach is to develop custom thresholds specific to the currently planned vision for various regions of the County, taking into account where and when growth is projected to occur. This threshold Transportation Impact Study for the Terra Vi Resort Project Page 30 Tuolumne County, CA (June 15, 2020) recognizes that as a rural county development in some locations inherently generates higher levels of VMT than the countywide average for similar development. This threshold would compare the VMT metrics of the project with the characteristics of similar uses within specific regions of the County.* Because "per room" VMT identified for Terra Vi is less than that estimate for typical rural hotels in this area of Tuolumne County, the project's impact on VMT is less than significant. Please see Appendix P of this Final EIR for an updated VMT analysis.
PUB84-17	D. CUMULATIVE ROADWAY SAFETY IMPACTS The DEIR does not analyze how traffic from the Project, together with traffic from the Yosemite Under Canvas development, the Thousand Trails/Yosemite Lakes RV Expansion, the Berkeley	The project Transportation Impact Analysis contained in Appendix J of the Draft EIR describes the cumulative effects on traffic

Comment #	Comment	Response
	Tuolumne Camp Restoration project, and the Mountain Sage Conditional Use Permit project, would cumulatively affect the roadway safety.	from background traffic growth and other projects in the Transportation Impact Analysis. Projected conditions satisfy the requirements of the Tuolumne County General Plan. Please see Response ORG6-68 for information regarding cumulative safety.
PUB84-18	E. PROPOSED 120 IMPROVEMENTS The Project would cause a sight distance "deficiency" at the intersection of SR-120/Sawmill Mountain Road that would need to be mitigated. The "Construction" section of the DEIR, on pg 4.15-15 references project-related improvements proposed along SR 120 near the site – an eastbound left-turn lane, a westbound right-turn lane, and an eastbound receiving lane on SR 120 and it is noted that, "These improvements are outside of the project site within the Caltrans right-of-way." There will need to be some cutting of the hillside within the Caltrans right-of-way, which is beyond the limits of the project site or the jurisdiction of the County. Thus, this impact should have been identified as Significant and Unavoidable, as there is no certainty that it this will be accomplished as the DEIR does not provide any evidence to suggest that Caltrans would approve this roadway project.	Please see Response PUB8-04. Caltrans has reviewed the Draft EIR and is aware of the proposed improvements and has indicated that approval for the design will occur through an encroachment permit. As part of the permit process, Caltrans will review the traffic operations information developed for the EIR within the context of Highway Design Manual guidelines to confirm the applicability of proposed improvements. Design changes deemed necessary by Caltrans will be identified. If any deviation from HDM standards is needed and supported by Caltrans, the adopted process for design exceptions is initiated, ultimately leading to Caltrans approval of construction documents.
PUB84-19	F. 1SO3 IS A US FOREST SERVICE ROAD 1S03, also known as Sawmill Mountain Road is, in fact, not a standard road at all. It is a 22' wide road with no shoulder that leads to 15 residences and then continues on deep in to the forest. It is a dead end road that is paved in some parts and not in others. It has always been a "fire road" meant for fire and forest maintenance operations and, except for being used as access to the residences there, that is the only way it has ever been used. This road was not meant nor is it suited for the type of vehicular, bicycle and pedestrian traffic this project will generate. It is an inappropriate use that unnecessarily puts the residents of 1S03 as well as hotel guests and visitors in harm's way, especially if there should be an emergency. Use of this road for commercial purposes also creates a hazard for the Forest Service should they need to access the road quickly. Every other lodging facility on Hwy 120 has their main entrance off of the highway; the DEIR has not made the case that Terra Vi should be the exception to this. No explanation is	Regarding the proposed use of the forest route, please see Responses ORG6-14 and PUB48-03. As noted on page 6-5 of the Draft EIR, the County considered an alternative under which the project site access would be via Highway 120 but rejected this alternative from further consideration. The alternative was rejected because, as the project's access points do not create any significant CEQA

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
	offered for using 1S03 as the main entrance road except that it "already exists" which leads one to believe that this was a decision made out of convenience for the developer and not out of "best practice". The use of this road as the main entrance creates a plethora of issues in regards to safety that have been previously addressed in this letter. An alternate route must be considered and studied in earnest because up until this point it is clear that it has not been.	impacts, consideration of this alternative is not warranted.
PUB84-20	6. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES Threatened and Endangered Resources: The DEIR does not adequately address the many threatened and endangered resources that are potentially present on the property. The mitigations suggested do not prove or in any way inspire confidence that, should endangered species and/or habitats found, they would not be destroyed. Over and over again the DEIR suggests education and fencing off of such areas. There is no indication or assurances that such measures are actually effective in the type of construction this project would require. It is not reasonable that a portion of such a large project could be fenced off for protection without somehow being damaged or destroyed. More effective and reasonable mitigations must be explored in order to protect he biological resources on the site. Further, more observation must be done over time to ensure that no such threatened or endangered species exist on the site, as the DEIR asserts. This DEIR indicates that limited observation over a limited time period was the determining factor regarding what exists on the land and what doesn't. More time and care must be taken to guarantee that all threatened and endangered biological resources have been observed.	The scope of special status plants and animals to be addressed, per standard professional practice, is to consult the California Natural Diversity Database and the United States Fish and Wildlife Service official species lists and address all species identified. This is included in the Biological Assessment. The consultant additionally included an analysis of plants included in the California Native Plant Society Inventory or Rare and Endangered Plants, Calflora databases and other species addressed in the Tuolumne County Wildlife Project maps and extensive online resources related to studies of critical deer winter range. Assurances are provided as mitigation monitoring provisions included with each mitigation measure. As required by CEQA, and as part of the EIR certification process, the County will include a Mitigation Monitoring or Reporting Plan which will list all mitigation measures and identify the responsible party for ensuring that the mitigation measures are followed, including any requirements for long term monitoring. Biological studies of the project site were performed over three years. Studies occurred in 2018 and 2019. A supplemental study was performed in 2020 in accordance with Mitigation Measures BIO-1.13 and BIO-

Comment #	Comment	Response
		1.14 with a subsequent seed collection. The adequacy of surveys and analysis performed for the project is consistent with and in many instances exceeds, the level performed for similar projects.
PUB84-21	Deer Migration: This land is a well known deer habit and winter migration area. While the DEIR asserts that this area has a low to moderate suitability as a deer movement corridor (DEIR, pg 4.3-59) the reality is that this area is covered with deer in the winter and spring months. Yet, there is no mitigation suggested for the removal of this deer habit and little concern given to the fact that an important corridor will be lost. Yes, there is fencing proposed to keep the deer out of the area and out of the way of cars and traffic, but that does not address the loss of their habitat. The DEIR must more adequately address this issue.	Deer associated with migratory deer herds behave differently from resident deer. Migratory deer herds move quickly between their summer and winter grounds (in a matter of days) and vice versa. The project site is not within the prime "high value" migratory deer corridor (it has low-to-moderate suitability). High value migratory corridor areas are located more north of the project site (See Figure 4.3-10 on page 4.3-60 of the Draft EIR). Proximity to the highway, Sawmill Mountain Road and existing residences reduce the value of the project site for migratory deer herd movements. High value migratory corridor is not being removed by the proposed project. Open space preserved at the project site located farthest from the highway, existing residences, the proposed hotel, and away from Sawmill Mountain Road would be retained and will allow deer to forage as they move between their destination wintering and summering grounds—consistent with the site's designation as low-to-moderate value habitat. Deer that remain in the area for weeks are unlikely to be part of the migratory deer herd but are more likely to be resident deer that have developed a higher tolerance for human activity.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
		The contribution of the project to the overall, cumulative impacts of development on the deer herd is addressed on pages 4.3-51 through 4.3-61 of the Draft EIR. Mitigation Measures BIO-4.1 and BIO-4.2 address the project's contribution to the potential cumulative impacts of the project on migratory deer.
PUB84-22	7. CUMULATIVE IMPACTS Currently, there are four developments and use permits being pursued in this area of the County. They are as follows: • The Terra Vi Lodge Yosemite project: a proposed master-planned lodging development that would be located directly north of the project site across State Highway 120 and includes a public market, a general lodge with multipurpose indoor and outdoor areas, 100 guestrooms, 7 cabins providing 26 guestrooms, and 5 employee housing units. • The Berkeley Tuolumne Restoration project: approximately 2.7 miles southeast of the project site at 31585 Hardin Flat Road, which would include 90 cabins to replace a similar use lost during the 2013 Rim Fire. • Consideration of a Use Permit for the Mountain Sage Nursery in Groveland to conduct occasional special events. • The Thousand Trails/Yosemite Lakes RV expansion project: a proposed 150-site expansion of the existing Yosemite Lakes RV Resort, divided between RV sites, cabins, and employee model home sites, approximately 0.8 mile southeast of the project site at 31191 Hardin Flat Road. While this DEIR does address some of the cumulative impacts of these projects, it never analyzes or studies the true cumulative impact of all of these projects being sited within about a three mile radius. Over and over again the DEIR states that there will be "little to no significance" in regards to just about every single aspect of this projects, from fire threat, to water, to traffic, to noise to aesthetics; somehow this DEIR finds a way to mitigate its way to "LTS" in almost every scenario. This DEIR fails to seriously consider the cumulative impacts in almost every area. Until a more thorough and earnest analysis is done of how all these projects will impact the area, this DEIR should not be finalized. It would be irresponsible to do so because the true impact of ALL of these projects will never be studied and thus known to the public.	The focus of a cumulative analysis in an EIR is whether the proposed project that is the subject of that EIR would create a cumulatively considerable impact. Therefore, the Draft EIR considers whether the Terra Vi project would contribute to a significant cumulative impact, and does not assess in detail the specific impacts of the other projects included in the cumulative analysis. Section 15130, Discussion of Cumulative Impacts, of the CEQA Guidelines requires an EIR to discuss a project's cumulative impacts "when the project's incremental effect is cumulatively considerable." As defined in Section 15065, Mandatory Findings of Significance, of the CEQA Guidelines, a project's impacts are cumulatively considerable when "the incremental effects of an individual project are significant when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probably future projects." As the commenter does not provide specific details or evidence as to why particular cumulative impact discussions are

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
		inadequate, a more detailed response cannot be provided.
PUB84-23	8. Noise The DEIR does not accurately nor adequately assess the project's impact in regards to noise and does not provide enough evidence for the conclusion that its impacts would be "Less than Significant", specifically in regards to construction noise and overall noise impacts. There are multiple residences located close to the Project site that would be impacted by Project noise, but the DEIR largely addresses impacts to only one residence. The DEIR fails to specify the number of homes in the area, their specific location or their distance from the Project. The Project will generate noise from sources including vehicle traffic, truck circulation, a loading dock, and an outdoor generator. The DEIR fails to provide adequate mitigation for these impacts. The DEIR also concludes that construction-related noise would be less than significant suggesting that these impacts would be "short-term." A construction project that lasts two years cannot be considered short-term. In regards to helicopter noise, the DEIR determines this to be "significant and unavoidable" and fails to identify any mitigation for this issue. The DEIR admits that helicopter takeoff and landing from the Project helipad would produce substantial increases in daytime and nighttime noise but it does not adequately analyze how helicopter-related noise would impact residents in the area or identify adequate mitigation for these impacts.	Please see Response ORG6-46, Response ORG6-58, and Appendix L, Supplemental Noise Analysis, of this EIR.
PUB84-24	8. SUMMARY At the end of the project description in section 3.4 on page 3-28 the requirements for permits and approvals are delineated, this explanation includes the following: *"The community development director shall find that the proposed development would not be substantially detrimental to the health, safety, or general welfare of persons residing or working in the neighborhood of the project site, and that the development would be consistent with the Tuolumne County General Plan."* Based on this flawed document, from miscalculations, to omissions to lack of consistency with the general plan, it would be difficult to assert that this project is not detrimental to the health, safety or general welfare of persons residing or working in the neighborhood of the project site and that the development would be consistent with the Tuolumne County General Plan. Such a finding would be irresponsible on the County's part. This DEIR is not sound enough and does not make the case that the risks the project proposes are worth the reward.	The project provides a summary of the comments above. Please see Responses PUB84-01 through PUB84-23.

Comment #	Comment	Response
	Project alternatives have not been seriously considered or vetted. While they are mentioned at the end, their viability is not addressed in earnest. Project alternatives must be fully considered in a more serious way than they are in this DEIR. Overall, the DEIR does not adequately make the case for this project; without further environmental review this DEIR should not be finalized and this project should not move forward.	
PUB85	Douglas and Alicia Cask, July 30, 2020	
PUB85-01	Our Family has owned the Paden Family Property since the early 1940's, when purchased by our Grandfather Haskell Paden. It is located at 11311 Sawmill Mountain Road- Groveland Ca-Hwy 120- Tualumne *[sic]* County. We have just today been made aware of several large, pending resort developments that will be located directly right next door and across the street to our property line. These Resorts will be clearly seen from every inch and acre of our family property. The Resorts will be built right up to our property line, all on this previously quiet country cul de sac, private road. Our little one lane windy mountain road is very clearly not equipped for the influx of people and cars, that will result from allowing these resorts to be built. The masses will be speeding down this winding dirt road to our gorgeous river, for a quick day trip to find the next spot to post on social media, and inundate our paradise with trash and human waste. The trout fishing will just disappear from the result of all the humans trashing it, and the wild life and natural plants and fruits will all but be gone from human abuse and disregard. The animals and land are just now bouncing back and recovering from the devastating Rim Fire over 6 years ago, that cruelly took our treasured 70 year old family cabin. Our family would just be heartbroken all over again to see humans destroy the beautiful nature around it completely. In the last two days, We have seen in our little neighborhood, a Mama Bear and her two Cubs, a Bobcat, Mountain Quail, Mountain Stellar Blue Jays, Red headed Wood Peckers, Tree and Ground Squirrels, Rainbow Trout, and Deer. These many endangered species will quickly disappear if multiple, unneccessary *[sic]* resorts are	The commenter expresses concerns regarding traffic and impacts to wildlife but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. These topics are evaluated in Chapter 4.15, Transportation, and Chapter 4.3, Biological Resources, of the Draft EIR.

Comment #	Comment	Response
	just blindly approved for nearby Hardin Flats and the Sawmill Mountain Area for mass population, or for any public vacation housing. These plans cannot move forward without any further consideration or input from the local neighborhood landowners who are all Stewards to our gorgeous Forests. In depth geological, traffic, sewage, and water studies are absolutely required and needed, on the impacts to the local endangered wildlife, and what the impact to our local wells and ground water tables that will be drained by these mega resorts, that is happening already to similar resorts right up the road from us now. Please reconsider your approval for ANY FUTURE DEVELOPMENT PLANS going forward in the SAWMILL MOUNTAIN AREA AND HARDIN FLATS AREA ON HIGHWAY 120 TUOLUMNE COUNTY without multiple in depth studies, to the impact on the natural flora, fauna, wild life, and water resources, and to not APPROVE ANY PERMITS to build anymore mega resorts that will endanger our beautiful area. We would like to request to be notified timely, by email or mail on any future public or private meetings, or hearings on this matter.	
PUB86	Pat Cervelli, July 30, 2020	
PUB86-01	I am writing to oppose the project Terra VI. It is located in a very high fire danger zone. With capacity for about 500 guests plus a large number of staff, there is a great likelihood of human-caused fire in this extremely dry environment.	The commenter expresses concerns regarding wildfire but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. This topic is evaluated in Chapter 4.17, Wildfire, of the Draft EIR. Please also see Master Response 5.
PUB86-02	In addition, there is no access to public water, only well water which we know can dry up in drought conditions. Mountain Springs Golf Course was built on the promise of well water. Didn't those wells dry up soon after construction of the golf course?	The commenter expresses concerns regarding water supply but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. Water supply is evaluated in Chapter 4.10, Hydrology and Water Quality, of the Draft EIR.
PUB86-03	I live on the Tuolumne River canyon and have experienced two major fires here: the 1987 Complex Fire and the 2013 Rim Fire. We, my neighbors and I who have recently established a Firewise Community, dread anything like this Terra VI development which will only	The commenter expresses concerns regarding wildfire but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. This

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
	increase fire danger to many in our County. I hope you will recommend against building this development.	topic is evaluated in Chapter 4.17, Wildfire, of the Draft EIR. Please also see Master Response 5.
PUB87	Cindy Charles, July 30, 2020	
PUB87-01	I will preface my comments with expressing my frustration at not having adequate time to thoroughly read and analyze the 1,866 page Terra Vi DEIR, given its massive size and the fact it was released within days of the 1,263 page Yosemite Under Canvas DEIR. The Terra Vi DEIR contains voluminous amounts of technical data and various consultant reports. It is utterly impossible for me to adequately access and provide meaningful comments on all the issues and my concerns without having an extension of time beyond the minimum 45 days. It is a great disappointment that the County Community Development Department and Board of Supervisors denied the request for a time extension to comment on the two massive documents. I will repeat that the severe time constraint of understanding two concurrent major development projects is a great burden to community members wishing to provide meaningful comments. There was not a reasonable amount of time provided for me and others to fully research the technical aspects of this project. During the COVID crisis, we are limited in our ability to contact the appropriate experts to help us understand such things as the well testing/hydrology reports, and wastewater treatment systems. The message of denial seems to indicate a lack of genuine interest by the County on hearing what the community has to say. This project, if approved, will result in major, long lasting changes for that region and community.	The comment expresses concern that the public review period of the Draft EIR was not extended. Please see Master Response 1, which explains the County's decision not to extend the public review period of the Draft EIR.
PUB87-02	As a Tuolumne County resident and a member of the Tuolumne River Trust Board of Directors, I am submitting the following comments on the Terra Vi Draft Environmental Impact Report. These comments are not at all my comprehensive comments, but only a selection of some of the major issues. The Terra Vi DEIR seriously understates the impacts without sufficient documented support. The DEIR fails by avoiding complete and balanced treatment of the various impacts or by dismissing the effects as less than significant. The DEIR does not adequately evaluate the environmental impacts of the proposed project nor the very real cumulative effects with neighboring proposed developments. It also lacks comprehensive, realistic mitigation measures which need to be required for those impacts.	The comment provides an introduction to the comments below. Please see Responses PUB87-03 through PUB87-25.
PUB87-03	Water Supply/Hydrology The DEIR fails to adequately address the requirement for sufficiently available water supplies to	Please see Responses ORG5-03, ORG6-40, ORG6-41, and ORG6-42.

Comment #	Comment	Response
	serve the project during normal, dry and multiple dry years. The water testing performed at the project site to date has been the bare minimum for such a pivotal requirement of a reliable water supply. Testing was done only for the minimum 10-day period, in a year (2019) which had higher than average precipitation (Geoscience Report, Figure 8). In fact, 3 out of the last 5 years had above average precipitation, while 4 out of the last 10 years had below average precipitation, with 3 of those years severely below average. It is well known by now that California has very cyclical water year types ranging from critically dry (drought) to extremely wet. The risk of a lack of water has not been adequately studied or addressed. There is no back-up plan in the case of well failure.	
PUB87-04	The DEIR states that water supply for the proposed project would be from onsite groundwater wells and the groundwater at the site occurs in weathered bedrock. These two wells were developed for the project in 2019 and are new, less than 2 years old, without any substantial or robust performance record. It is unknown at this point how the wells will respond to a dry water year or multiple, consecutive dry years	Please see Responses ORG5-03, ORG6-40, ORG6-41, and ORG6-42.
PUB87-05	The proposed development directly across the highway, YUC, which is also depending on the bedrock water source, discussed in its DEIR: • "It is extremely difficult to predict sustainable yield and storage capacity for fractured bedrock aquifers, which are the sole source of groundwater for the project. The lack of regional information on the fractured bedrock aquifers, the absence of readily available well hydrographs for the area, and a reliable data base of groundwater conditions in this area, all contribute to reducing effective estimates of sustainability from groundwater sources." (YUC DEIR, p. G-32) The hydrologist's report for Terra Vi fails to consider this uncertainty of water supply sourced from fractured/weathered bedrock.	Please see Responses ORG6-42 and ORG6-88.
PUB87-06	The DEIR states that the wells would supply the proposed project with 16,636 gallons per day (gpd) that the project is estimated to demand. While the source this project is given as Shamim Engineering Consultants which used "table A, Chapter 4 of the Los Angeles Plumbing code with standard CALGreen reductions based on minimum efficiency fixtures." (p 568), the final DEIR should provide additional information on how these projections were calculated. The methodology for the projection of water use needs to be furnished to support this figure in a transparent manner to support realistic projections.	Revised water demand estimates have been prepared for the proposed project and are included in Appendix M, Supplemental Hydrogeology Information, of this Final EIR. Appendix M provides the assumptions used in calculating water demand.
PUB87-07	The DEIR fails to adequately address concerns regarding impacts to groundwater supply of existing water supply wells in the vicinity of the project site.	Both the narrative and figures in the project Hydrogeology Study (see Appendix G of the

Comment #	Comment	Response
	The Terra Vi DEIR states: • "Pump testing on the project site was conducted during the period when the Yosemite Under Canvas wells were also being tested to ensure that the source capacity assessment would include the potential long-term influences of nearby off-site wells operating at the same time" (p 296) The Terra Vi 10 day well test was conducted between October 23-November 2, 2019 (p 578 Terra Vi DEIR, Volume 2). The testing period for the YUC Well #2 occurred between October 25-November 4th, 2019 and the YUC Well #1 was tested during November 8-November 18, 2019 (pG-28 YUC DEIR). Given these dates, Terra Vi tested its two wells while only YUC's Well #2 was undergoing its 10-day test. The statement above implies that both Terra Vi's wells and both of YUC's wells were undergoing the 10-day testing over the same time period which is not true. Only the effect of YUC's Well 2 was observed on Terra Vi's wells. Terra Vi's DEIR overstates the amount of simultaneous well testing of the two projects.	Draft EIR) indicate that both of the Terra Vi wells were tested simultaneously during the period that the Yosemite Under Canvas project was also testing its well closest to Terra Vi. There is no requirement to test both wells at the same time. The Terra Vi project Hydrogeology Study elected to take a very conservative approach by testing both Terra Vi wells simultaneously, and specifically during the time that Yosemite Under Canvas was testing one of its wells. The testing for the Terra Vi project had no control over the testing plans of Yosemite Under Canvas but elected to conduct a testing program that would allow an evaluation of cumulative impacts of both projects. The project hydrogeologist, Geoscience, made no implication that both Yosemite Under Canvas wells were pumped at the same time. Figures provided in the Geoscience report (see Appendix G of the Draft EIR) show which Yosemite Under Canvas well was being pump simultaneously when the two Terra Vi wells were pumped simultaneously for the 10-day test. The Yosemite Under Canvas project has stated that it does not see a condition where both wells would be needed to be pumped for their project, and the same is true for Terra Vi. Therefore, the Terra Vi analysis is very conservative with regards to the cumulative water supply analysis. Please see Response ORG6-42.
PUB87-08	In addition, only three of the neighboring residential wells were tested in conjunction with Terra Vi's two wells. There is no mention of how many residential wells are in the area and could	The wells of neighbor's closest to the Terra Vi pumping wells of those that would allow

Comment #	Comment	Response
	potentially be affected by the project's pumping. The omission of consideration of at least the number of other wells in the area needs to be addressed in the final DEIR.	instrumentation were included in the monitoring program during the 10-day test. This would provide first line information on potential impacts on drawdown in neighboring wells. The further from the pumping well, the lesser degree of potential drawdown, therefore the appropriate wells were selected to evaluate project impacts
PUB87-09	The Terra Vi DEIR has a conflict with the YUC DEIR when it comes to influence detected between their respective wells: • "The water levels in the on-site Terra Vi wells showed no impact during the pump testing of the Yosemite Under Canvas wells to the south. Therefore, simultaneous pumping from wells on the Terra Vi property or the Yosemite Under Canvas property would not impact the other property. The two properties are on different sides of a watershed boundary and likely are accessing different fracture zones".(p 393) The YUC DEIR reports that their hydrologists found some connection between YUC Well #1 and the Terra Vi wells. The developer should perform additional well testing analysis to determine the level of influence more accurately between the wells since there was only one testing period conducted for each well. The cumulative impacts of all the newly drilling wells must be fully and adequately studied and evaluated. There clearly is not enough information for assessment of groundwater reliability for these new developments as well as the existing wells in the area. Since these two large proposed projects are undergoing environmental analysis concurrently, it is essential that their cumulative impacts are assessed. The final EIR must take a more diligent and robust analysis of the water supply of these newly drilled wells. The water supply availability is a pivotable issue and the risk of adversely affecting the wells of existing residents and the long-term sustainability of the water supply requires additional testing, research and analysis, including sufficient documentation.	Geoscience has reviewed the data collected and agrees with Yosemite Under Canvas that pumping simultaneously from both of the Terra Vi wells might have resulted in drawdown of as much as 1.23 feet in the Yosemite Under Canvas well located closest to the Terra Vi project site. This drawdown is considered insignificant and would have no impact on Yosemite Under Canvas well operations. This is not a significant impact considering that both of the Terra Vi wells and Yosemite Under Canvas Well No. 1 were pumping approximately 4.7 times the anticipated cumulative demand for the projects. However, when Yosemite Under Canvas conducted the pumping test of their Well Number #1, groundwater levels in all of the Terra Vi wells showed no change. This suggests that only if both Terra Vi wells are pumping, there be a slight amount of drawdown at the Yosemite Under Canvas well. However Terra Vi water demands only require that one well pump and that one well does not need to be at full capacity to meet the project demands. Neither Terra Vi nor Yosemite Under Canvas would pump multiple wells simultaneously for project

Comment #	Comment	Response
		operations; therefore, the testing represents worst case cumulative pumping, and even in this case the effect is insignificant. The Terra Vi well testing was both rigorous, conservative, clearly showing the potential cumulative impacts of the combined Terra Vi and Yosemite Under Canvas pumping as well as potential impacts to local neighbors. Please see Response PUB85-07, ORG6-42, and ORG6-32. Water levels have not significantly changed between October 2019 and September 2020.
PUB87-10	The DEIR does not consider a "worst-case" scenario for water. There is no contingency plan in the event of an insufficient water supply. Availability for a reliable water supply for this project as well as the adjacent YUC project has been a top critical concern in public comments to date. Omission of considering a worst-case scenario in the DEIR is extremely dismissive of the very real consequences of a well becoming less productive or going dry. The Natural Environmental Science Center at Chinquapin (Nature Bridge Campus) in Yosemite National Park experienced the occurrence of a worst-case scenario. The initial well testing yielded good water availability which disappeared a few years later. The multi-million-dollar complex still has not resolved its water supply problem and remains vacant. *As reported by the National Park Service:* "The existing Chinquapin water system currently uses one well as a water source to provide water service to the Chinquapin Restroom, the Chinquapin Residence, and the Nature Bridge Campus and Henness Ridge. The existing well has seen a substantial decrease in productivity; the initial capacity test in 2006 indicated the well-produced water at a rate of 27-29 gallons per minute while the most recent capacity test performed in July of 2017 indicated that the well production has decreased to about 4.5 gallons per minute. This current rate is insufficient for the system's water demand needs".1	Please see Response ORG6-42 and PUB28-04.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
PUB87-11	Wastewater System The DEIR fails to fully explain how the wastewater system will not contaminate the groundwater and the neighboring residential wells. There is also concern for contaminating a spring located just 300 feet to the north which ultimately flows into the Middle Fork Tuolumne River.	Please see Response ORG6-32.
PUB87-12	The wastewater plan relies heavily on just meeting County regulations. It also mentions vaguely a Drainage Plan will be developed which sounds like checking a bureaucratic box; no details are provided on that plan. The project developers appear to take a hands-off approach in the responsibility of wastewater system impacts. In past public comments, there have been major concerns with potential contamination of the groundwater by wastewater. There is no analysis or discussion of details as to how the system will meet minimum requirements. There is no discussion how this large wastewater system and the water supply system will be designed and operated to ensure there will be no contamination of the groundwater. There should be some integrated explanation and analysis of how the two systems will be working together to ensure water quality, avoidance of contamination of the Tuolumne River and avoidance of septic treatment failure. The DEIR should include identification and consideration of any likely impediments to installation and operation of the wastewater system. The discussion should be site-specific. There is no discussion of the maintenance and monitoring of the system.	Please see Response ORG6-32.
PUB87-13	Fire Risk & Public Safety The DEIR fails to realistically assess the impacts of fire risk to the project and the surrounding area. The mitigation measures are severely inadequate to meet the increased fire risk introduced to the area by the project. The project site is designated as a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone and that designation is unlikely to change. The recently released Tuolumne Grand Jury Fire Safety Report (June, 2020)2 wrote: “To survive a truly disastrous event, fire protection and fire readiness must be a continued priority for visitors and residents of Tuolumne County and these priorities need to be at the forefront of the agendas of all elected officials.” (p. 2)	The commenter expresses concerns regarding wildfire risk and emergency response but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. These topics are evaluated in Chapter 4.15, Public Services and Recreation, and Chapter 4.17, Wildfire, of the Draft EIR. Please also see Master Responses 5 and 6.

Comment #	Comment	Response
	"Tuolumne County faces unprecedented danger to life and property from wildfire" (p.2) The DEIR refers to this report and is therefore well aware of current lack of adequate fire protection within Tuolumne County: • "Due to ongoing concerns within Tuolumne County regarding the adequacy of fire protection and emergency medical (EMS) the [County] commissioned a countywide First Responder and EMS Study, to review existing services, evaluate current needs… The study, completed by Matrix Consulting group in February of 2019, identified significant challenges to the ongoing provision of fire and EMS services within the unincorporated areas of Tuolumne County. These include declining participation of volunteer emergency response personnel and a commensurate increase in need for paid emergency response personnel, combined with a constrained ability of the funding mechanisms available to pay for the operational and capital costs of fire and EMS services to keep up with the increased costs to provide these services Further, the study found that a review of finances was needed for department and district lacking proper funding". (p 345) The mitigation measures that the project proposes to meet the demand for fire protection services to the project site are woefully inadequate in the case of a rapidly exploding, fast moving wildfire (which has already burned through area). Having two emergency staff plus a few more Terra Vi employees trained as volunteer fire fighters is not a solution for the need to protect guests and staff from fire in a very remote area. The DEIR simply acknowledges the lack of sufficient fire protection services currently, but only proposes to train a few employees to deal with life-threatening wildfire dangers as a mitigation measure.	
PUB87-14	The DEIR states: • "In a worst-case scenario in which early evacuation is not feasible, the expectation is that the guests and employees would remain on-site in the event that a wildland fire nears the project". (p. 76) In the worst case scenario of people not being able to evacuate in the face of a approaching wildfire, it does not make any sense to have an expectation to keep terrified people on site unless there is an underground bunker in the development plan. This is an exceedingly vague statement without any thought to the reality of what happened in the Camp Fire when people could not safety evacuate the area.	Please see Master Response 4 regarding emergency evacuation.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
PUB87-15	The suppression systems and site hydrants that the project proposes to use (a combination of reclaimed, treated greywater, and potable water storage) are not fully explained and seems like a vague plan. How is the hydrant system going to be designed and approved? What is the capacity of the firefighting water tank and will it have enough pressure to work with the fire hoses?	Details of the hydrant system and how it is designed and approved is not a CEQA topic. The water demand discussion included in the Draft EIR includes water demand for fire suppression, and impacts to water supply are assessed accordingly.
PUB87-16	The project's evacuation plan is relying on "early" notice to minimize peak traffic fleeing a wild fire: • "Based on monitoring of both weather conditions and nearby incidents, guests would be notified to evacuate early to minimize peak traffic on Highway 120 in the event of an incident that requires evacuation. Pre-fire evacuation plans would identify triggers for evacuation in terms of proximity of wildfires, and winds" (p 76) Believing that early warning is enough to avoid the gigantic, choatic traffic influx onto Highway 120 in the face of a wildfire, given the size of this resort, plus the cumulative traffic from the RV Park (with large bulky vehicles), the Berkeley Camp, the Sawmill Mountain Residents and the Yosemite Under Canvas guests, Hardin Flat Road residents and potentially other evacuees from the eastern direction of Highway 120 is really ludicrous. The evacuation plan is more than weak to deal with the reality of the potential worst-case scenario of a fast-moving wildfire in this Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone	Please see Master Response 4 regarding emergency evacuation.
PUB87-17	The DEIR fails to realistically assess the adequacy of firefighting resources and availability. As has been reiterated in past public comments, the project is very remote from the safety services for fire, police and ambulance service. The nearest Tuolumne County Fire Department (TCFD) firefighting resources are in Groveland, about 17 miles west of the project site on Highway 120. There is a significant amount of travel time required to get from Groveland to the project site. When a wildlife occurs, the firefighting resources may not be readily available because they are deployed elsewhere. In addition, the project's DEIR incorrectly states that GCSD and TCFD operate under a mutual aid agreement. The conclusion that fire protection services can be provided to the project with current resources and by adequately mitigating by training some employees to be volunteer firefighters is not valid. The DEIR dismisses the fact that their resort will increaed *[sic]* need for additional personnel or new or physically altered fire protection facilities in order to maintain acceptable service ratios and response times. Terra Vi will add as many as 400 guests plus employees at risk	The Draft EIR acknowledges fire prevention service response times in Chapter 4.14, Public Services, Parks, and Recreation of the Draft EIR, and that the "proposed project has the potential to increase demand for fire protection services to the project site. The construction or alteration of fire protection facilities to meet the increase in demand could cause significant environmental impacts." This is identified as a significant impact for which the Draft EIR includes Mitigation Measure PS-1. The GCSD and TCFD do operate under a

Comment #	Comment	Response
	from wildfire danger and Yosemite Under Canvas will add over 250 people. The assertion that adding more demands on the fire and emergency system without significant impacts or the need to expand these county services is unacceptable. The Tuolumne Grand Jury Fire Safety Report (June, 2020) reports: "Most of the fire engines and equipment in the county are old and becoming obsolete. There are no comprehensive plans or consistent budget allocations for replacement." (p.9) At the recent July 15, 2020 County Board of Supervisors Meeting, an agenda item was an overview and discussion of the dire situation of providing adequate firefighting services. The Board is already struggling with budget problems and an underfunded firefighting system.3 Clearly, the firefighting resources are aging and already spread thin. It makes no sense adding more demands on the fire and emergency system without more funding and expansion, and the County is currently in no position to do so. The project cannot just punt on the responsibility for helping to fund this increased critical need.	mutual aid agreement. The EIR consultants and County staff communicated with the GCSD Fire Chief and Deputy Fire Chief during the preparation of the Draft EIR to determine the existing conditions and potential project effects as they relate to fire and emergency medical services. The information in the Draft EIR is based on those communications. In addition, the Mariposa County Fire Department is included in mutual aid agreements, and CAL FIRE also serves the area to aid in fire protection and response services. Please see Master Response 6 regarding provision of public services.
PUB87-18	Traffic The DEIR does not adequately consider traffic safety and congestion due to the dramatically increased vehicle flow and entries/exits along Highway 120 with the Terra Vi, the proposed Yosemite Under Canvas development, expansion of the Yosemite Lakes RV park and the re-opening of the Berkeley Camp. Traffic impacts to the Hardin Flat Road are lacking in the DEIR. A more robust traffic study must be included in the final EIR to analyze all impacts of the increased number of cars from visitors, employees of the developments and the increased amount of daily delivery trucks/maintenance vehicles to service the developments. (There is no mention of all the increased service vehicles which will be going to the resort and the cumulative impact of those vehicles going to YUC. The addition of multiple entrances and exits to the new proposed developments and the need for widening Highway 120 for safety reasons must be evaluated. The proposed use of the Sawmill Mountain Road, a Forest Service Road, is inappropriate for this project. The approach to the Yosemite Park entrance already becomes significantly congested in the high season, with cars backed up literally for miles to get into the park.	The project transportation study contained in Appendix J of the Draft EIR addresses the cumulative effects of all projects on the overall operation of these intersections under cumulative conditions. As noted in Table 16 page 48, all locations will satisfy the Tuolumne County General Plan standard. Please see Response ORG6-68 regarding cumulative safety. The operation of the Yosemite Park entrance on Highway 120 is outside of the control of Tuolumne County and Caltrans and is beyond the scope of this analysis.
PUB87-19	The claim of reducing traffic on Highway 120 with a YARTS stop is questionable and not meaningful.	Please see Responses ORG9-75 and PUB28-07 for information regarding the Draft EIR assessment of impacts to YARTS.

Comment #	Comment	Response
	The DEIR seeks to check the box in stating that guests will use YARTs for transportation to the Park in lieu of using their cars. The YUC project also is hoping its guests will use YARTs. There are currently only three YARTS runs a day to Yosemite National Park and back. It is extremely doubtful the current YARTS system can absorb the increase in potential ridership. Proposing that YARTS is the answer to reducing traffic just checks a box and is not a real solution. The project should evaluate contributing to the expanded support of YARTS service or provide its own shuttle transport to the Park, perhaps in partnership with YUC.	
PUB87-20	Recreational Impacts to Tuolumne River Watershed The DEIR omits analysis of the recreational impact by Terri Vi to the surrounding Tuolumne River Watershed. Visitors to Terra Vi are very likely to visit many local sites within Stanislaus National forest, including the Middle Fork of the Tuolumne, Rainbow Pools and other locations on the South Fork of the Tuolumne, as well as the main Tuolumne River itself. This could cause significant additional crowding of popular areas that are already highly impacted with day use. With every new lodging development, guests are directed to the same few easy access points of the river, such as the Carlon Falls trail. In recent years, these places have become crowded and very hard used in the high summer season, In particular, the number of cars parked to access these sites has risen dramatically which introduces major safety concerns. For instance, the parking lot at Rainbow pools is small and visitors park all along Highway 120 and run across the busy highway to get down to the river. Also, increased visitors usually result in increased trash left behind in the popular sections of the river. The final EIS must describe the anticipated change to current recreational use levels at nearby recreational resources on such as Rainbow Pools, the Tuolumne River and its tributaries, and other readily accessible locations within the watershed. We need to understand the impacts on recreational use and if mitigation may be required.	The commenter refers to recreational areas within the Stanislaus National Forest. Impact discussion PS-10 in Chapter 4.14, Public Services and Recreation, of the Draft EIR considers potential impacts to Stanislaus National Forest. The use and crowding alone of a facility does not constitute a significant CEQA impact. Stanislaus National Forest receives 2 million annual visitors; the number of daily visitors who might visit the park as guests of the proposed project is nominal compared to this level of annual visitation. In addition, it can be reasonably expected that the proposed project would largely accommodate visitors who are already planning to visit destinations in the region, including those referenced by the commenter, rather than generate new visitors to the region, which would further reduce the proposed project's effect on the Tuolumne River watershed and Stanislaus National Forest. Please also see Response PUB82-27.
PUB88	Nancy Constantino, July 30, 2020	
PUB88-01	I submit the following comments to address key concerns regarding the Draft Environmental Impact Report for the proposed Terra Vi Lodge development. The areas of concern determined during scoping meetings and public comment were not adequately studied. The following Significant Impacts have not been properly analyzed and mitigation measures are inadequate.	The comment provides an introduction to the comments below. Please see Responses PUB88-02 through PUB88-25.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
PUB88-02	Property Access: Section 4.11.1.2 (Existing Conditions), under the Land Use and Planning chapter, omits several easements that impact the proposed property: a) Existing narrow, one-way dirt skid trail driveway that leads off Forest Route 1S03 provides the only access to about half of the 80 acre homestead homes. The trail has been used continuously for 60 years since we have been on the mountain, as well as the homesteaders before us who settled the land in the early 1900's. b) Another forestry service easement over private property exists for the other portion of the homestead homes on Route 1S03. c) Our deed describes an easement that allows access to our private property and abuts the Manly property line and the driveway leading to Forest Route 1S03. (See attached document, "Sawmill Easements") My concern is that these easements have not been mentioned in the DEIR and should have been identified before designing the site. Last year, I pointed out the omissions during the NOP public comment period. I should hope that the Terra Vi planners and the County are reading all comment letters and addressing the issues brought forth. Knowing where the easements are located is crucial to understand before any planning should commence. It seems that the architect or planner was given the boundary lines of the property without any idea of the surrounding properties, access roads, Forest Routes, and basic understanding of how the Terra Vi property ties into the neighborhood. There are several planning mistakes, such as the septic location which is located on a slope flowing into a known watercourse that provides well water to many neighboring homes. Another mistake is that the proposed helipad is within mere feet of the only means of access to my property and my neighbor's properties. These and other mistakes to be discussed later in this letter. I will begin with Forest Routes: The most critical planning flaw in the DEIR is the assumption of Forest Route 1S03 as the "primary access road for guests and employees of the lodge" and Terra Vi's main circulation." Forest Routes are not roads and are not meant for commercial access. These rudimentary trails are built and managed by the Forest Service, under control by the US Government, to access remote undeveloped areas for the purposes of the logging industry, forest management workers, and backcountry access. Furthermore, Forest Route 1S03 is the only dedicated access and egress for the 80 acre Sawmill Mountain area, residential neighborhood.	Please see Responses ORG6-14 and PUB80-07.
PUB88-03	Evacuation: Another oversight is that Under Canvas is proposing the use of Forestry Route 1S09 directly across from the Sawmill exit which would create an additional "intersection" choke point during evacuation. This is a cumulative problem that has not been addressed by Terra Vi or UC. The	Regarding potential conflicts with vehicles exiting the Yosemite Under Canvas site, please see Response ORG6-22.

Comment #	Comment	Response
	planners on both projects must seek to design with the entire Sawmill/Hardin Flat area in mind. Again, the Forest Routes are not meant for commercial use and this is an issue that needs to be acknowledged rather than dismissed as insignificant. Terra Vi should have considered this when planning the overall footprint, access, egress, and internal circulation for the lodge. The project cannot move forward as proposed with the systemic problems inherent in the cumulative site evacuation plan. Once evacuees have exited the site safely, they must then be provided with two directions of egress. The infrastructure and basic layout of the two-lane Highway 120 corridor lacks two separate distinct exits required by fire safety code. Both exits from the site lead to 120! When thousands exit onto Highway 120, there is essentially only one way off the mountain (the path into Yosemite would most likely be closed in an emergency) and then all evacuation would be forced to route through the small towns of Hardin Flat, Buck Meadows, Groveland and then down Priest Grade (a dangerous road for most tourists unfamiliar with mountain driving). This section of the Highway 120 corridor does not support the high occupancy loads of such massive lodges. It is a mistake to locate high occupancy type commercial developments on this stretch of the Highway and there is no way to mitigate the situation. Safe access and egress is determined by the Building and Fire codes that restrict hordes of people from being subjected to unsafe situations. The physical layout of the mountain cannot be changed to provide two distinct exits. Instead, alternative locations for the developments should be sought out or other suitable occupancy types should be considered for the property. Many people died in the Camp Fire in Paradise last year as they were trying to evacuate their homes. They only had one road in and out of the area; the residents of Sawmill Mountain and Hardin Flat are in the same terrible predicament. Why would the County knowingly place a highly hazardous property use such as Terra Vi and Under Canvas in a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone without contemplating safe exits and evacuation? The evacuation issues all stem from these oversights and mistakes. Somewhere during the process, an ill-informed decision was made to rezone these properties without going through the proper reviews, approvals, and public notification procedures. If the information had been reviewed appropriately at that time, it would have been obvious to the Fire Marshal and Planning department that a zoning change would not work. The occupancy loads for commercial	The project site provides two points of egress onto Sawmill Mountain Road, as well as direct access to Highway 120 for emergency vehicles. Please see Response ORG6-13 for further details regarding access and egress. Please also see Master Responses 4 and 7

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
	projects exceed the exits and safety for this rural forest area and two lane Highway. The DEIR fails to evaluate evacuation scenarios.	
PUB88-04	This brings us back to the issues of Land Use, Agriculture and Forestry Resources, Zoning The proposed project area meets the definition of "Timberland" pursuant to Public Resources Code 4526. Mr. Gregory Robert Manly entered into a Forest Improvement Program contract agreement with California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CFIP) in June, 2015. According to this contract, the participant (Mr. Manly) certifies that the parcel of forestland <u>will not be developed for uses incompatible with forest resources management within 10 years following recordation date.</u> The property has undergone reforestation efforts and CalFire has been monitoring the forest improvement work. The DEIR asserts that the CFIP has now been annulled but there is no evidence of this statement. Per the CFIP agreement signed by Manly, he declared the property was zoned AE Agricultural and that the current zoning is Rural. The DEIR talks in circles about the fact that this is Timberland, that it isn't Timberland, that it would not result in the loss or conversion of forest land and that impacts would be less than significant. Let's resolve these issues once and for all. Please provide all pertinent information and compliance criteria regarding the rezoning, the CFIP, and the land conversion for public review and comment. The paper trail will likely reveal that this has all been done without correct applications, nor waiting periods or public notifications. This zoning issue is ultimately causing the inherent problem with safety, exits, and evacuation. This is exactly the type of issue that good planning, due diligence, and following County, Building, Planning and Fire code seeks to avoid. The DEIR states, "There are no other lands in the vicinity of the project site that are zoned for commercial use and thus development of a hotel on the project site is not expected to lead to surrounding lands being developed with similar or ancillary uses". Interesting that this is a concern but not applied to the very projects, Terra Vi and Under Canvas. The DEIR falsely claims that the project does not conflict with existing zoning but it absolutely conflicts and would result in the loss of forest land which is a significant impact that cannot be mitigated. The Public Resources Code (PRC) regulates the conversion of timberland to non-timberland uses and the permit system for rezoning. Public Resources Code, Section 4621-4628 stipulates that	Please see Responses ORG9-89 and PUB80-04.

Comment #	Comment	Response
	"Conversions can be approved if it is approved to be in the public interest, would not cause a substantial and unmitigated adverse effect upon timberland or open space areas, if the soils, slopes, and watershed would be suitable for the proposed uses, if there is no alternate suitable land for the proposed development to occur, and if the existing use is uneconomic in character." <u>However, there ARE alternate suitable lands for Terra Vi to consider. Additionally, the watershed is NOT suitable for the proposed use and the conversion WILL cause significant adverse effects upon timberland property.</u> The conclusions are so convoluted, its hard to understand the logic for "Because the proposed project would not contribute to any identified cumulative impacts associated with forestry resources, the proposed project would result in a less-than-significant cumulative impact with respect to forestry resources." The rationalization is actually irrational. The plain idea that the timberland at Terra Vi and Under Canvas is proposed to be converted is a significant impact. The DEIR's attempt to claim otherwise has not been substantiated.	
PUB88-05	Transportation, Traffic The impacts related to the public concerns about site access to Sawmill Mountain via Forest Route 1S03 have not been addressed at all, other than to reiterate the description of the project and claim that it is a less than significant issue. I have delineated the reasons why the access is not viable for Terra Vi Lodge and why all commercial access must be moved to the Highway, should this project advance. The impacts to the residents of Sawmill Mountain are significant, yet the DEIR ignores the subject. Another problem that reinforces the need to relocate Terra Vi's primary access is that the sight lines and distance from the western approach are too short for safe Sawmill Mountain exit access. The DEIR discusses cutting the embankment and removing vegetation in order to accommodate construction, and again, asserts a less than significant impact. There is no mention of discussions with CalTrans regarding this roadway change or the environmental impacts caused by the supposed problem correction itself. As mentioned above, the primary lodge access on Forest Route 1S03 needs to be relocated to 120. Locating the Terra Vi entry further down the Highway would also serve to increase the safety of the current Sawmill Area access for Sawmill residents; this approach is dangerous currently due to poor visibility. The Under Canvas access from Forest Route 1S09 must also be relocated to avoid congestion in the immediate Sawmill exit "intersection." The internal circulation proposed at Terra Vi has been planned without any sensitivity to the	Caltrans District 10 has reviewed the Draft EIR and provided comments. No changes to identified improvements have been indicated. Please see Response GOV8-04. Please see Responses ORG6-63 and ORG6-64 regarding improvements to the Highway 120/Sawmill Mountain Road intersection. The project access does not need to be moved to satisfy applicable design standards.

Comment #	Comment	Response
	proximity of several Sawmill homes. These homes are not just vacation cabins; some are full time residences. A cluster of Terra Vi cabins is also planned right along the northern edge of the property boundary line. Why would Terra Vi propose a road and cabins immediately adjacent to private residential property unless they were designing without knowledge or concern for the existing property owners? The constant 24/7 traffic, car and motorcycle sounds, doors slamming, people talking, lights, and luggage dragged across the parking lot will ruin the right for Sawmill residences to enjoy the solitude and privacy of their property. The DEIR does not address any of these significant issues.	
PUB88-06	Circulation: The project proponents have established a goal of 10 percent resort guests using YARTS to reach Yosemite National Park per day during the peak season. This sounds like an arbitrary percentage; how was it determined? To achieve this goal, Terra Vi would provide a YARTS stop, with bus access being provided to the site to pick up riders staying at the lodge. Additionally, posed as an intended public benefit, the project would provide up to 30 day-use parking stalls to encourage the use of the public transportation and ride sharing. What is the true motivation behind this? Could this be an attempt to maintain the original size of the parking lot at 286 spots even though the size of the Lodge has been reduced? I fear that the real reason is to enable future phases of the lodge to easily be shoved through the planning process. This is akin to the "existing wells" on site which were actually just drilled last year, and suddenly we will have "existing parking" that just happens to meet the demand of the new phases. What is the justification? Bringing MORE tourists to the quiet, rural area with an already massive lodge and precarious evacuation measures is ridiculous. How about sizing the parking lot to match the building size and reduce the amount of concrete, impervious surfaces, and ugly parking lot views. The YARTS system is already crowded and there are times when capacity is met and travelers are stranded. Furthermore, why bring huge 45' diesel coaches into the area adding more pollution, contributing to endless noise, and inviting more people to drive up to Sawmill to park, thereby creating more environmental issues.	Please see Responses ORG9-75 and PUB28-07 regarding use of YARTS. The project goals for the Park & Ride spaces are noted on page 3-7 of the Draft EIR.
PUB88-07	Aesthetics Yosemite National Park is known as one of the most beautiful places in the state, the country, and the world. Scenic Highway 120 is exactly that; it is scenic. Land Use and Planning Goal 1B, Policy 1.B.3 claims the design is "consistent" with the General Plan because it minimizes views of the parking lot from Highway 120. However, the DEIR fails to review the parking lot as viewed from the Sawmill vantage point, which is definitely not consistent with the General Plan.	As shown in Figure 4.1-1, two of the four viewpoints used for visual simulations are from Sawmill Mountain Road. Visual effects from these two viewpoints are discussed on pages 4.1-11 to 4.1-12 of the Draft EIR.

Comment #	Comment	Response
	The proposed Terra Vi Lodge project has been reduced in size since the last proposal, except (as mentioned above) the parking lot remains the same with 286 parking spaces. The DEIR does not outline the subsequent phases and the proposal is not sincere or transparent regarding future plans. Also, what is the "Site for Future Development" shown on the plans? The current drawings show 100 guest rooms with up to 240 in future phases, 7 cabins now and up to 25 four bedroom cabins in future phases, 286 parking spaces, a helipad, YARTS bus stop, shopping market, large event space, and multiple out-buildings. We are talking about over 500 guests plus employees with this first phase and over 1,300 for future phases, plus several hundred support staff on site daily; this huge project does not suit the lot size, location, and will degrade the beauty of the forest and the scenic highway. The addition of the Glamping project, more campsites at Yosemite Lakes Thousand Trails RV park, and Berkley-Tuolumne Camp further congest this precious, remote, rural timberland. I implore that all decision makers consider all of the proposed projects and future expansions in the area at this time; the cumulative impact is substantial. The scenic vistas, in particular will be significantly impacted and forever destroyed. Once trees are cut down, they are gone. When the Covid pandemic eases, things will have drastically changed. Serious consideration of Yosemite's future plans for admitting visitors to the park should be studied: quantities, day permits, reservations, etc. There may not be a need for accommodations outside the park. We should slow down and take some time to consider the impacts before any projects are slated for approval. Otherwise, we would then have an obsolete, vacant building that serves as an eyesore, a graffiti and homeless magnet, and another fire ignition risk in Tuolumne County. These impacts seriously affect the aesthetic quality of the Scenic Highway 120 corridor. As currently designed, the scenic views from my property as well as my neighbors on Forest Route 1S03 will be substantially impacted. New artificial lighting will further deteriorate views of the night sky. The DEIR provides information about lighting at the helipad that cannot be shielded; this is unacceptable. The artificial lighting is noted under Aesthetics but also impacts Biological Resources which could disrupt many wildlife species including the vulnerable riparian habitat in this ecologically sensitive area. Many animals are cued by nightfall for feeding, mating, foraging; these normal patterns are at risk for interruption and harm to sensitive wildlife and plant species. There is no mitigation noted for these impacts other than "complying with building codes."	

Comment #	Comment	Response
PUB88-08	Cultural and Tribal Cultural Resources The Tuolumne Band of Me-Wuk Indians has requested that one of their Native American Monitors be present for an updated archeological survey as well as ground disturbing activities. While I see that this has been mentioned in the DEIR and that it is included in CULT-1a and CULT-1B, I do not see it in the text of the DEIR. Please identify where these requests have been included in the Mitigation Measures. During the initial comment period for the Terra Vi Lodge, the Draft Environmental Impact Statement alluded that "through a collaborative effort with the Tuolumne Me-Wuk Tribal Council their heritage would be celebrated." Mr. Stanley Cox, Me-Wuk Cultural Director stated in a letter dated December 17, 2018 to the County that "our cultural department has not had any contact with this company (Hansji Development) and they should not imply that we are working with them." Please advise as to how the decisions were made regarding the open space, as well as firewood and medicinal plant gathering activities prior to construction. Is this a satisfactory agreement that the Me-Wuk have agreed to? It is concerning that the Terra Vi Lodge project would knowingly state falsehoods in their documents and potentially significantly impact a sacred place with cultural, archeological, prehistoric and historical value to a California Native American tribe.	Page 4.4-17 of the Draft EIR erroneously states that Mitigation Measures CULT-1a and CULT-1b allow for tribal monitoring of construction activities. This text has been revised, as shown in Chapter 3, Revisions to the Draft EIR, of this Final EIR. The Draft EIR included the requests from the Tuolumne Band of Me-Wuk Indians that were feasible for the project sponsor and County to implement. The Draft EIR identifies that the potential for inadvertent discoveries during construction is a possibility. Because only a qualified archaeologist or paleontologist may determine if a find is a significant resource under CEQA, the Draft EIR includes mitigation that would require construction crews to be trained to identify potential resources and, in the event of a discovery, for work to stop and a qualified archaeologist or paleontologist to be notified. The Tuolumne Band of Me-Wuk Indians identified the top of the knoll, which was treated as an historical resource for the purpose of this project, and provided mitigation measures for preservation in place via open space, which was included in the Draft EIR. The Tribe also requested access to the site prior to construction for native plant and firewood gathering. These measures are feasible for the project sponsor to implement and were therefore included as mitigation measures. As described on pages 4.4-9 to 4.4-10 of the

Comment #	Comment	Response
		Draft EIR, Patrick GIS prepared the project cultural resources study for the Draft EIR and initiated coordination with the Native American community in March 2019 by submitting a formal request to the California Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) for a Sacred Lands File search, to identify culturally sensitive properties in or near the project area. The search was negative for cultural resources. Patrick GIS participated in an on-site field visit with a Tuolumne Band of Me-Wuk Indians tribal member in June 2019. Patrick GIS also met with the Tribal Cultural Department for the Tuolumne Band to discuss the project in July 2019; the Cultural Department requested a site visit, which was arranged and conducted later in July 2019. Patrick GIS also corresponded with tribal members via several phone calls and email communication.
PUB88-09	Hazards Helicopter: Please provide the restrictions and required clearances. The current pad location is an obstruction located next to our only driveway into and out of our homes. How will Sawmill residences evacuate when a helicopter is blocking our ONLY egress from Sawmill Mountain. Based on what the DEIR claims, the helipad will be used twice a day with “unavoidable, excessive, and significant noise” that cannot be mitigated. It is ludicrous to state that mitigation techniques such as upgraded doors and windows at the lodge and “Disclosure Statements” to the guests that the helicopter will create maximum noise, especially at night, will alleviate the problem. It does nothing for the surrounding properties and fails to mitigate the issue to less than significant. Removing the helicopter all together would solve the problem. If a true emergency were to occur, the over-sized ample parking lot could easily serve as a landing pad.	Please see Response PUB80-05.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
PUB88-10	Pedestrians: The DEIR dismisses the issue of pedestrians attempting to cross the highway to visit the Terra Vi store, bar, restaurant, pool and vice versa. What is to keep the tourists from trespassing through and damaging adjacent private property? Please address these concerns.	Please see Response ORG6-67 regarding pedestrian safety.
PUB88-11	Deer: The DEIR does identify deer migration patterns and habitat and acknowledges that "the project has the potential to indirectly interfere with the movement of native resident mule deer traveling to and from winter range through the introduction of additional people, pets and traffic." However, the proposed mitigation is shameful. "Prior to the Certificate of Occupancy, the project applicant will pay a non profit who conducts deer research activities. Is this really the mitigation solution? Will the deer not be frightened away by the two years of construction prior to receiving the Certificate of Occupancy? The deer herd on Sawmill Mountain is well established and my family enjoys watching the deer in our protected, quiet meadow. Scaring deer away from their migration paths and habitat during construction and then offering to pay for research after the fact, is deplorable. This alone shows Terra Vi's true colors and lack of consideration for the forest and it's inhabitants.	The proposed mitigation was established in consultation with biologists monitoring the wintering deer herd with the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (personal communication between Amy Augustine, Augustine Planning and Mark Abraham, Wildlife Biologist, California Department of Fish and Wildlife Eastern Stanislaus, Northern Mariposa, & Tuolumne County, March 11, 2020). Deference is given to the species' experts in formulating the appropriate mitigation. The deer herd has adapted to the presence of people associated with residences, other campgrounds, and the highway along its migratory route in this area. Please also see Response ORG6-62 for a further discussion of wintering deer adaptations to people.
PUB88-12	Roadway: The DEIR fails to adequately analyze safety hazards that would occur during the lengthy two year construction period. Slow-moving equipment and construction trucks may cause potential collisions and traffic delays.	Please see Response ORG6-68 regarding construction traffic safety.
PUB88-13	The DEIR also fails to analyze hazards related to bicyclists. Instead, conclusions about safety impacts are considered insignificant because it is incorrectly assumed that bicyclists will remain only on the portion of road between Sawmill and Hardin Flat. Plenty of bicyclists utilize Highway 120 and travel beyond to Yosemite or Groveland. This is a significant safety concern.	Please see Response ORG6-67 regarding pedestrian and bicycle safety.
PUB88-14	The DEIR fails to address the hazards associated with snowfall in the area and the presence of snow plow equipment that enters and exits the CalTrans maintenance shed located at Sawmill. Travelers on this portion of Highway 120 are typically ill equipped and pull over to park, becoming stranded along the side of the road which often creates issues with safe snow removal and passage.	The comment is noted. It would be speculative to try to predict visitor behavior such as that referenced by the commenter, and the concerns raised by the commenter are outside of the scope of this EIR as they pertain to future individual behavior and not

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
		potential impacts that would be created by the proposed project.
PUB88-15	Hydrology and Water Quality I will defer this category to the experts for specifics, but must point out key concerns about coronovirus contamination, septic contamination, water quality, and water supply. A project of this size is an incompatible use on a remote forest site without public water or public sewer. The lodge and glamping developments may deplete our precious and scarce groundwater supplies. Contamination: The developer has proposed a location for septic tanks and leach lines that is situated on a known watercourse that leads through my meadow, my neighbor's meadow, several wells, and empties into the stream, the creek and ultimately the Tuolumne River. The CFIP contract describes the project site as located in the Big Creek planning watershed (calwater 2.2 #6536.800201) that is classified as high risk by the FRAP (Fire and Resource Assessment Program) team. The 14,197.1 acre watershed is part of the broader Tuolumne River watershed that is also classified as high risk. The South Fork of the Tuolumne River runs ¼ mile south of the property. I have brought up this major concern and planning flaw in previous comment letters regarding the location of the leach field and proximity to my well. The report included under Biological Resources emphasizes one of the ephemeral channel locations, flow pattern and freshwater emergent wetland adjacent to the leach field that threatens the health of the meadow, however this has been ignored during the planning process. The leach area and septic tanks should not be located on a known watercourse which leads to resident's wells. Terra Vi has not recognized this mistake; the system must be relocated. The DEIR has failed to supply concrete evidence that the project's wastewater treatment system will not contaminate my water. Instead, the rationale provided is that the system will be built to code and will therefore be adequate. This is not adequate analysis. Also, during the pump testing it should be noted that our well water had an odorous smell that permeated our whole cabin; this has never happened in the 60 years we have owned the property. I have also pointed out in previous letters that the leach fields as designed have the potential for freezing atop the ground during winter months. This concern will significantly impact our private properties and has never been addressed.	Please see Master Response 2 and Responses ORG6-32 and PUB29-01.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
	A new concern is relevant with regard to the Coronavirus and recent findings of the virus in Mariposa County's wastewater system. What this means is that tourists are staying in hotels and shedding the virus which then contaminates the system. This is scary. I do not want to worry about potential virus leaching into my water supply. The DEIR should address this issue.	
PUB88-16	Availability: The availability and quality of my water will be adversely affected by the Terra Vi project. The DEIR does not provide any assurances that ample groundwater exists to supply all cumulative properties and does not adequately provide testing information that would simulate a drought year situation. It is not known if the new wells drilled will be able to provide enough water for a sprinkler system, storage tanks, swimming pool, laundry facilities, maintenance facilities, special events, cleaning, water treatment, food preparation/ service waste water treatment, and most importantly fire suppression. As mentioned in previous letters regarding Biological Resources, any watercourse disturbance affects the riparian habitat and threatens a variety of plant and wildlife species. Many animals depend on riparian habitat, and utilize this habitat for foraging, water, shelter, and migration. The project could substantially affect riparian habitats by resulting in further destruction or loss of these vulnerable habitat types. This past Spring, my meadow as well as my neighbor's adjoining meadow were brimming with wildlife activity, particularly the Pacific Chorus Frog, the Arboreal Salamander, and California Newt, a species of special concern in California. I defer to the independent experts with regard to ample water supply for all of Terra Vi and Under Canvas water needs, though it appears that groundwater supply will be depleted by such large projects. Under Canvas says they need over two million gallons per day supplied by two wells on the project site; that does not include water for fire suppression, nor provision of storage tanks. There is no assurance that adequate water supplies exist to continually serve the project without depleting groundwater supplies to neighboring properties. What would happen during a drought event?	Please see Response ORG6-42. Revised water demand estimates have been prepared for the proposed project and are included in Appendix M, Supplemental Hydrogeology Information, of this Final EIR. Appendix M provides the assumptions used in calculating water demand. Water for firefighting would be provided in accordance with applicable regulations and standards. As stated on page 4.17-31, "Fire flow for the buildings would be provided by the potable water storage tanks. The quantity of water storage, pressure of water supply, and maintenance of the storage tanks would be designed to comply with State Responsibility Areas Fire Safe Regulations, CFC, Tuolumne County General Plan policies, and Tuolumne County Code of Ordinances, Chapter 15.20, Fire Safety Standards." Please see Response ORG6-43 regarding the water storage tanks. The special-status species with the potential to occur on the project site are listed in Table 4.3-3 of the Draft EIR and do not include the species referenced by the commenter. There are no springs on the project site.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
PUB88-17	Alternatives The DEIR claims to have reviewed alternatives but in fact has rejected many before any review has actually occurred. The reasoning for the rejections is unsound, flawed and contradictory. 1. Rejected. Alternative Site Access: "The County considered an alternative where the primary access point would be located along Highway 120 rather than 1S03 Forest Route." The DEIR claims that no significant impacts were associated with the location of the project's proposed access point and that such an alternative would not avoid any significant impacts. This claim is completely false and misguided. As discussed previously, Forest Route 1S03 is not to be utilized for commercial use, would create serious evacuation issues, and is the only designated access for Sawmill residences. This alternative must be considered.	CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6 states that "An EIR shall describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the project, or to the location of the project, which would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project." Since the Draft EIR did not identify significant impacts related to relocating the main hotel access, the Draft EIR does not need to analyze an alternative for this. Please see Response ORG6-14 regarding Forest Route 1S03.
PUB88-18	2. Rejected. Relocated Leach Field: "The County considered an alternative under which the leach fields would be relocated to the eastern portion of the project site." Yet the DEIR erroneously claims again that there are no significant impacts associated with the location of the project's leach fields. Again, please review my valid concerns that the current location of the leach fields will contaminate my meadows and well water, and will contaminate the watercourse which leads to the Tuolumne River. The impacts are indeed significant. The DEIR has rejected an alternative without any consideration. This alternative must be considered.	CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6 states that "An EIR shall describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the project, or to the location of the project, which would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project." Since the Draft EIR did not identify significant impacts related to location of the leach fields, this alternative does not need to be further analyzed. In addition, compliance with applicable regulations governing the design and installation of on-site wastewater systems ensure that systems like these would not likely result in contamination of groundwater.
PUB88-19	3. Rejected. Alternative Water Source: "The County considered an alternative where imported water would be utilized rather than groundwater pumped from on-site wells." Does this mean that water would be trucked in? What does "imported water" mean? My understanding is that trucked water is not legal for commercial businesses in California, so another viable alternative should be evaluated.	Groundwater and water supply are addressed under impact discussion HYD-2 in Chapter 4.10, Hydrology and Water Quality and impact discussion UTIL-2 in Chapter 4.16, Utilities and Services Systems, of the

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
	At any rate, the DEIR claims that no significant impacts associated with the groundwater wells have been identified. This flawed logic suggests that looking at alternatives is unnecessary. However, there is no guarantee that groundwater supplies will not be depleted, which is a highly significant environmental impact. Alternatives must be considered.	Draft EIR. The comment does not provide evidence supporting its conclusion, therefore no further comment is required.
PUB88-20	4. Rejected. Alternate Location: Casa Loma was rejected because the site, located a mere 8 miles from the Manly site is in Mariposa County rather than Tuolumne County. However, this is a viable option to be considered.	As described in Chapter 6, Alternatives, the Casa Loma site was listed as an alternative considered but rejected because Tuolumne County as the lead agency does not have a say for projects located outside of its jurisdiction.
PUB88-21	5. Considered. Reduced Footprint Alternative: This alternative still proposes improper utilization of the 1S03 Forest Route as the main circulation. This alternative would need to be redesigned in order to be considered as an alternative.	Please see Response ORG6-14 regarding the 1S03 Forest Route.
PUB88-22	6. Considered. No Project Alternative: This is the only alternative that would work on the property.	The commenter provides an opinion and does not provide supporting evidence or questions regarding the analysis contained in the Draft EIR, therefore no further response is required.
PUB88-23	7. Considered. Alternate Location: The Scar looks like a viable alternative yet the DEIR laments that it would not include an emergency helipad. This is not a requirement of the project and even though the DEIR claims it would provide improved emergency access, it would not substitute for groundbased emergency vehicle access. The Scar option seems to be the only alternative that makes sense, with access to public water and sewer, as well as being situated closer to emergency services in the town of Groveland. This location is ideal because it is below the snow line, thereby avoiding difficulties with tourists driving in the snow, putting on chains on the side of the road and avoiding hazards such as snow removal equipment. The addition of a grocery store close to town would be another asset to the Groveland community, as there is only one marketplace in the area currently.	The comment provides an opinion on an included project alternative. As described in Chapter 6, Alternatives, the alternatives are compared based on an overall comparison of the potential impacts for all environmental issue categories included, and therefore the Reduced Footprint Alternative was proposed as the Environmentally Superior Alternative, after the No Project Alternative. Please also see Master Response 7.
PUB88-24	The environmentally superior alternative that is expected to generate the least amount of impacts is the No Project Alternative. CEQA guidelines state that if the environmentally superior alternative is the No Project Alternative, then the EIR must also identify an alternative among the alternatives. The DEIR then claims that the runner up option is the Reduced Footprint Alternative. However, as delineated above and throughout this letter, the Reduced Footprint Alternative is reliant	The comment concludes the preceding comments in the letter, for which responses are listed above, therefore no further response is required.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
	upon dedicated use of Forest Route 1S03 which is not viable. It is abundantly clear that the DEIR is flawed in making false conclusions and it is clear that the Terra Vi project is not suited for the proposed project property. In actuality, no viable option has been offered other than the No Project Alternative or the Scar Alternative location.	
PUB88-25	Conclusion Overall, the DEIR has not thoroughly evaluated the concerns that the public has brought forward in previous meetings and comment letters. The project interferes with safe evacuation and emergency response which is in direct violation of the General Plan. Additionally, I have delineated many new issues that require serious review and substantial planning changes to be considered. As currently designed, the project contains many significant environmental impacts which cannot be adequately mitigated. The cumulative impacts from projects proposed in this area are significant. It is vital that the County, Planning Commission, Board of Directors, Forestry, and other Agencies reviewing and commenting on the proposed projects are looking well beyond the confines of the drawings and boundaries of the project property lines to determine the overall impacts on the surrounding areas, now and in the future. We must all be good stewards of the land. The two proposed projects, (Terra Vi) with over 100 guest rooms in a three story high Lodge, with 7 fourbedroom cabins, 22 employee apartments and suites, 286 parking spaces, a helipad, bus stop, shopping market, large event space, multiple out-buildings, swimming pool, with 550 guests and 50-100 support staff on site, as well as (Under Canvas) with 99 tent structures, mobile kitchen, dining and reception tents, laundry facility, swimming pool, another helipad, 102 campfire pits, barbecues, bathrooms and approximately 400 guests and 30-50 employees, do not suit the lot size or location, and are inconsistent with the character of our community. There are additional projects proposed for Berkeley Camp and Yosemite Lakes that must also be factored in, as the cumulative impacts would be significant. In conclusion, there are many categories that require an objective, thorough review and revision of the DEIR that require recirculation for public comment. I have outlined just some of the key areas that are concerning while there are many more that must be considered by the appropriate agencies.	The comment provides a summary to the comments above. Please see Responses PUB88-01 through PUB88-24.
PUB89	Priscilla Cornell, July 30, 2020	

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
PUB89-01	This is the first I have heard of this proposed resort. OMG, speaking as a long time--30 year plus--resident of Groveland, that is the LAST thing we need . I say NO, NO, NO! This little town can not handle anymore tourists coming through then we already have to deal with. Especially in these medically challenging times. I already feel like --tourists go home--the thoughts of hundreds more--please no! I hope whatever panel is deciding this will take that into consideration. Thank you for the chance to express my concerns and opinion.	The comment is noted. The comment does not address the adequacy of the Draft EIR.
PUB90	**Dan Courtney, July 30, 2020**	
PUB90-01	I'm just checking in to see if the request for extension on comments to the Terra Vi DEIR has been accepted?	The comment asks about the status of the requested extension of the public review period of the Draft EIR. Please see Master Response 1, which explains the County's decision not to extend the public review period of the Draft EIR.
PUB91	**Suzanne Ctibor, July 30, 2020**	
PUB91-01	I am writing you again to express my opinion of Terra Vi Lodge, proposed for Highway 120 and Sawmill Mt. road. I sincerely hope that this project is rejected. It, like Rush Creek and Evergreen, will bring more problems than an 'extra' million dollars in tax revenue for Tuolumne County will NOT be enough for all the traffic, and all the problems this large of a project will incur. It will bring more emergency services, the incidents of fire, and the Sherrifs *[sic]* department having to investigate thefts, and other problems 300 or more people per day will bring. Think, more traffic, more accidents, more dead wildlife! Not to mention the aesthetic value of the forest. If any of you have ever driven 120 during the height of tourist season, you would be subject to people that don't know how to drive on mountain roads. They have no regard for double yellows, no passing signs, and certainly not speed limit signs!! I have been passed on double yellows with blind corners more times than I can even count. I have been passed on the RIGHT WHILE CHILDREN WERE IN THE CROSSWALK at Tenaya Elementary, because the driver behind me was in too much of a hurry. I couldn't even catch up to him so I could get his license plate number to call CHP. Highway 120 was not built with the thought of the amount of traffic there would be on it in the future! Again, an 'estimated' one million dollars in tax revenue, as far as I'm concerned, will not offset	The comment is noted. The comment does not address the adequacy of the Draft EIR. Please see Master Response 6 regarding public services.

Comment #	Comment	Response
	the cost of the services provided by the County and GCSD that this project will incur. The effect on local businesses, especially the 'mom and pop' businesses, like many of our local hotels, B&B's, AirB&B's, and more will also be effected by this project. There are very few places to rent in this area, it's almost impossible for even locals to find a place to rent, as many of the rentals in Pine Mountain Lake are now AirB&B's and not rentable on a monthly basis. Outside employees may not be able to find housing for long term. Where will they be housed? Please reconsider this proposal. A 3 story hotel would be a huge eyesore in our beautiful area, especially if it looks like a hotel/motel that you see off of Highway 99 in Stockton.	
PUB92	**Patricia Elliott, July 30, 2020**	
PUB92-01	The Terra Vi development is a massive project that threatens the future of Yosemite National Park. Tuolumne County has a sacred obligation to protect the Park from the abuse, greed and self interest of big city developers. We know that the Park is on the verge of overuse already. Why would you approve a project that will only add to the traffic congestion, increase the risk of fire and threaten the water supply on Sawmill Mountain? A few tax dollars will not solve the county's financial problems. Terra Vi will have it's own restaurant and store so the town of Groveland will not benefit from this development. Please protect Yosemite National Park for future generations.	The comment is noted. The comment does not address the adequacy of the Draft EIR.
PUB93	**Elizabeth Erickson, July 30, 2020**	
PUB93-01	Please take into consideration that this project has a huge impact on our small community in Sawmill Mt. Road. Also, our family has been property owners since the early 1940's and my grandfather just passed away (he and his father built our cabin when he was in college) this is a legacy to pass on to others to enjoy the wilderness. There has to be other options that cause less impact and distress on the people and environment around.	The comment is noted. The comment does not address the adequacy of the Draft EIR.
PUB93-02	Our family has owned a parcel adjacent to the proposed development since the mid-1940's. We have a family cabin that my Great-Grandfather and Grandfather built. Our family has been enjoying the South Fork, Middle Fork, Sawmill Mountain and the Groveland community for five generations. This letter is in response to the "Terra Vi DEIR," which included extensive appendices, well test reports, site plans, and past comments. This document dismisses items that are considered	The comment provides an introduction to the comments that follow. Please see Responses PUB93-03 through PUB93-08.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
	relevant to the safety and well-being of the neighboring communities and the general public that frequent the Highway 120 corridor in Tuolumne County.	
PUB93-03	The First Issue to address is the Parcel and Zoning Questions: This DEIR is doing a report on a parcel that was never legally subdivided in compliance with the Tuolumne County Ordinance. As a property within the community of the Manly property we would like the County to follow the proper procedure and notification for a divide and rezoning.	Please see Response PUB61-02.
PUB93-04	The Second Issue to address is the Timberland Conversion: The matter of conversion of the site from commercial forest use to a non-forest use. The DEIR notes that the project could have a significant impact on the environment <u>if it results in the conversion of forest land to non-forest use.</u> The DEIR text clearly acknowledges that the project would result in a conversion of the project site from a focus on timber management to a focus on recreation. Over past decades, when projects affecting forest lands have been reviewed, Tuolumne County planning commissioners and county Supervisors have historically strongly advocated for strict and thorough review of the impact of converting commercial timberlands to other uses.	Please see Responses ORG9-89 and PUB80-04.
PUB93-05	Third Issue is Fire Risk: The Grand Jury published a report on June 3, 2020 a Tuolumne County Fire Safety Report. (which can be found on the County's website: https://www.tuolumnecounty.ca.gov/1294/2020-Grand-Jury-Report) The report states "Of the 20 most destructive Fires in California's History, 10 have happened within the last four years….Recent wildfires events in Tuolumne County include the 2013 Rim Fire that burned more than 257,000 acres over 68 days.." it continues to state that "A mass evacuation will always be difficult on neighborhood roads that are two lanes, winding and easily blocked by one fallen tree, power poles, or abandoned vehicles across a road." Adding a 250+ room hotel, employees, and general public along with the properties already there, this project would cause a massive potential for disaster with hundreds of guests and employees attempting to evacuate along with the owners of properties adjacent to the proposed project..	The comment does not question the analysis contained in the Draft EIR, therefore no further response is required. Please see Master Response 4 for details on evacuation.
PUB93-06	The Fourth Issues is Water Supply: All properties currently get their water supply from wells. Terra Vi's well testing failed. With the indicated required draw on the water table, the project could and probably would	The comment incorrectly states that the Terra Vi well testing failed. The Hydrogeology Study provided the required data in

Comment #	Comment	Response
	leave the Sawmill Community with no water. The is no documented mitigation for this. The DEIR finding of Less Than Significant is based on just the minimum required tests that in no way confirm that any of the onsite wells have sufficient volume of recharge to be a permanent water source for the large scale of this development. All the other local, large hotels that are also in granite sub-strata have struggled to provide sufficient water. The DEIR does not appropriately state that the water flow testing showed that the pump test was a failure in providing the appropriate water that would meet the demand of such a project. There is no mitigation for depriving the surrounding properties of their water supply.	accordance with the required County protocol to assess the available water supply from hard rock wells. The tests clearly shows that the on-site wells are more than capable of supplying the project needs. The production from just one of the Terra Vi wells can supply more than double the project water demand. In addition, please see Response ORG5-03 and ORG6-42.
PUB93-07	The Fifth issue is Forest Service Road: Terra Vi is assuming they would have access from the Sawmill Mountain Road (Forest Route IS03). Their main circulation, access and egress is all planned for using this route. However, a Forest Route, such as IS03, is for forest administration and forest access. Also Forest Route IS03 is the only access that the 15 cabins in the 80 acre homestead have. Considering that the planned site for Terra Vi has an alternative access approved by CalTrans 200 yards east along Highway 120, the alternative would be the most appropriate access to such a planned project.	The comment is a duplicate of Comment PUB83-06. Please see Response PUB83-06.
PUB93-08	The Sixth issue is Waste Water: The DEIR does not address the potential for system failure of the waste water treatment system. The failure of the system would result in contaminating the water supply for the 15 resident cabins, the Middle Fork of the Tuolumne River and also could be in violation of the clean water act. The DEIR completely overlooks the negative impact of a waste water treatment failure. The USGS Ascension Mountain quad map (photo-inspected 1992) shows a spring located outside the project boundaries, 300± feet to the north (the same off-site aquatic feature shown in the NWI map). On the quad map, the spring flows into an unnamed perennial channel that flows northwest into the Middle Tuolumne River and, based on topography, EC-01 also would be expected to flow into the same off-site perennial channel 300± feet north of the project boundaries and subsequently to the Middle Fork Tuolumne River. What does this tell us? These concerns address only a few of the issues; as this DEIR is over 1,200 plus pages with a short time granted to review not only the Terra Vi DEIR but also the Under Canvas DEIR, the	The commenter expresses concerns regarding the project's wastewater generation and disposal but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. Wastewater is evaluated in Chapter 4.16, Utilities and Service Systems, of the Draft EIR. Please also see Master Response 2.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
	county is limiting the community's ability to adequately respond to all the misinformation and lack of facts this DEIR provides.	
PUB94	Erick Erickson, July 30, 2020	
PUB94-01	My grandfather and father purchased a parcel adjacent to the proposed development in the 1940's and built a cabin on it. It is a one-room cabin intended to be a sanctuary and retreat. It remains essentially as it was built and is not rented out or used by anyone other than family. It is a very, very special place with memorials for my sister, grandfather and, just recently, my father on-site. Five generations of my family have enjoyed the peaceful beauty of this little piece of Tuolumne County. As the Finance Director of a small town, I recognize the temptation of the taxes and fees from this project. However, outside of the clear and obvious errors and omissions in the DEIR, I implore you to consider the devastating impact that what is essentially a hotel will have on the surrounding area and the peaceful enjoyment of our land. That said, this letter is in response to the "Terra Vi DEIR," which included extensive appendices, well test reports, site plans, and past comments. There was very little time to read and absorb the large document and my responses will reflect the lack of time allowed to do so. In my town, a development of this nature would be subject to extensive public outreach and education to be sure the community was fully versed in the risks and rewards and could provide input. However, even with the limited time available, it is clear that this document overlooks and dismisses items that are considered relevant to the safety and well-being of the neighboring communities and the general public that frequent the Highway 120 corridor in Tuolumne County.	The comment provides an introduction to the comments below. Please see Responses PUB94-02 through PUB94-07.
PUB94-02	1. Illegal subdivision. This DEIR is a report on a parcel that was never legally subdivided in compliance with Tuolumne County Ordinance. As a property within the community of the Manly property we would like the County to follow the proper procedure for such a divide and rezoning. This illegal subdivision has been brought to the County several times and there has been no response whatsoever.	The EIR evaluates the project as proposed and not previous land use decisions of the County.
PUB94-03	2. Timberland Conversion. The matter of conversion of the site from commercial forest use to a non-forest use. The DEIR notes that the project could have a significant impact on the environment if it results in the conversion of forest land to non-forest use. The DEIR text clearly acknowledges that the project would result in a conversion of the project site from a focus on timber management to a focus on recreation.	Please see Responses ORG9-89 and PUB80-04.

Comment #	Comment	Response
	Over past decades, when projects affecting forest lands have been reviewed, Tuolumne County planning commissioners and county supervisors have historically strongly advocated for strict and thorough review of the impact of converting commercial timberlands to other uses.	
PUB94-04	3. Fire and Emergency Services. The Grand Jury published a report on June 3, 2020 a Tuolumne County Fire Safety Report. (which can be found on the County's website: https://www.tuolumnecounty.ca.gov/1294/2020-Grand-Jury-Report) The report states "Of the 20 most destructive Fires in California's History, 10 have happened within the last four years….Recent wildfires events in Tuolumne County include the 2013 Rim Fire that burned more than 257,000 acres over 68 days.." it continues to state that "A mass evacuation will always be difficult on neighborhood roads that are two lanes, winding and easily blocked by one fallen tree, power poles, or abandoned vehicles across a road." The area to be developed into Terra VI was classified in 2007 as Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone by CAL FIRE (see DEIR). The catastrophic Rim Fire of 2013 clearly demonstrated this classification is appropriate. It actually burned part of the site. The likelihood of having any open fires on the site during high fire season cannot help but worsen the fire risk. Any conclusion that this would be a Less Than Significant fire risk his seriously flawed. The DERI is silent on providing adequate and dedicated firefighting water. There must be one or more tanks of dedicated fire water as there is no other source to fight fires. Further, the site must be plumbed with hydrants to distribute the water. Adding a 250+ room hotel, employees, and general public along with the properties already there, this project would cause a massive potential for disaster with hundreds of guests and employees attempting to evacuate along with the owners of properties adjacent to the proposed project.	Regarding the Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone classification, the Draft EIR acknowledges that the proposed project is within this classification area. Regarding on-site fire water, as described in Section 3.3.8.1 of Chapter 3, Project Description, fire suppression systems and site hydrants for fire protection would be provided using a combination of reclaimed and potable water storage. Please see Master Response 4 regarding emergency evacuation.
PUB94-05	4. Water Supply. All properties currently get their water supply from wells. Terra Vi's well testing failed. With the indicated required draw on the water table, the project could and probably would leave the Sawmill Community with no water. There is no documented mitigation for this. The DEIR finding of Less Than Significant is based on just the minimum required tests that in no way confirm that any of the onsite wells have sufficient volume of recharge to be a permanent water source for the large scale of this development. All the other local, large hotels that are also in granite sub-strata have struggled to provide sufficient water. The DEIR does not appropriately state that the water flow testing showed that the pump test	The Hydrogeology Study elected to pump both project wells simultaneously to provide a conservative (i.e., worst case) analysis. Total pumping during the 10-day period was 470 percent of the project demand. Cumulative drawdown in the residential wells (that is Terra Vi pumping combined with residential pumping) was at a maximum of 24 feet to 54 feet. With only one Terra Vi

Comment #	Comment	Response
	was a failure in providing the appropriate water that would meet the demand of such a project. There is no mitigation for depriving the surrounding properties of their water supply.	well pumping to meet project demands, that is only 21.8 percent of the pumping conducted for the 10-day test, cumulative drawdown in the local wells will be approximately 5 to 12 feet, which is insignificant given the depth of pump setting in the residential wells. The Terra Vi testing was completed in the Fall of 2018 and 2019 which was a wet year with rainfall 27 percent above average. However, 2019 to 2020 year has been an extremely dry year with rainfall 62 percent of the average. The 2019 to 2020 year ranks among the 10 driest years in the 102-year record for the area. However, even with an extremely dry season from 2019 to 2020, the difference in groundwater levels from 2018 to 2019 and 2019 to 2020 ranged from 0.39 feet in Monitoring Well #2 to 5.24 feet in Terra Vi pumping Well #2. Terra Vi monitoring of wells' static water levels showed very similar static water levels as the residential wells located close by to the north, during the test (see Table 2 of the project Hydrogeology Study contained in Appendix G of the Draft EIR), therefore the very small water level decline in the Terra Vi wells after an extremely dry season would be similar in the residential wells. This information clearly demonstrates that the bedrock aquifer has more than ample storage for long-term project operations without depleting the local supply. Please also see Response ORG6-42.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
PUB94-06	5. Waste water. The DEIR does not address the potential for system failure of the waste water treatment system. The failure of the system would result in contaminating the water supply for the 15 resident cabins, the Middle Fork of the Tuolumne River and also could be in violation of the clean water act. The DEIR completely overlooks the negative impact of a waste water treatment failure. Additionally, the DEIR provides no explanation of how groundwater contamination was to be prevented from its septic systems during high water years with substantial runoff. In that there are many others downstream from these projects using Tuolumne River water, groundwater contamination further research during very wet years is critical	Please see Master Response 2, which explains that the project now proposes an on-site package wastewater treatment system. Please see Response PUB16-08 for a discussion of sewer and groundwater contamination.
PUB94-07	I am deeply disappointed, that the consultant that prepared this DEIR and the Tuolumne County Planning Department have allowed so many blatant errors and omissions. It is also disappointing that Tuolumne County released two very lengthy DEIRs at almost the same time, during summer months when many residents are unavailable, and during the Covid crisis. It would be easy to conclude that the County was trying to minimize resident review and comment and rush approval. This is not my experience in my local government and certainly should not be how Tuolumne County to act as guardians of the integrity of developments within our County.	The comment expresses concern that the public review period of the Draft EIR was not extended. Please see Master Response 1, which explains the County's decision not to extend the public review period of the Draft EIR.
PUB95	**Ingrid and Jeffrey Carlson, July 30, 2020**	
PUB95-01	Our family has owned a parcel adjacent to the proposed development since the mid-1940's. Our family and friends have been enjoying the South Fork, Middle Fork, Sawmill Mountain and the Groveland community for five generations.	The comment is noted. The comment does not address the adequacy of the Draft EIR.
PUB95-02	This letter is in response to the "Terra Vi DEIR," which included extensive appendices, well test reports, site plans, and past comments. This document dismisses items that are considered relevant to the safety and well-being of the neighboring communities and the general public that frequent the Highway 120 corridor in Tuolumne County.	The comment provides an introduction to the comments below. Please see Responses PUB95-03 through PUB95-09.
PUB95-03	The First Issue to address is the Parcel and Zoning Questions: This DEIR is doing a report on a parcel that was never legally subdivided in compliance with the Tuolumne County Ordinance. As a property within the community of the Manly property we would like the County to follow the proper procedure and notification for a divide and rezoning.	The comment pertains to a previous rezoning of the project site. This EIR considers the proposed project in the context of baseline conditions, under which the project site is zoned Commercial Recreation.
PUB95-04	The Second Issue to address is the Timberland Conversion: The matter of conversion of the site from commercial forest use to a non-forest use. The DEIR notes that the project could have a significant impact on the environment if it results in the conversion of forest land to non-forest use. The DEIR text clearly acknowledges that the project	Please see Responses ORG9-89 and PUB80-04.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
	would result in a conversion of the project site from a focus on timber management to a focus on recreation. Over past decades, when projects affecting forest lands have been reviewed, Tuolumne County planning commissioners and county supervisors have historically strongly advocated for strict and thorough review of the impact of converting commercial timberlands to other uses.	
PUB95-05	Third Issue is Fire Risk: The Grand Jury published a report on June 3, 2020 a Tuolumne County Fire Safety Report. (which can be found on the County's website: https://www.tuolumnecounty.ca.gov/1294/2020-Grand-Jury-Report) The report states "Of the 20 most destructive Fires in California's History, 10 have happened within the last four years….Recent wildfires events in Tuolumne County include the 2013 Rim Fire that burned more than 257,000 acres over 68 days.." it continues to state that "A mass evacuation will always be difficult on neighborhood roads that are two lanes, winding and easily blocked by one fallen tree, power poles, or abandoned vehicles across a road." Adding a 250+ room hotel, employees, and general public along with the properties already there, this project would cause a massive potential for disaster with hundreds of guests and employees attempting to evacuate along with the owners of properties adjacent to the proposed project..	Please see Master Response 4 regarding emergency evacuation.
PUB95-06	The Fourth Issues is Water Supply: All properties currently get their water supply from wells. Terra Vi's well testing failed. With the indicated required draw on the water table, the project could and probably would leave the Sawmill Community with no water. The is no documented mitigation for this. The DEIR finding of Less Than Significant is based on just the minimum required tests that in no way confirm that any of the onsite wells have sufficient volume of recharge to be a permanent water source for the large scale of this development. All the other local, large hotels that are also in granite sub-strata have struggled to provide sufficient water. The DEIR does not appropriately state that the water flow testing showed that the pump test was a failure in providing the appropriate water that would meet the demand of such a project. There is no mitigation for depriving the surrounding properties of their water supply.	Please see Response ORG6-42.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
PUB95-07	The Fifth issue is Forest Service Road: Terra Vi is assuming they would have access from the Sawmill Mountain Road (Forest Route IS03). Their main circulation, access and egress is all planned for using this route. However, a Forest Route, such as IS03, is for forest administration and forest access. Also Forest Route IS03 is the only access that the 15 cabins in the 80 acre homestead have. Considering that the planned site for Terra Vi has an alternative access approved by CalTrans 200 yards east along Highway 120, the alternative would be the most appropriate access to such a planned project.	The comment is a duplicate of Comment PUB83-06. Please see Response PUB83-06.
PUB95-08	The Sixth issue is Waste Water: The DEIR does not address the potential for system failure of the waste water treatment system. The failure of the system would result in contaminating the water supply for the 15 resident cabins, the Middle Fork of the Tuolumne River and also could be in violation of the clean water act. The DEIR completely overlooks the negative impact of a waste water treatment failure. The USGS Ascension Mountain quad map (photo-inspected 1992) shows a spring located outside the project boundaries, 300± feet to the north (the same off-site aquatic feature shown in the NWI map). On the quad map, the spring flows into an unnamed perennial channel that flows northwest into the Middle Tuolumne River and, based on topography, EC-01 also would be expected to flow into the same off-site perennial channel 300± feet north of the project boundaries and subsequently to the Middle Fork Tuolumne River. What does this tell us?	Please see Master Response 2. As described in Master Response 2, the project proposes an on-site wastewater treatment plant.
PUB95-09	These concerns address only a few of the issues; as this DEIR is over 1,200 plus pages with a short time granted to review not only the Terra Vi DEIR but also the Under Canvas DEIR, the county is limiting the community's ability to adequately respond to all the misinformation and lack of facts this DEIR provides.	The comment provides a conclusion to the comments above. Please see Responses PUB95-01 through PUB95-08.
PUB96	**Lars Erickson, July 30, 2020**	
PUB96-01	Our family has owned a parcel adjacent to the proposed development since the mid-1940's. Our family and friends have been enjoying the South Fork, Middle Fork, Sawmill Mountain and the Groveland community for five generations. This letter is in response to the "Terra Vi DEIR," which included extensive appendices, well test reports, site plans, and past comments. This document dismisses items that are considered	The comment provides an introduction to the comments below. Please see Responses PUB96-02 through PUB96-07.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
	relevant to the safety and well-being of the neighboring communities and the general public that frequent the Highway 120 corridor in Tuolumne County.	
PUB96-02	The First Issue to address is the Parcel and Zoning Questions: This DEIR is doing a report on a parcel that was never legally subdivided in compliance with the Tuolumne County Ordinance. As a property within the community of the Manly property we would like the County to follow the proper procedure and notification for a divide and rezoning.	Please see Response PUB61-02.
PUB96-03	The Second Issue to address is the Timberland Conversion: The matter of conversion of the site from commercial forest use to a non-forest use. The DEIR notes that the project could have a significant impact on the environment if it results in the conversion offorest *[sic]* land to non-forest use. The DEIR text clearly acknowledges that the project would result in a conversion of the project site from a focus on timber management to a focus on recreation. Over past decades, when projects affecting forest lands have been reviewed, Tuolumne County planning commissioners and county supervisors have historically strongly advocated for strict and thorough review of the impact of converting commercial timberlands to other uses.	Please see Responses ORG9-89 and PUB80-04.
PUB96-04	Third Issue is Fire Risk: The Grand Jury published a report on June 3,2020 a Tuolumne County Fire Safety Report. (which can be found on the County's website: https://www.tuolumnecounty.ca.gov/l294l2020-Grand-Jury-Report) The report states "Of the 20 most destructive Fires in California's History, l0 have happened within the last four years....Recent wildfires events in Tuolumne County include the 2013 Rim Fire that burned more than 257,000 acres over 68 days.." it continues to state that "A mass evacuation will always be difficult on neighborhood roads that are two lanes, winding and easily blocked by one fallen tree, power poles, or abandoned vehicles across a road." Adding a 250+ room hotel, ernployees, *[sic]* and general public along with the properties already there, this project would cause a massive potential for disaster with hundreds of guests and employees attempting to evacuate along with the owners of properties adjacent to the proposed project..	The commenter expresses concerns regarding wildfire but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. This topic is evaluated in Chapter 4.17, Wildfire, of the Draft EIR. Please also see Master Response 5.
PUB96-05	The Fourth Issues is Water Supply: All properties currently get their water supply from wells. Terra Vi's well testing failed. With the indicated required draw on the water table, the project could and probably would leave the Sawmill Community with no water. The is no documented mitigation for this.	Please see Response ORG6-42.

Comment #	Comment	Response
	The DEIR finding of Less Than Significant is based on just the minimum required tests that in no way confirm that any of the onsite wells have sufficient volume of recharge to be a permanent water source for the large scale of this development. All the other local, large hotels that are also in granite sub-strata have struggled to provide sufficient water. The DEIR does not appropriately state that the water flow testing showed that the pump test was a failure in providing the appropriate water that would meet the demand of such a project. There is no mitigation for depriving the surrounding properties of their water supply.	
PUB96-06	The Fifth issue is Forest Service Road: Terra Vi is assuming they would have access from the Sawmill Mountain Road (Forest Route IS03). Their main circulation, access and egress is all planned for using this route. However, a Forest Route, such as IS03, is for forest administration and forest access. Also Forest Route IS03 is the only access that the 15 cabins in the 80 acre homestead have. Considering that the planned site for Terra Vi has an alternative access approved by CalTrans 200 yards east along Highway 120, the alternative would be the most appropriate access to such a planned project.	Please see Responses ORG6-14 and PUB48-03.
PUB96-07	The Sixth issue is Waste Water: The DEIR does not address the potential for system failure of the waste water treatment system. The failure of the system would result in contaminating the water supply for the 15 resident cabins, the Middle Fork of the Tuolumne River and also could be in violation of the clean water act. The DEIR completely overlooks the negative impact of a waste water treatment failure. The USGS Ascension Mountain quad map (photo-inspected 1992) shows a spring located outside the project boundaries, 30Gt feet to the north (the same oflsite *[sic]* aquatic feature shown in the NWI map). On the quad map, the spring flows into an unnamed perennial channel that flows northwest into the Middle Tuolumne River and, based on topography, EC-01 also would be expected to flow into the same oflsite perennial channel 30Gt feet north of the project boundaries and subsequently to the Middle Fork Tuolumne River. What does this tell us? These concems *[sic]* address only a few of the issues; as this DEIR is over 1,200 plus pages with a short time granted to review not only the Terra Vi DEIR but also the Under Canvas DEIR, the county is limiting the community's ability to adequately respond to all the misinformation and lack of facts this DEIR provides.	The commenter expresses concerns regarding the project's wastewater generation and disposal but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. Wastewater is evaluated in Chapter 4.16, Utilities and Service Systems, of the Draft EIR. Please also see Master Response 2.
PUB97	Sally Erickson, July 30, 2020	

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
PUB97-01	Our family has owned a parcel adjacent to the proposed development since the mid-1940's. Our family and friends have been enjoying the South Fork, Middle Fork, Sawmill Mountain and the Groveland community for five generations. This letter is in response to the "Terra Vi DEIR," which included extensive appendices, well test reports, site plans, and past comments. This document dismisses items that are considered relevant to the safety and well-being of the neighboring communities and the general public that frequent the Highway 120 corridor in Tuolumne County.	Please see Response PUB96-01.
PUB97-02	The First Issue to address is the Parcel and Zoning Questions: This DEIR is doing a report on a parcel that was never legally subdivided in compliance with the Tuolumne County Ordinance. As a property within the community of the Manly property we would like the County to follow the proper procedure and notification for a divide and rezoning.	Please see Response PUB61-02.
PUB97-03	The Second Issue to address is the Timberland Conversion: The matter of conversion of the site from commercial forest use to a non-forest use. The DEIR notes that the project could have a significant impact on the environment <u>if it results in the conversion of forest land to non-forest use.</u> The DEIR text clearly acknowledges that the project would result in a conversion of the project site from a focus on timber management to a focus on recreation. Over past decades, when projects affecting forest lands have been reviewed, Tuolumne County planning commissioners and county supervisors have historically strongly advocated for strict and thorough review of the impact of converting commercial timberlands to other uses.	Please see Responses ORG9-89 and PUB80-04.
PUB97-04	Third Issue is Fire Risk: The Grand Jury published a report on June 3, 2020 a Tuolumne County Fire Safety Report. (which can be found on the County's website: https://www.tuolumnecounty.ca.gov/1294/2020-Grand-Jury-Report) The report states "Of the 20 most destructive Fires in California's History, 10 have happened within the last four years….Recent wildfires events in Tuolumne County include the 2013 Rim Fire that burned more than 257,000 acres over 68 days.." it continues to state that "A mass evacuation will always be difficult on neighborhood roads that are two lanes, winding and easily blocked by one fallen tree, power poles, or abandoned vehicles across a road." Adding a 250+ room hotel, employees, and general public along with the properties already there, this project would cause a massive potential for disaster with hundreds of guests and employees attempting to evacuate along with the owners of properties adjacent to the proposed project..	Please see Response PUB96-04.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
PUB97-05	The Fourth Issues is Water Supply: All properties currently get their water supply from wells. Terra Vi's well testing failed. With the indicated required draw on the water table, the project could and probably would leave the Sawmill Community with no water. The is no documented mitigation for this. The DEIR finding of Less Than Significant is based on just the minimum required tests that in no way confirm that any of the onsite wells have sufficient volume of recharge to be a permanent water source for the large scale of this development. All the other local, large hotels that are also in granite sub-strata have struggled to provide sufficient water. The DEIR does not appropriately state that the water flow testing showed that the pump test was a failure in providing the appropriate water that would meet the demand of such a project. There is no mitigation for depriving the surrounding properties of their water supply.	Please see Response ORG6-42.
PUB97-06	The Fifth issue is Forest Service Road: Terra Vi is assuming they would have access from the Sawmill Mountain Road (Forest Route IS03). Their main circulation, access and egress is all planned for using this route. However, a Forest Route, such as IS03, is for forest administration and forest access. Also Forest Route IS03 is the only access that the 15 cabins in the 80 acre homestead have. Considering that the planned site for Terra Vi has an alternative access approved by CalTrans 200 yards east along Highway 120, the alternative would be the most appropriate access to such a planned project.	Please see Responses ORG6-14 and PUB48-03.
PUB97-07	The Sixth issue is Waste Water: The DEIR does not address the potential for system failure of the waste water treatment system. The failure of the system would result in contaminating the water supply for the 15 resident cabins, the Middle Fork of the Tuolumne River and also could be in violation of the clean water act. The DEIR completely overlooks the negative impact of a waste water treatment failure. The USGS Ascension Mountain quad map (photo-inspected 1992) shows a spring located outside the project boundaries, 300± feet to the north (the same off-site aquatic feature shown in the NWI map). On the quad map, the spring flows into an unnamed perennial channel that flows northwest into the Middle Tuolumne River and, based on topography, EC-01 also would be expected to flow into the same off-site perennial channel 300± feet north of the project boundaries and subsequently to the Middle Fork Tuolumne River. What does this tell us? These concerns address only a few of the issues; as this DEIR is over 1,200 plus pages with a	Please see Response PUB96-07.

Comment #	Comment	Response
	short time granted to review not only the Terra Vi DEIR but also the Under Canvas DEIR, the county is limiting the community's ability to adequately respond to all the misinformation and lack of facts this DEIR provides.	
PUB98	Ben Gardella, July 30, 2020	
PUB98-01	I have several concerns after reviewing this report. This is a massive development directly adjacent to 15 residences. One of which has been in my family since 1972. We rely on an honest and thorough assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed project. And from what I understand, there are numerous aspects of this report that fall far short of what is required.	The comment is noted. The comment does not address the adequacy of the Draft EIR.
PUB98-02	Cultural Resources Assessment Contradicts Tuolumne County General Plan This project does not adhere to the Tuolumne County General Plan. There are cultural resources identified within the Project area. The Applicant proposes installing a fence to protect these resources during construction but once construction is complete the resource is open to trampling and damage by the owners and guests of Terra VI lodge.	The comment incorrectly states that the site contains known cultural resources and that the project proposes fencing to protect such resources. A records search conducted for the project cultural study did not reveal any known cultural resources within the project site. Field visits were conducted for the project cultural resources study and one isolated obsidian flake and various historic-era trash were identified; isolated finds are not considered eligible for listing in the California Register. One area of the site is being treated as a cultural resources for the purpose of this project and will be maintained in open space per the recommendations of the Tuolumne Band of Me-Wuk Indians.
PUB98-03	This project is also in violation of AB52 consultation laws as evidenced by the following direct correspondence with Tuolumne Band of Me-Wuk Indians Tribal Council.	Patrick GIS Group, Inc. conducted outreach and solicited information from Interested Parties as part of the due diligence of a consultant to identify historical resources in the project area. The Tuolumne Band of Me-Wuk worked closely with the consultant throughout the project, including a meeting, field visits, phone calls, and email correspondence. (Please see Response PUB88-08 for more details on tribal

Comment #	Comment	Response
		coordination.) This is not the same effort as AB 52 and consultation cannot be deferred to a consultant. Under AB 52, if a tribe wishes to be notified of projects within its traditionally and culturally affiliated area, a tribe must submit a written request to the relevant lead agency (PRC 21080.3.1). Within 14 days of determining that a private project application is complete, or to undertake a public agency project, the lead agency must provide formal notification, in writing, to the tribes that have requested notification of proposed projects. Without this formal request, there is no requirement that a lead agency must engage in AB 52 consultation with the tribe.
PUB98-04	The Tuolumne Band of Me-Wuk Indians Tribal Council was not consulted by the Lead Agency during the AB52 process, and relied on residents to provide updates on the Initial Study and DEIR process.	Please see Responses PUB88-08 and PUB98-03. The Tuolumne Band of Me-Wuk Indians did not formally request consultation consistent with AB 52. However, the tribe was informally consulted by the County and EIR consultant.
PUB98-05	The significance of the cultural resources identified within the project area was not adequately addressed. Archaeological assessment of a resource does not determine the Tribal cultural value of a resource. The lack of AB52 consultation which enables the Lead Agency to determine the Tribal significance of a resource indicates the 2018 General Plan Cultural Resource Element for this project has not been met.	One area (the top of the knoll) was identified by the Tuolumne Band of Me-Wuk as having tribal cultural value. Although this area is not an officially designated historical resource (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 21074) and has not been evaluated for its eligibility to become a designated historical resources (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 5024.1), the EIR took an overly conservative approach and treated this area as a cultural resource under CEQA for the purpose of the project. Consistent with the tribe recommendation, Mitigation Measure

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
		CULT-4b requires the area be preserved in place by open space. Please see Response PUB88-08 for more details on tribal coordination.
PUB98-06	The mitigation measures offered with regards to ground disturbing activities is wholly inadequate once you've identified cultural resources within the site.	Please see Response PUB88-08 regarding mitigation that addresses the potential to discover cultural resources during ground disturbing activities. The comment does not explain how, in the opinion of the commenter, the mitigation measures are inadequate. Therefore, a more detailed response cannot be provided.
PUB98-07	CULT-1a of the DEIR advises that only cultural resource training is required for construction personnel within a known archaeological resource. This is akin to the fox guarding the henhouse and provides no professional oversight to the ground disturbance of the proposed Project. Opportunities to hide, obfuscate, or remove archaeological or tribal cultural resources from the Project Area to prevent project delays are highly likely under the proposed mitigation measures.	The comment incorrectly states that training for construction personnel would only apply within a known archaeology resources. As stated in Mitigation Measure CULT-1a, "Prior to the issuance of grading permits, the County shall confirm the applicant has required all construction crews to undergo adequate training for the identification of federal- or State-eligible cultural resources..." This mitigation measure applies to all construction crews. Furthermore, as there are no known archaeological resources within the project site, this mitigation measure applies to the entire area of site disturbance. The training recommended is standard language to inform construction personnel of the laws protecting resources in the case of inadvertent discoveries during construction. Only a qualified archaeologist may determine if a find is a significant resource under CEQA.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
PUB98-08	CULT-1b is also inadequate. It advises that the Project retain a qualified archaeologist to prepare a data recovery plan only after a resource has been impacted by the Project. This does not conform to the General Plan, or to CEQA guidelines under AB52 protecting Tribal Cultural Resources (TCR). Archaeological firms are not qualified to determine what is a significant Tribal Cultural Resource. The Tuolumne Band of Me-Wuk Indians were not adequately consulted in this review process, and therefore the review process should be considered incomplete.	The comment does not explain how, in the opinion of the commenter, the project does not conform to the General Plan. Consistent with General Plan Implementation 13.B.a, the project consultant prepared a cultural resources assessment. As described in Response PUB98-03, the Tuolumne Band of Me-Wuk Indians did not formally request consultation consistent with AB 52 and therefore was consulted informally. Response PUB88-08 provides more information on the consultation that occurred between the project cultural resources consultant and the Tuolumne Band of Me-Wuk Indians.
PUB98-09	Once it is admitted that the project may cause "a substantial adverse change in the significance of a Tribal Cultural Resource" (i.e. CULT-4) -- what are the mitigation strategies offered? -- one-time access for a tribal representative to remove and transplant native plants. -- one-time access for a tribal representative to remove firewood -- a 50 foot buffer on the most remote, unusable land for the purpose of reflection of its own guests (not tribal representatives) This is unacceptable. The county must re-engage with tribal representatives to find a more acceptable mitigation strategy.	As described in Response PUB88-08, the Draft EIR included the requests from the Tuolumne Band of Me-Wuk Indians that were feasible for the project sponsor and County to implement.
PUB98-10	Conforming with the County's General Plan The stated goal of Natural Resources in the County's general plan is sited in 16.A.1: "Recognize that agricultural and timberlands have historically defined the rural character and scenic beauty of Tuolumne County." A brand new hotel, market, swimming pool and yoga studio is in direct conflict with this mission statement.	The commenter expresses concerns regarding forestry land and resources but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. These topics are evaluated in Chapter 4.6, Forestry Resources, of the Draft EIR.
PUB98-11	In the following section 16.A.2 of the General Plan:	The commenter expresses concerns regarding scenic quality and resources but

Comment #	Comment	Response
	"Conserve the natural scenic quality and rural character along designated scenic routes in the County." As of right now, this area of HWY 120 is not officially designated scenic. But with greater awareness as to what is happening and the global climate awareness that is upon us, it is clear that given enough time, there would be plenty of votes to designate this area scenic. As is stated as a possibility in 16.A.c: "The designation of additional local or state Scenic Routes shall only be approved by the Board of Supervisors after consent of the owners of a minimum of 51% of the property area and 51% of the owners of the property adjacent to the proposed Scenic Route. The determination of the consent of the property owners for the designation of a Scenic Route shall be based upon each parcel having one vote." There are 15 residences immediately adjacent to these two parcels up for development. One parcel == one vote.	does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. This topic is evaluated in Chapter 4.1, Aesthetics, of the Draft EIR.
PUB99	Laura George, July 30, 2020	
PUB99-01	Thank you for allowing the opportunity to comment on the Draft EIR for Terra Vi Lodge. Following are my primary concerns, although there are so many inadequacies in the DEIR that need to be addressed, it would be impossible to comment on everything in this letter.	The comment provides an introduction to the comments below. Please see Responses PUB99-02 through PUB99-05.
PUB99-02	It makes no sense to develop an area that has been proven to carry an extremely high fire risk. The Rim Fire of 2013 is only one example of the devastation that can occur due to a perfect storm of human negligence, drought conditions, and fuel filled forests. The impact of Terra Vi must always take into consideration the cumulative effects of the nearby proposed Yosemite Under Canvas project. Developing this well-known fire risk land will create a death trap for local residents in the event of evacuation. The closest emergency services can take at least 30-45 minutes for their one ambulance or two fire trucks to arrive. The DEIR fails to assess fire risk and evacuation mitigation procedures adequately. Highway 120 eastbound leads to Yosemite, and westbound, leads to Old and New Priest Grade roads, which, as you know are steep (up to 17% grade) winding roads not for the faint of heart, nor for naïve visitors in rental cars who are unfamiliar with the dangers of these tortuous mountain roads. One can only imagine the mayhem in the event of mass fire evacuation down the only artery out of the area.	The commenter expresses concerns regarding wildfire but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. This topic is evaluated in Chapter 4.17, Wildfire, of the Draft EIR. Please also see Master Response 5.

Comment #	Comment	Response
PUB99-03	The DEIR fails to adequately address the issue of water supply and septic contamination to residential wells. Terra Vi has not adequately assessed their water needs, nor have they confirmed that their leach fields won't contaminate neighboring wells. I understand that nearby Rush Creek has had to truck water in during drought years. Developing a large hotel to accommodate 550 guests will place a great strain on the water table, in addition to creating waste hazard for neighboring homes. Are they willing to pay to have water trucked in for the current residents in the area during drought years to make up for the water they are essentially taking from neighboring residents' wells?	Please see Responses PUB16-09 and ORG6-42 and Master Response 2.
PUB99-04	The DEIR fails to adequately address the issue and mitigation of noise pollution. Noise generated by the hotel operation will frighten wildlife that we have admired and lived with harmoniously for years. The combination of increased traffic, helipad operations, and lodge guests visits and events/parties will undoubtedly put an end to the serenity that our family has enjoyed on Sawmill Mountain for over 60 years.	The commenter expresses concerns regarding the project's noise generation but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. Noise is evaluated in Chapter 4.12, Noise, of the Draft EIR.
PUB99-05	It is a shame that the County has to choose between creating more tax revenue and protecting its residents and land. Please see that a comprehensive and accurate EIR is created prior to moving forward. Bottom line is that this development has no place being built in this area for all of the aforementioned reasons and many more that have been covered by my family and neighbors. Truly, there are far more important things in life than money and I sincerely hope that Tuolumne County, the developers, and the Terra Vi proposed site land owners rise above their greed and do the right thing. The earth, the animals, and we, depend on your decision for the future of the planet and for preserving our peaceful treasured mountain. Thank you for your consideration.	The comment is noted. The comment does not address the adequacy of the Draft EIR.
PUB100	**Robert Hohn, July 30, 2020**	
PUB100-01	I am writing to urge you to oppose the Terra Vi Lodge development plan for several reasons: 1. It is the sort of 'leapfrog' development which I believe should be discouraged in our county. It is many miles from local fire, police, and medical services, which would put a huge burden on those services. It would also take business away from Groveland hotels and restaurants.	The commenter expresses concerns regarding emergency services on the project site but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. Emergency service and response is evaluated in Chapter 4.14, Public Services and Recreation, of the Draft EIR. Please also see Master Response 6.
PUB100-02	2. It is in an intense fire-prone region. This area burned hot and heavy in the Rim Fire. It makes no sense to allow a development in which hundreds of people would be put in harms way in a fast moving wild fire.	The commenter expresses concerns regarding wildfire but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. This topic is evaluated in Chapter 4.17, Wildfire,

Comment #	Comment	Response
		of the Draft EIR. Please also see Master Response 5.
PUB100-03	3. The project relies on well-water, which seems highly problematic. We know there will be severe droughts in the coming years. What happens when the wells start under-performing? Also, they will have to construct their own sewage treatment system to handle vast amounts of waste water. What happens if that system fails? There are simply too many problems for this leapfrog development to be approved at this particular site.	The commenter expresses concerns regarding water supply but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. Water supply is evaluated in Chapter 4.10, Hydrology and Water Quality, of the Draft EIR.
PUB101	**Bob Kaehms, July 30, 2020**	
PUB101-01	I saw a PML note float by again for the lodge up near Sawmill Mt. It seems like it would get a lot more support if more resources went into boosting fire services to a level where fire insurance wouldn't cost as much in the Groveland area. That could be done by putting in another station that would extend the 5 mile insurance range to more of the PML residents. In many areas, when a large construction project impacts a community, the builders are required to increase things like parks, schools etc. In this area, increasing fire projection would go a long way. It seems to me that the addition of 2 additional volunteer emergency staff who meet the certifications for a volunteer firefighter, as stated in the article, is well under what may be required in a normal community.	The commenter expresses an opinion regarding fire services on the project site but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. Fire service and response is evaluated in Chapter 4.14, Public Services and Recreation, of the Draft EIR. Please also see Master Response 6.
PUB102	**Lillian Miotto, July 30, 2020**	
PUB102-01	I am writing to oppose the development of the Terra Vi Lodge Yosemite for the following reasons: 1. WATER- I am concerned that there is not sufficient water supply to the area to support such a large facility. Testing has been done at the end of a wet season, however we cannot only use this data. Research needs to be done during the dry years as well to ensure that the wells that we have will not run dry while trying to support such a large facility.	Please see Response ORG6-42.
PUB102-02	2. SEPTIC- Tying together with the water concerns are additional concerns about an engineered septic system. With no public sewer system, Terra Vi Lodge Yosemite as well as the Under Canvas glamping must build their own septic systems. This will put further pressure on the water supply to the area. These systems are risking contaminating and polluting the Toulumne River as well as our current wells.	Please see Response ORG6-32 and Master Response 2.
PUB102-03	3. TRAFFIC- With two projects going in at the same time there will be a huge increase to both the vehicle B1075 and pedestrian traffic to the area. Furthermore, I believe that there will be an	The commenter expresses concerns regarding traffic but does not address the

Comment #	Comment	Response
	increase in the number of accidents and deaths with vacationers crossing HWY 120 and not being familiar with the area.	adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. Traffic is evaluated in Chapter 4.15, Transportation, of the Draft EIR.
PUB102-04	4. FIRE- The building of the two projects mentioned above puts a huge risk of potential fires to the area. Furthermore, the building of these sites increases the number of people that will be coming to the area and in doing so hundreds of more people will be put at risk should there be a summer wind-blown wildfire. The county facilities that we have cannot support evacuating the additional visitors that these facilities would bring.	The commenter expresses concerns regarding wildfire but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. This topic is evaluated in Chapter 4.17, Wildfire, of the Draft EIR. Please also see Master Response 5.
PUB103	**Matthew Moore, July 30, 2020**	
PUB103-01	I am writing to express several concerns regarding the proposed Terri Vi Lodge project. As a property owner in Tuolumne County, I understand and respect the need to expand the tax base. However, as a property owner on Hardin Flat Rd., just over Highway 120 from Sawmill Mountain Rd ., I am mindful of the fragility of the area. My principal concerns are as follows:	The comment provides an introduction to the comments below. Please see Responses PUB103-02 through PUB103-07.
PUB103-02	Cumulative impact with other projects, specifically Yosemite Under Canvas, Berkeley Tuolumne Camp restoration, and Yosemite Lakes expansion: The proposed project is much larger than any of the other projects which already will stress County services and pose risks such as...	The commenter expresses concerns regarding cumulative impacts. Refer to Chapters 4.1 through 4.17 of the Draft EIR, which each include a discussion of cumulative impacts related to each CEQA discussion topic.
PUB103-03	Fire: The proposed development is in a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone and a minimum of 30 minutes from the nearest fire station. I have already had difficulty retaining homeowners' insurance as a result of the Rim Fire and persistent fire risk.	The commenter expresses concerns regarding wildfire but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. This topic is evaluated in Chapter 4.17, Wildfire, of the Draft EIR. Please also see Master Response 5.
PUB103-04	Traffic and egress: With so many vehicles on the only road in and out of the Big Oak Flat entrance to Yosemite , the risk to human life in the event of a major fire is real. The DEIR does not allay these concerns.	The commenter expresses concerns regarding traffic but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. Traffic is evaluated in Chapter 4.15, Transportation, of the Draft EIR.
PUB103-05	Water: The well studies performed are wholly inadequate, based on examination of the information provided and evaluations contained in the letters of other public commenters. How will the developer respond if neighboring residential wells dry up as a result of this development?	The commenter expresses concerns regarding water supply but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. Water supply is evaluated in Chapter

Comment #	Comment	Response
		4.10, Hydrology and Water Quality, of the Draft EIR.
PUB103-06	Sewage: The design and capacity of the proposed sewage system seems insufficient for the six of *[sic]* the development. Contamination of ground water seems a significant risk that is not fully addressed by the DEIR.	The commenter expresses concerns regarding the project's wastewater generation and disposal but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. Wastewater is evaluated in Chapter 4.16, Utilities and Service Systems, of the Draft EIR. Please also see Master Response 2.
PUB103-07	Good faith: The timing and size of the DEIRs for this project and the Under Canvas Project raise the question of whether the County truly respects the views of local stakeholders. In short, I do not support this development. It puts short term tax revenues ahead of long-term environmental impact. We are better than this.	The comment provides a conclusion of the comments above. Please see Responses PUB103-01 through PUB103-06.
PUB104	**Ronald James Morgan, July 30, 2020**	
PUB104-01	We need you to stop and really take a look down deep within yourself. This and the project across Hwy 120 will be terribly disruptive to the area and those who live and enjoy the area. Folks in the area have long ties to this area and the changes being proposed will be a detriment to this beautiful area they have work so hard to keep to the natural beauty of the area. We've all read the pros and cons of this project. The more I read the more I see the experts say these projects are bad for the area and cannot be supported by what exists. Even if the infrastructure could be made in such a way to be able to provide support such projects the scars would be deep and not heal.	The comment is noted. The comment does not address the adequacy of the Draft EIR.
PUB105	**Sylvia Nestor, July 30, 2020**	
PUB105-01	As a 20-year property owner and an 8+-year full-time resident in the Pine Mountain Lake section of Groveland, I am extremely concerned about the multiple negative environmental impacts and potentially substantial threats to community safety posed by the Terra Vi Lodge development at the intersection of Hwy 120 and Sawmill Mountain Road. After living through the Rim Fire, plus recent years of severe drought that resulted in many dried up wells and millions of dead trees, I am greatly concerned about the inevitable negative impact this development would have on the broad area water supply, natural water systems (rivers, streams, etc.) due to an overwhelmed septic system, and , heightened fire risk in an excessively vulnerable area with already insufficient fire-fighting and emergency services.	The commenter expresses concerns regarding wildfire risk emergency services on the project site but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. These topics are evaluated in Chapter 4.17, Wildfire, and Chapter 4.14, Public Services and Recreation, of the Draft EIR. Please also see Master Response 5.

Comment #	Comment	Response
PUB105-02	Water Supply: Despite well tests done in a wet year that show ample supply, groundwater is rapidly reduced in just a couple of drought years. In likely future droughts, the lack of a public water supply of surface water from a reservoir, lake, or river and the dramatically large increase in demand by hundreds of daily users at the lodge would easily result in dried up wells for the lodge and surrounding community. Add a wildfire in that situation and severe catastrophe ensues.	Please see Response ORG6-42.
PUB105-03	Septic System: As there is no public sewe r system, relying on an engineered septic system to treat the humongous amounts of daily wastewater is beyond problematic, even in a wet year (tremendous amounts of water are required for those systems). The potential for the lower meadow in back of the lodge, surrounding wells and/or the Tuolumne River to be contaminated is far too great, especially as the system ages.	Please see Response PUB16-08 and Master Response 2.
PUB105-04	Fire Risk: Keeping in mind that this exact site was burned extensively by the Rim Fire, there is much greater risk for additional fires introduced by the vast increase in people inhabiting the vulnerable area. All of our emergency county services would be stretched way too far, thereby endangering those of us in in the Yosemite Gateway Corridor.	The commenter expresses concerns regarding wildfire but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. This topic is evaluated in Chapter 4.17, Wildfire, of the Draft EIR. Please also see Master Response 5.
PUB106	**Andy Nickell, July 30, 2020**	
PUB106-01	Dear Quincy & Taryn, This letter is in reply to the Terra Vi EIR and their plan to construct a luxury loding facility, Site Development Permit SDP18-003, Assessor's Parcel Numbers 068-120-060 and 068-120-061. The EIR has chosen to ignore the many concerns raised during the initial public review periods. They proposed no significant changes that I see based on the initial round of feedback.	The comment provides an introduction to the comments below. Please see Responses PUB106-02 through PUB106-08.
PUB106-02	I am still greatly concerned about the size and scope of this project and the cumulative impact on the area from YUC, Terra Vi, NACO expansion and the Berkeley camp rebuild, which is not addressed by this report. The county seems to think that there will not be a significant impact by bringing in thousands of additional people per day between these sites. How can there not be significant impact from that kind of additional use of our area. Hardin Flat Road is already in a terrible state of disrepair and simply can't handle that extra traffic volume.	The commenter expresses concerns regarding cumulative impacts. Refer to Chapters 4.1 through 4.17 of the Draft EIR, which each include a discussion of cumulative impacts related to each CEQA discussion topic.
PUB106-03	The fire risk associated with the facilities and hundreds of guests coming and going is far greater than the report acknowledges. Any approved development must have firefighting capabilities onsite!	The comment provides an opinion regarding the project's need for firefighting capabilities on-site. Mitigation Measure PS-1 in the Draft EIR requires that the proposed project provide trained and certified emergency staff

Comment #	Comment	Response
		with a minimum of two emergency trained staff on-site at all times. Mitigation Measure PS-1 requires that the certified staff on-site be trained to meet TCFD volunteer fire service standards.
PUB106-04	The water use requirements suggested in the report are laughably low, and obviously not realistic and are especially of concern in drought years when the water table drops.	Please see Responses ORG5-04 and ORG6-42.
PUB106-05	The proposed leach field system instead of waste water treatment plant is also inappropriate for any commercial development, the proposed site of the leach fields is directly uphill of neighboring wells. I have serious concerns about the viability and reliability of a traditional leach field system as laid out on this site.	The commenter expresses concerns regarding wildfire but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. This topic is evaluated in Chapter 4.17, Wildfire, of the Draft EIR. Please also see Master Response 5.
PUB106-6	The draft EIR fails to take into account the inevitable crossing of highway 120 by pedestrians should both Yosemite Under Canvas and Terra Vie be developed, this is extremely hazardous especially because of the blind turn at the top of the hill and the presence of one of only a small handful of passing lanes between the Yosemite entrance and Groveland.	Please see Response ORG6-67 regarding pedestrian and bicycle safety.
PUB106-07	Suggesting that Terra Vi will not have a significant impact on noise or light pollution is disingenuous, they plan to have weddings, weddings have loud music, there is no way that playing loud music will not have a negative effect on neighbors as well as local wildlife.	The commenter expresses concerns regarding noise and light pollution but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. These topics are evaluated in Chapter 4.12, Noise, and Chapter 4.1, Aesthetics, of the Draft EIR.
PUB106-08	The amount of proposed onsite employee housing fails to address the added stress that this development and its needed workers will bring to the area. Terra Vi needs to be able to house at least 90% of its employees.	The commenter expresses concerns regarding employee housing but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. Employee housing is evaluated in Chapter 4.13, Population and Housing, of the Draft EIR.
PUB107	**Nancy Perry, July 30, 2020**	
PUB107-01	This is such a bad idea I can't begin to count the ways. Stealing water from underground, the impact it will have on mountain roads and traffic as if the amount of cars racing thru this area Isn't enough. Let's not forget to mention evacuation from the risk of a fire. There is not enough of anything to support this nightmare of a project. These huge projects do nothing to support local business, fire efforts, water district, etc. I say NO to this horrible project.	The commenter expresses concerns regarding water supply, traffic, evacuation, and wildfire risk but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. These topics are evaluated in Chapter

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
	Please vote NO and do not pass approval of this development.	4.10, Hydrology and Water Quality, Chapter 4.15, Transportation, Chapter 4.9, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, and Chapter 4.17, Wildfire, of the Draft EIR. Please also see Master Responses 4 and 5.
PUB108	**Gene Pfeiffer, July 30, 2020**	
PUB108-01	I do not feel that the EIR report has adequately addressed the issues raised by me and others regarding the proposed project. The dangerous traffic situations at the entrance to the project using Sawmill Mt. Road (Forest Rte 1S03) has not been adequately addressed in the EIR. My first concern is the entrance to the proposed entrance is right after a hill and turn on HY120 that one needs to bevery careful turning left when leaving Sawmill Mt. Road going towards Yosemite Park. In addition, if there is a fire at the propose project or at Under Canvas our escape route would be blocked. In around 1950 this area had a forest fire and again with the Rim Fire in 2013. Our 850 sq. ft. bunk house burnt to the ground in the Rim Fire.	Please see Response ORG 6-64 regarding improvements to the Highway 120/Sawmill Mountain Road intersection. Please see Master Response 4 regarding emergency evacuation.
PUB108-02	The plans for the Hansji Hotels is using modular construction and will look like a glorified trailer park. When the surrounding neighbors had a meeting with the developers at the start of this project, they were shown pictures of their pass projects and the renderings look pretty good. This project will be an eyesore for people going to Yosemite Park and is not in keeping with the current beauty of HW120 to the entrance to the park only 5 miles away.	The commenter expresses concerns regarding aesthetics but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. Aesthetics is evaluated in Chapter 4.1, Aesthetics, of the Draft EIR.
PUB108-03	The water issue is of great concern to us and our neighbors. We had our new well drilled in 2017 and the well drillers had to go down 500 feet to get adequate water supply. The Hansji Company needed to test the wells for the EIR report and we agreed to allow the testing on our well. Prior to our testing our water tasted fine. After they pumped over 210,355 gallons of water out of our well over 5 days the water had a bad metallic taste. Also, the dishes in the dishwasher now has a cloudy film on the glasses. When we boil water in a pot, the pot also has a film on the sides and bottom of the pots. As we are plumping more water in the summer the taste is almost gone, but in the winter time with reduced pumping the taste is back. Hansji installed a filter and that helped somewhat with the bad taste in the winter time. They were supposed to do additional testing but have not done it. It appears that with the large amount of pumping during testing that and an increase flow rate from 7 gallons a minute when the well was dug, to 10 gallons a minute now it appears that water may be drawing from a new fracture in the granite. Could this be causing the bad taste? This question has not been answered in the EIR if with the increase pumping required for Hansji project and Under Canvas will other wells also have the same problems that we have encountered?	Terra Vi was first notified of the commentor's taste concerns at the end of capacity testing in November 2019. The Terra Vi team has worked with the well owner to diagnose the potential cause of the taste issue by removing equipment from the well, collecting additional water quality samples from the well and the house water supply system, and installing a filter system at the well head. Results of water quality sampling suggest that high hardness is likely the cause of the complaints and that hardness in well 26G(B) was high before the Terra Vi wells were pumped.

Comment #	Comment	Response
		Water quality samples taken before capacity testing (sampled 10/21/2019), after capacity testing (sampled 11/11/2019), and as confirmation samples (sampled 12/5/2019) do not show variability that would suggest a change in source water. The water quality samples collected before and after source capacity testing meet California Title 22 requirements for drinking water and concentrations below secondary maximum contaminant levels set for aesthetic standards. A filter was installed in December of 2019 to address taste complaints. Water quality samples were taken in April 2020 to test the filter. General chemistry was consistent between the 2019 and 2020 samples. All samples reported Total Hardness between 230 and 250 mg/L , in the hard to very hard range. These hardness results are consistent with the comment's complaints of film on glasses and pots, but the hardness was elevated prior to the start of Terra Vi source capacity testing. Water quality samples taken before and after source capacity testing indicate pumping Terra Vi Wells did not have in impact on the water quality in well 26G(B). The comment's complaints suggest hard water. Total hardness was consistent before and after the testing, indicating the testing did not impact total hardness. The increased flow rate was observed prior to the source capacity testing. Without data

Comment #	Comment	Response
		on prior water levels, previous equipping, and testing procedures used to calculate the 7 gpm rate, a cause of the increase cannot be determined. Prior to the start of capacity testing, flow from the 26G(B) well was measured twice at approximately 13 gpm. Flow was measured once by measuring time to fill a known volume container and once by measuring timed flow with a water meter reading in gallons. The well owner reports a flow of 7 gpm when the well was constructed in 2017. It is not known how that measurement was made. The increase in flow occurred at some point in time prior to the source capacity testing of the Terra Vi wells, indicating the pumping of the Terra Vi wells did not cause a change in flow. The comment suggests 210,355 gallons were pumped over a five-day period. This volume is not consistent with observed flow rates and pumping durations; at 13 gpm, the well would need to be continuously pumped for approximately 270 hours (11 days) to produce 210,355 gallons. Well 26G(B) was purged as part of shock chlorination treatments following installation and removal of PVC access tubes. Each purging event lasted approximately two days. Additional purging took place following well owner taste complaints. These purges lasted

Comment #	Comment	Response
		approximately three days. The well was not purged for five days. Pumping 26G(B) was not part of source capacity testing of the Terra Vi wells. Water quality sampling and flow rate observations indicate the source capacity testing of Terra Vi wells did not change the source of groundwater produced in 26G(B) or change the chemistry of the groundwater produced from Well 26G(B). Well 26G(B) was constructed in 2017, following an extended period of average to below average precipitation. Precipitation from 2017, 2018, and 2019 was 181 percent of average, 80 percent of average, and 127 percent of average, respectively. While groundwater level is not available, it is likely that groundwater levels in the fractured rock aquifer were recovering from drought conditions. The increased capacity of the well and the change in taste may be related to rising groundwater levels. This is consistent with the respondents comment that the taste decreased over the summer, when groundwater elevations would be lower than during the winter, when groundwater elevation recovers due to reduced pumping and increased precipitation. Nearby wells did not show the same high hardness observed in 26G(B). This indicates that the different fracture sets may produce

Comment #	Comment	Response
		difference water quality and that seasonal variations in pumping and water level may produce different water qualities. Regardless, the high hardness in 26G(B) was present before and after the Terra Vi source capacity testing, indicating the testing did not cause the hardness or cause a change in hardness.
PUB108-04	Has the county done a costs analysis on the increase costs of additional county services and the increase taxes that would be gained by this ill-conceived project?	The comment is noted. The comment does not address the adequacy of the Draft EIR.
PUB108-05	I understand that Rush Creek (a much better designed project) even before the Covid-19 was not having full occupancy. Will this project take away business from Rush Creek causing the county's tax revenue for the county to not be that much greater with this project?	The comment is noted. The comment does not address the adequacy of the Draft EIR.
PUB108-06	My Father first came to this area (Hardin Flats) in 1926 for the fly fishing and camping. My parents said that my first trip to Harden Flats was in 1941 when I was only 6 weeks old. My parents built a cabin along the South Fork of the Tuolumne River in 1952. We bought our property on Sawmill Mt. in 1966 and build our cabin in 1970. Our family feels that this oversized project in not in keeping with the environment.	The comment is noted. The comment does not address the adequacy of the Draft EIR.
PUB108-07	When the property was rezoned commercial in 1091 we opposed the rezoning and the county did not consider the rezoning correctly. I am including my 1991 letter and the initial study by the county.	The comment is noted. The comment does not address the adequacy of the Draft EIR.
PUB108-08	*Attachment: Augst [sic] 19, 1991 letter from Gene & Joann Pfeiffer*	The comment is noted. The comment does not address the adequacy of the Draft EIR.
PUB109	**Patrick Pfeiffer, July 30, 2020**	
PUB109-01	As a property owner at both Sawmill Mountain and Hardin Flat Road, I am writing to voice my concerns regarding the proposed Terra VI Lodge and the DEIR Prepared for the project. The DEIR prepared fails to address many important issues associated with the project. The DEIR states areas of concerns but fails to mitigate those concerns adequately. Below is a list of some of my concerns that need to be addressed in the best interest of the local community on Sawmill Mountain and Hardin Flat Rd, as well as the safety and wellbeing of the entire Groveland Community.	The comment provides an introduction to the comments below. Please see Responses PUB109-02 through PUB109-12.
PUB109-02	1) Traffic and Congestion a. The proposed access to Terra VI Lodger is not a county road. It is a Forest Service Rd (#1S03). It is currently used by the forest service, residents of Sawmill Mountain area and the general	Please see Responses ORG6-14 and PUB48-03.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
	public to access national forest lands and the middle s fork of the Tuolumne River. Using it for commercial use is not per easement granted to the USFS dated July 23rd, 1965. "the said easement herby granted is of r the reconstruction, maintenance and full free and quiet use and enjoyment of the road traversing above the described premises." Us e of this road as access to a lodger of this size would also restrict access by the USFS during logging operations and firefighting operations.	
PUB109-03	b. The access on and off of Sawmill Mountain Rd. onto Highway 120 lacks proper visibility due to its location at the top of a knoll. Exiting Sawmill Mountain Rd. (1503) heading Eastbound is dangerous now and will only be worse with several hundred guest that are unfamiliar with its challenges. Visibility is poor and not per Cal-Trans minimum requirements. This was not adequately addressed in the DEIR.	Please see Response ORG6-64 regarding improvements to the Highway 120/Sawmill Mountain Road intersection.
PUB109-04	c. Cumulative impact from the proposed Yosemite under Canvas Project was not addressed and should be since the proposed secondary exit from Yosemite under Canvas is directly across from 1503. Yosemite under Canvas proposes using another USFS road #1509. In an evacuation situation this would create a bottle neck potentially trapping residents of Sawmill Mountain and Hardin Flat from exiting their property. This bottle neck would also create a situation which would prevent emergency vehicles from responding in a timely manner. This was not addressed in the DEIR.	Draft EIR describes the cumulative effects on traffic from background traffic growth and other projects in the Transportation Impact Analysis on page 41 of Appendix J. Projected conditions satisfy the requirements of the Tuolumne County General Plan. Please see Response ORG6-68 for information regarding cumulative safety.
PUB109-05	2) WILDFIRE/ FIRE HAZARDS a. The DEIR fails to properly address the increase fire risk presented by the construction and operation of a lodge of this size. It also does not address the cumulative impact associated with other proposed projects.	The commenter expresses concerns regarding wildfire but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. This topic is evaluated in Chapter 4.17, Wildfire, of the Draft EIR. Please also see Master Response 7.
PUB109-06	b. The proposed project is in a very high fire hazard severity zone and previously burned in the 2013 Rim Fire. This project should not be allowed to be built unless an additional fire station is constructed nearby to support firefighting efforts.	The commenter expresses concerns regarding wildfire but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. This topic is evaluated in Chapter 4.17, Wildfire, of the Draft EIR. Please also see Master Response 7.
PUB109-07	3) EMERGENCY SERVICE a. Current response time for emergency services are poor and additional needs created by the construction and subsequent use of the proposed lodge will put Groveland Residents at risk. The DEIR states a 20-minute response time. This was not properly addressed. It is not reasonable to	Emergency response times are included in Chapter 4.14, Public Services, Parks, and Recreation, of the Draft EIR. These response

Comment #	Comment	Response
	believe that an emergency vehicle could be dispatched and mobilized on site in less than 45 minutes. This was not adequately addressed in the DEIR.	times are based on distance from the project site.
PUB109-08	4) WATER/ SEWER a. the amount of water needed for this lodge and its impact on local resident's water supply was not adequately addressed	The commenter expresses concerns regarding water supply but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. Water supply is evaluated in Chapter 4.10, Hydrology and Water Quality, of the Draft EIR.
PUB109-09	b. The amount of water needed for firefighting efforts in the event of a fire was underestimated in the DEIR.	The commenter expresses concerns regarding water supply but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. Water supply is evaluated in Chapter 4.10, Hydrology and Water Quality, of the Draft EIR.
PUB109-10	c. The proposed Leach Fields Associated with the septic system is located within 800' of an active spring which feeds int a small creek and ultimately the middle-Fork of the Tuolumne River. The impact associated with a septic system failure was not adequately addressed in the DEIR.	The commenter expresses concerns regarding the project's wastewater generation and disposal but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. Wastewater is evaluated in Chapter 4.16, Utilities and Service Systems, of the Draft EIR. Please also see Master Response 2.
PUB109-11	5) WILDLIFE IMPACTS a. The land slated for the proposed lodge is currently used as a deer wintering area. I have seen up to 100 mule deer at a time in the proposed location. Per the DEIR there will be a donation made to a non-profit to mitigate the impact to the dee hero. This seems nothing short of a "Pay off' and does not address the issues to wildlife at the proposed site.	Please see Response PUB88-11.
PUB109-12	b. The DEIR also does not adequately address impact to other wildlife. Thank you for taking the time to listen to my concerns and the concerns of others in the area. I trust that you will address all concerns as part of the EIR final draft as it not only effects those in the immediate area of Sawmill Mountain both those in the Greater area of Groveland.	The commenter expresses concerns regarding wildlife in the vicinity of the project site but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. Wildlife is evaluated in Chapter 4.3, Biological Resources, of the Draft EIR.
PUB110	**Louis Rivara, July 30, 2020**	

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
PUB110-01	As as *[sic]* a homeowner on Hardin Flat Road, I believe there are several reasons this project should not move forward. Here are a few. 1. County Sheriff Services are completely inadequate in this area for the addition of 250 or more units in the immediate vicinity as Terra Vi, Yosemite Under Canvas, and Berkeley Camp expansion. Personally, when we experienced two break-ins, we were told no officer was available to come by our property for at least three days. On another occasion, when a family member believed we were personally at risk and reported it, we received a voice message from the Sheriff's Department with the request to call back in the morning if help was required. And we are not an isolated case. With limited services and staffing located more than an hour away in Sonora, we have learned that this is a remote area of the county that cannot support the onslaught of the development that is projected.	The commenter expresses concerns regarding emergency services on the project site but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. Emergency service and response is evaluated in Chapter 4.14, Public Services and Recreation, of the Draft EIR. Please also see Master Response 6.
PUB110-02	2. While we agree that economic solutions are needed in the county, it seems grossly unfair that the targeted solution is sought more than 45 miles from the county's largest city and in an area that by its nature is rural with abundant natural beauty and wildlife. It is those characteristics that will be grossly impacted and lost forever.	The comment is noted. The comment does not address the adequacy of the Draft EIR.
PUB110-03	3. It is clear that one family, the Manly family, stands to gain a huge income stream through their proposed multiple projects in the vicinity. It is not appropriate that one family that owns land in the region will benefit so greatly while others will be paying the price.	The comment is noted. The comment does not address the adequacy of the Draft EIR.
PUB110-04	4. There are major issues with the DEIR. Included in those are the report's conclusions regarding water. With many homes downhill from the Terra Vi site, the report does not adequately address the impact of wastewater disposal on groundwater and possible water contamination on the sites of nearby property owners. Also, the testing methodology used, based on what I have read, seems to be insufficient for the type of location and terrain where Terra Vi is to be located.	Please see Response ORG6-32 and Master Response 2.
PUB110-05	5. The mitigation measures seem to be fraught with weak assurances rather than any clear guarantees that the surrounding lands and properties will not be harmed.	The commenter provides an opinion regarding mitigation measures in the Draft EIR but does not provide specific evidence to support the opinion.
PUB110-06	6. During Coronavirus and with Yosemite's own plans for it future unclear, it is unsound to push forward without more thoroughly vetting the impact this project will have on an area where the National Park Service is limiting entrance and cutting back service.	The comment is noted. The comment does not address the adequacy of the Draft EIR.
PUB110-07	7. The impact of a helicopter pad on the quality and serenity of the surrounding area will not be sufficiently mitigated by the efforts proposed. It seems to me that the single best reason for a	Draft EIR page3-18 states that the County will include a Condition of Approval which

Comment #	Comment	Response
	helicopter pad at this location is so that persons can be flown to Sonora and elsewhere when emergencies occur. However, the request for a helicopter pad in itself seems to constitute an admission on the part of the developers that the infrastructure does not exist in the region to adequately deal with emergencies that they seem to expect are certain. If on the other hand, the hope of Terra Vi is that executives can be flown in for the "Terra Vi Experience," rather than having to drive up the hill, then others businesses along the way will not see the benefits expected. Again, maybe great for the County or the Manleys, but not for the rest.	prohibits the use of the helipad for non-emergency uses.
PUB110-08	In a sense, this seems like a 2020 version of the fight that John Muir had on his hands when Hetch Hetchy was constructed more than a century ago. With Rush Creek, Evergreen Lodge and others already in the area, more is not better. The county's financial woes would best be solved by focusing support around existing developed areas. Let's see meaningful initiatives to existing business owners, not the introduction of more competition when more is not needed. Let's see area like Tuolumne City focused on in a way that uplifts those in that community. Let's housing developed that can draw those that are now seeking to exit dense metropolitan areas who also now have the capacity to work from home. Let's see a targeted effort to attract retirees to enjoy the special way of life that Tuolumne County affords. Let's not begin to destroy the great natural resources that are unparalleled in Tuolumne County.	The comment is noted. The comment does not address the adequacy of the Draft EIR.
PUB111	**Margene Rivara, July 30, 2020**	
PUB111-01	To be perfectly clear and to put it bluntly, there is absolutely no way Terra Vi should be built on the site presently being considered. It is dangerous, irresponsible and short sighted to move forward with such a proposal. According to the Reports I have read, related to Water availability, Sewage Runoff, Extreme Fire Hazard Potential, Lack of Emergency Services, Traffic Congestion and Irreparable Damage to the Environment, there is no justification to warrant building this project. The Draft EIR is weak and not completely accurate about the facts related to this Development. In addition to this huge project being proposed in a very poor location, there is already plenty of Development in close proximity to the proposed site, which includes, Yosemite Lakes, Berkeley Camp (approved to be rebuilt after it burned down in the 2013 Rim Fire), Rush Creek Lodge, and Evergreen Lodge.	The commenter states a concern regarding the location of the project. The Draft EIR evaluated an Alternate Location Alternative which determined that an alternate location would yield relatively similar results as the proposed project with reduced impacts in regard to noise, public services, parks and recreation, and utilities and service systems. Refer to Chapter 6, Alternatives, of the Draft EIR, for more information. Please also see Master Response 7.
PUB111-02	During the Rim Fire, the Fire moved more than 18 miles from Groveland, to completely burn down Berkeley Camp and bump at the Boundary of Yosemite and the Park itself. It was finally stopped at great Tax Payer Expense after much damage was done. We were fortunate Yosemite was saved that time, but we cannot risk a next time. Should there be such a fire again at the proposed Terra Vi Site or YUC Site, across Hwy 120 there is high probability the fire could race right into Yosemite. Do not ignore what is common knowledge. The proposed sight is marked on	The commenter expresses concerns regarding wildfire but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. This topic is evaluated in Chapter 4.17, Wildfire, of the Draft EIR. Please also see Master Response 5.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
	Fire maps as "Extreme Fire Danger". At stake is Yosemite, the Environment and a way of life for the Animals that cannot be replaced.	
PUB111-03	The way I see it, the only winner in the Development of Terra Vi and YUC if the project is approved is the Family of Tim Manly, and the Southern Calif. Hansji Corp. The losers are the Environment and those who have lived "lightly" on the land in harmony with the environment for many generations. They have protected the land, and the environment which they are feel is worth fighting for, and so do I.	The comment is noted. The comment does not address the adequacy of the Draft EIR.
PUB111-04	My suggestion is, why not build such projects closer to Groveland where there can be a win for all concerned. The Services that Groveland can supply are immense, such as Air Transport, Fire Services, Sheriff Services, Medical Services, Shopping, available land for parking and public Transportation, and Education Services for the families of those working at the development. The impact on the Environment would be less damaging and the positive impact to Groveland would be a plus. A Groveland location would be a win for everyone, including the County and the Tax Revenues you would receive. It is far safer and has more advantages while at the same time has far less risk.	The commenter states a concern regarding the location of the project. The Draft EIR evaluated an Alternate Location Alternative which determined that an alternate location would yield relatively similar results as the proposed project with reduced impacts in regard to noise, public services, parks and recreation, and utilities and service systems. Refer to Chapter 6, Alternatives, of the Draft EIR, for more information.
PUB112	**Margaret Speed, July 30, 2020**	
PUB112-01	Mr Yaley, I would like to express my opposition to any further development along Hwy 120 between Groveland and Yosemite until the two lane Hwy 120 is widened to accommodate the substantial additional traffic. As an employee in Yosemite, who drove there from Groveland for 9 years, the impact on traffic from your most recently approved project in the same area, Rush Creek Lodge, was very apparent. Now you are leaning towards approving these two additional projects in the same area to impact traffic to a tremendous degree. Will we have gridlock in Groveland? Maybe. Please stop sacrificing our quality of life in Groveland for revenue from these projects that will be used to enhance Tuolumne County's budget. It seems like the cart is always put before the horse. Widen the road first, then look to further development. Sierra Vi is not just a new motel. It will impact the area on a very large scale. I haven't even gone into the myriad of other problems these developments will bring: fire, ambulance, water. Please deny these developments until the aforementioned issues are corrected. Don't try to figure it out after the projects are built and then discover there aren't any good solutions. What if Yosemite decides to continue with only allowing a reduced number of visitors to the Park and continue the Day Use Reservation system? Where are all these people from Rush Creek Lodge, Sierra Vi and Glamping campground going to go? They are here to go to Yosemite not wander along	The commenter expresses concerns regarding traffic but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. Traffic is evaluated in Chapter 4.15, Transportation, of the Draft EIR.

Comment #	Comment	Response
	forest roads or go to our tiny Rainbow Pools when they can't get into Yosemite. You don't have enough answers yet, Mr. Yaley, to approve these developments.	
PUB113	**Pauline Turski, July 30, 2020**	
PUB113-01	I am very much in favor of this project. I cannot see how it will impact Groveland; it will help small local businesses! It will provide a tax base. There is already traffic going through Groveland to Yosemite! There is not enough housing in PML / Groveland as it is. I have attended many GCSD meetings about this project and how the services will work. This community needs to start growing up; they need to start working together.	The comment is noted. The comment does not address the adequacy of the Draft EIR.
PUB114	**Steve Vrionis, July 30, 2020**	
PUB114-01	I write on behalf of the Erickson family and further additionally submit their letter and cosign as a show of support.	The comment is noted. The comment resubmits Comment Letter PUB94.
PUB114-02	Our family has owned a parcel adjacent to the proposed development since the mid-1940's. Our family and friends have been enjoying the South Fork, Middle Fork, Sawmill Mountain and the Groveland community for five generations. This letter is in response to the "Terra Vi DEIR," which included extensive appendices, well test reports, site plans, and past comments. This document dismisses items that are considered relevant to the safety and well-being of the neighboring communities and the general public that frequent the Highway 120 corridor in Tuolumne County. The First Issue to address is the Parcel and Zoning Questions: This DEIR is doing a report on a parcel that was never legally subdivided in compliance with the Tuolumne County Ordinance. As a property within the community of the Manly property we would like the County to follow the proper procedure and notification for a divide and rezoning. The Second Issue to address is the Timberland Conversion: The matter of conversion of the site from commercial forest use to a non-forest use. The DEIR notes that the project could have a significant impact on the environment <u>if it results in the conversion of forest land to non-forest use.</u> The DEIR text clearly acknowledges that the project would result in a conversion of the project site from a focus on timber management to a focus on recreation. Over past decades, when projects affecting forest lands have been reviewed, Tuolumne County planning commissioners	The comment is a duplicate of Comment Letter PUB94. Please see Responses PUB94-01 through PUB94-07.

Comment #	Comment	Response
	and county supervisors have historically strongly advocated for strict and thorough review of the impact of converting commercial timberlands to other uses. Third Issue is Fire Risk: The Grand Jury published a report on June 3, 2020 a Tuolumne County Fire Safety Report. (which can be found on the County's website: https://www.tuolumnecounty.ca.gov/1294/2020-Grand-Jury-Report) The report states "Of the 20 most destructive Fires in California's History, 10 have happened within the last four years….Recent wildfires events in Tuolumne County include the 2013 Rim Fire that burned more than 257,000 acres over 68 days.." it continues to state that "A mass evacuation will always be difficult on neighborhood roads that are two lanes, winding and easily blocked by one fallen tree, power poles, or abandoned vehicles across a road." Adding a 250+ room hotel, employees, and general public along with the properties already there, this project would cause a massive potential for disaster with hundreds of guests and employees attempting to evacuate along with the owners of properties adjacent to the proposed project. The Fourth Issues is Water Supply: All properties currently get their water supply from wells. Terra Vi's well testing failed. With the indicated required draw on the water table, the project could and probably would leave the Sawmill Community with no water. The is no documented mitigation for this. The DEIR finding of Less Than Significant is based on just the minimum required tests that in no way confirm that any of the onsite wells have sufficient volume of recharge to be a permanent water source for the large scale of this development. All the other local, large hotels that are also in granite sub-strata have struggled to provide sufficient water. The DEIR does not appropriately state that the water flow testing showed that the pump test was a failure in providing the appropriate water that would meet the demand of such a project. There is no mitigation for depriving the surrounding properties of their water supply. The Fifth issue is Forest Service Road: Terra Vi is assuming they would have access from the Sawmill Mountain Road (Forest Route IS03). Their main circulation, access and egress is all planned for using this route. However, a Forest Route, such as IS03, is for forest administration and forest access. Also	

Comment #	Comment	Response
	Forest Route IS03 is the only access that the 15 cabins in the 80 acre homestead have. Considering that the planned site for Terra Vi has an alternative access approved by CalTrans 200 yards east along Highway 120, the alternative would be the most appropriate access to such a planned project. The Sixth issue is Waste Water: The DEIR does not address the potential for system failure of the waste water treatment system. The failure of the system would result in contaminating the water supply for the 15 resident cabins, the Middle Fork of the Tuolumne River and also could be in violation of the clean water act. The DEIR completely overlooks the negative impact of a waste water treatment failure. The USGS Ascension Mountain quad map (photo-inspected 1992) shows a spring located outside the project boundaries, 300± feet to the north (the same off-site aquatic feature shown in the NWI map). On the quad map, the spring flows into an unnamed perennial channel that flows northwest into the Middle Tuolumne River and, based on topography, EC-01 also would be expected to flow into the same off-site perennial channel 300± feet north of the project boundaries and subsequently to the Middle Fork Tuolumne River. What does this tell us? These concerns address only a few of the issues; as this DEIR is over 1,200 plus pages with a short time granted to review not only the Terra Vi DEIR but also the Under Canvas DEIR, the county is limiting the community's ability to adequately respond to all the misinformation and lack of facts this DEIR provides.	
PUB115	**Keigh Zenobia, July 30, 2020**	
PUB115-01	As a long-time resident of Pine Mountain Lake in Groveland, I vehemently object on several grounds to the Terra Vi Lodge development at the intersection of Hwy 120 and Sawmill Mountain Road. The Environmental Impact Report does not adequately address traffic safety concerns introduced by the project	The commenter expresses concerns regarding traffic but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. Traffic is evaluated in Chapter 4.15, Transportation, of the Draft EIR.
PUB115-02	Nor does it properly assess the probable shortfall of the area water supply for a project of this immense scale and likely endangerment by the overtaxed septic system to the surrounding natural water system.	The commenter expresses concerns regarding water supply but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. Water supply is evaluated in Chapter 4.10, Hydrology and Water Quality, of the Draft EIR.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
PUB115-03	Moreover, the exponentially increased fire-risk by such large numbers of daily visitors in an extremely vulnerable area of our county would pose too great of a threat and severely overtax our barely sufficient fire-fighting, emergency and sheriff services.	The commenter expresses concerns regarding wildfire but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. This topic is evaluated in Chapter 4.17, Wildfire, of the Draft EIR. Please also see Master Response 5.
PUB116	**Dan Courtney, July 31, 2020**	
PUB116-01	Please find attached a copy of the comment letter I submitted yesterday regarding the draft EIR for the Hansji Company Terra Vi hotel / resort proposed for Sawmill Mountain. To echo many comments you have received, or will be receiving, I have to state that I feel the way The County has handled this project from the very beginning has been disingenuous and counter productive. I own the property directly adjacent to the site and directly below the proposed giant leach field (approximately seven acres I believe). The subject property drains onto and through my meadow, springs and well before entering the middle fork of The Tuolumne River. My property will, without any doubt, be severally impacted yet neither I, or any of my neighbors, interested parties, community organizations, government agencies or anyone else was given a reasonable opportunity to review and comment on this massive draft environmental impact report, which, I understand to be the largest ever submitted in The County. The previous record was set, I understand, by the Yosemite Under Canvas draft EIR which, as you're aware, we JUST finished reviewing and commenting on. It was unconscionable to "dump" such a humongous amount of work on everyone, just seven business days between deadlines, in the middle of Summer, during the resurgence of COVID19 and to offer the bare minimum required review period. I know many people and organizations submitted valid and justified requests for a short extension which were apparently rejected. I did not even receive an answer on my request, despite my follow-up emails and phone calls.	The comment expresses concern that the public review period of the Draft EIR was not extended. Please see Master Response 1, which explains the County's decision not to extend the public review period of the Draft EIR.
PUB116-02	In fact, as far as I can tell, The County did not even run a notice in the Union Democrat, Mother Lode or other medias which would alert it's citizens and organizations of the issuance and comment period for the DEIR's on either project.	The comment is noted. The comment does not address the adequacy of the Draft EIR.
PUB116-03	I know that the District Ranger for the Groveland District of the USFS was not aware of the submittals until hearing about it from me thirty days into the review period and that Mr. Glenn Gottshall, President of the Tuolumne County Alliance for Resources and Environment (TUCARE) and every member of the Board was completely unaware of either DEIR and comment period until YESTERDAY, when Mr. Gottschall saw the article in the Union Democrat which was initiated	The comment is noted. The comment does not address the adequacy of the Draft EIR.

Comment #	Comment	Response
	by communications from the residents of Sawmill Mountain. There are hundreds, or thousands, of important residents and entities which were completely unaware. How is The County supposedly served when it's key citizens and organizations are kept in the dark and not allowed a chance to review and advise?	
PUB116-04	So I, an adjacent property owner, had no viable chance to review and comment. My attached letter is piecemeal and incomplete, as are the submittals from many impacted neighbors, organizations and concerned citizens and The County is thereby deprived of valuable input. I know the County is accepting comments until the BOS meeting, but there is a big difference with the effectiveness and standing of comments received after the deadline, as the County will not be legally required to respond to those points and issues raised post-deadline. Both Terra Vi and Yosemite Under Canvas are BIG projects and, if approved, will have tremendous impacts on Tuolumne County for decades to come. It's extremely important for the County to receive, and evaluate, ALL information related to potential impacts. I am hereby re-submiting *[sic]* my request for the Terra Vi DEIR comment period to be extended to the standard sixty day period, per CEQA guidelines, to allow citizens and organizations a reasonable opportunity to provide valuable input.	The comment is noted. The comment does not address the adequacy of the Draft EIR.
PUB116-05	In closing I would like to make the point that many of us feel The County is pushing these projects through with little, or no, consideration for the long term surrounding community. At every step of this process the comment periods are kept to the minimum as is Notice. In fact, Yosemite Under Canvas was just three days away from Board of Supervisors approval based on the results of just an Initial Study before I, an adjacent property owner, found out about the meeting by accident, when I called the Planning Department regarding an entirely different meeting, for the Terra Vi project. Attorney's Ellison Folk and Deborah Rosenthal had to scramble to have the Approval vote removed from the agenda. Prior to mistakenly receiving information on the Board of Supervisors meeting I had absolutely NO knowledge that Under Canvas was set for Approval. In fact I was never even made aware that an Application had been submitted for this project and neither were ANY of my neighbors on Sawmill Mountain and Hardin Flat, surrounding the project site. The Application had in fact been in process for ONE YEAR.	The comment is noted. The comment does not address the adequacy of the Draft EIR.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
	These tactics are counter productive in terms of gaining support from the community and ineffective in that we are a smart bunch and know how to address these issues.	
PUB116-06	Additionally, as you will see in my letter, there are serious issues with past entitlements on this property. The County has been made aware and, as the lead agency, has the legal responsibility to investigate, yet it apparently is not and failed to include the alleged Unlawful Land Division in the DEIR's for either project, despite their timely submittal and constant follow-up by County resident Matthew Chapman. His complaint needs to be taken seriously and investigated.	The comment is noted. The comment does not address the adequacy of the Draft EIR.
PUB116-07	Again, I implore you to extend the comment period for another two weeks, to the standard CEQA sixty (60) day period. Give your residents, representatives and organizations the opportunity to review and submit comprehensive comments. It's not like two weeks will make any difference in the timeframe of these proposed developments. Both have been in the works for two years and will likely be in the works for several more years as the surrounding community has been stewards of Sawmill Mountain and Hardin Flat for Seventy Five Years and will continue to do what's necessary to protect this beautiful part of Tuolumne County.	The comment requests an extension of the public review period of the Draft EIR. Please see Master Response 1, which explains the County's decision not to extend the public review period of the Draft EIR.
PUB116-08	Dear Ms. Yaley, please review the following comment letter I'm submitting on the Draft Environmental Impact Report for the proposed Terra Vi project. I will start by stating that we have to question whether the County is really looking out for it's constituents when it refuses to accommodate valid requests for a short extension to allow for a more through and valuable review and response to the Draft Environmental Impact Report. As the owner of the property directly adjacent to this proposed resort, sharing a long property line, and directly under the proposed giant leach field I am writing to share several concerns regarding various Impacts which were not adequately addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Report as well as to question the legality of the previous entitlements, which the County is required to investigate. The Sawmill Mountain / Hardin Flat area is comprised of R-2, R-5 and A-10 residential properties. This proposed hotel / resort site is directly in the center of our long term Homsteader residential area. It shows on the map as a small patch of private property surrounded by thousands of miles of Stanislaus National Forest and Yosemite National Park, just six miles to the east.	The comment provides an introduction to the comments below. Please see Responses PUB116-09 through PUB116-48.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
	My great-great uncle was one of the very original homesteadesr *[sic]* while serving as the foreman of the sawmill almost one century ago. The Sawmill Mountain / Hardin Flat area is a beautiful, rustic community. Our properties are typically one or two bedroom cabins or houses on five to ten acres parcels of incredibly beautiful, scenic, quiet nature "preserves" consisting of old-growth forest, lush green meadows, seasonal springs and streams feeding the Wild and Scenic Tuolumne River. The area is populated by far more animals than people including hawks, herds of Mule Deer, frogs, mountain lion, bear, endangered owls and bats and much more. Most of the homes have been in the same families for generations. Many of my neighbors are up to their third or fourth generation and the Erickson's are on their fifth generation. One of my earliest memories here was catching poison oak and falling in love with Calamine Lotion at around five years old. We are the caretakers for this land as generation after generation are raised here and taught how to protect and care for this beautiful yet fragile nature. Most of our homes (but unfortunately not all) survived the Rim Fire, due in part to our regular thinning and maintenance of this forest, which is both hard and expensive work. In fact, the firefighters and other responders nicknamed our area "The Oasis" because it was the last remaining stand of green in miles of black, burnt forest. We all love this mountain and river and do our best to protect it and preserve it for future generations. Personally, I'm a second generation owner, a relative "new kid" on the block. My late Mother, Jacqueline, loved this property immensely and was so at peace and happy surrounded by "her" trees and "her" meadows until she passed last year. It's for her sake, as well as mine and future generations that I write this letter to let you all know what a shame and tragedy it would be if Tuolumne County decides to forget about what it represents for the sake of dollars.	

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
PUB116-09	I'm going to briefly review the history of this land and then point out some of the numerous substantially negative impacts which have been largely ignored, dismissed or altogether ignored When this site was purportedly re-zoned from Timber Preserve to Commercial Recreation thirty years ago (Exhibit One – Letter from Gene Pfeiffer) the County provided minimal notice to the surrounding property owners, did not conduct an Environmental Impact Review and essentially made no mention of the existence of this large residential community. In fact, they referenced the underlying zoning of Hwy 120 as a justification of conformance with the commercial use, completely ignoring the fact the subject site is in the midst of our residential community, which was established over Seventy Five (75) years ago. From my research I've gathered that in 1991 the Tuolumne County Board of Supervisors voted to support a General Plan Amendment to re-zone the subject property from Timber Preserve (TPZ) to Commercial Recreation (CK) based on an Initial Study. The property at that time was a single approximately 139 acre parcel (APN 68-20-57). The approval document attached as Exhibit One brings up some interesting points including the fact that CEQA requires the lead agency to obtain an EIR unless there is "no substantial evidence in light of the whole record before the lead agency, that the Project may have a significant impact on the environment (Public Resource Code 21080 (c) (i) . However, the Initial Study did mention the possibility for multiple significant impacts including, but not limited to: Adversely impacting timber production. Being located in an Extreme Fire Hazard zone. A request by Fish & Game for a wildlife survey. Distance from emergency service. Impacts to wildlife.	The comment pertains to a previous rezoning of the project site. This EIR considers the proposed project in the context of baseline conditions, under which the project site is zoned Commercial Recreation.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
	Aesthetic impacts to the Hwy 120 corridor through the National Forest leading to the National Park. Tuolumne County Fire Department's statement that the project "may create a significant adverse impact as far as TCFD's and CDF's ability to provide fire protection within this area." The Initial Study reported that the Tuolumne County Fire Department indicated that the site receives year round structural fire protection from Cal Fire Smith Station, and seasonal (June 1 - November 1) from Cal Fire / Groveland. The response time from "First Due Engine Company" is 20 +- minutes. In fact, the Smith Station fire station is no longer a year-round CalFire facility but is now operated by the U.S. Forest Service who are neither trained for nor permitted to respond to structure fires on private property. So it appears this site no longer satisfies the conditions of the 1991 zone change. It also appears the County did not obtain input from many of the key agencies including Cal Trans. The study also states: Page 5: It is the policy of the State to discourage expansion of urban services into Timberland. Page 6: Conclusion the zone change does not constitute Urban Development and no urban services are required for the project or future development. Question: How do you develop large scale motel / hotel / resort complexes without urban services? General Plan Fire Hazard Rating of the project site is Extreme. No major deer migration corridor. (There is no question there are large herds of Mule Deer migrating through this property at this time). Pg. 8 Year round spring and ephereral drainages.	

Comment #	Comment	Response
	Importantly, the Initial Study, page 11, states that "Pursuant to Chapter 1 of the General Plan, the project site would ordinarily be run through the General Plan Decision Matrix (Appendix A) following cancellation of the Williamson Act contract, in order to determine the appropriate General Plan land use designation. Chart 1C of the Decision Matrix indicates that the appropriate General Plan designation for … Assessors Parcel No, 68-120-57 would be LR (Large Lot)." The Initial Study then makes the case that because Hwy 120's underlying zoning is designated Parks and Recreation as are two small adjacent parcels south of Hwy 120 and contiguous to subject property (I believe this refers to the pull-over lane and the drainage channel for Hwy 120) the findings can be made the property can be rezoned to Commercial Recreation. To me that sounds like a little bit of a stretch. There is no mention of the fact this property sits right in the center of a Seventy Five (75) year old well established Homesteader community consisting of well over Thirty multi-generational RE-2, RE-5 and A10/RR properties. The net effect of Re-Zoning this property from Timber Preserve to Commercial Recreation without the benefit of an Environmental Impact Review was to deprive the neighboring property owners, the community as a whole, the County and the surrounding environment of the ability to consider all of the potentially significant negative impacts listed in the Initial Study, and possibly more.	
PUB116-10	The next significant entitlement action on this property was the division of this single approximately 139 acre parcel (APN 68-120-57) into four relatively similar size lots between 2003 and 2004 through a lot line adjustment. Information pertaining to this County action, an allegation into a possible violation of the Subdivision Maps Act and an ongoing request for investigation was submitted to the County during the Scoping study but apparently was not included in this over 2,000 page DEIR. The allegation is, in part, that the lot line adjustment was performed illegally with parcels that did not in fact exist. More information is included in the Comment Letters submitted by one of our neighbors, Matt Chapman.	The County is aware of concerns regarding the previous subdivision involving the project site. The County Surveyor has previously considered these concerns and has determined that the previous lot line adjustments were properly executed.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
	It appears the County may be failing it's duty to investigate this allegation. Attached to this letter are several County documents including a Consent to Record four large separate legal parcels when only two legal parcels are in the referenced Certificate of Compliance (Exhibits Two, Three, Four & Five). The apparent net impact of this likely ministerial process was for the County to once again deprive the neighboring property owners, the community as a whole, the County and the surrounding environment any kind of Notice, possible circumvention of the Subdivision Map Act and loss of the opportunity to examine the potential impact of this division of land, which now lends itself to the creation of two separate large-scale commercial developments.	
PUB116-11	Fast forward to 2015 – 2016. A recorded CFIP agreement is brought to my attention. I've attached a California Forest Improvement Act (CFID) Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund (GGRF) agreement for a Federal Grant (Exhibit Six). This document was signed and submitted by the property owner less than five years ago, a couple of years after The Rim Fire, and includes the following information: Objective: Establish fully stocked forest conditions capable of carbon sequestration and long term timber production. Establishment of planted conifer plantations and maintain healthy productive stands into the future. Pg. 13. Approximately 30 acres of the northeast portion was planted at 300 trees per acre and a spot spray around seedlings was done. The remaining area had adequate natural regeneration and was not planted. The area has a history of wildfire activity. The 1987 Complex Fire, Rogge Fire 1995, and the Rim Fire 2013 all burned major portions of the Tuolumne River watershed either burning or threatening the property. The proximity of the parcels to Hwy 120, a major State highway and the northern access to Yosemite Park, add to the importance of creating a safe and aesthetic forest landscape.	Please see Response ORG9-28.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
	The Tuolumne River along with the other perennial watercourses provide valuable wildlife habitat for a number of species including deer, bear, wild turkey, and gray squirrels. The landowners want to insure these values by improving forest health and reducing current fuel load levels. When combined with other properties within the Tuolumne River Watershed, this project will help protect water quality, aesthetics, and wildlife values within the overall watershed. Pg. 14: Tree establishment and survival to a fully stocked timber stand will allow for carbon storage on site. Long term the stand will be grown to maturity and managed for timber. Trees will be left to grow on site to rotation age 60-100 years. As harvests occur regeneration will be encouraged to maintain a viable timber stand. Trees will occupy the site and timber volumes per acre are expected to be maintained between 15 and 40MBF/ac. Once trees are established shade will deter the growth of brushy fuels and plantation maintenance will greatly decrease hazardous fuel buildups that lead to large wildfires. Pg. 15: The landowner is committed to managing the parcel for long term forest and agricultural use. Current zoning is rural allowing for these land uses. The promotion of a mature forest will provide a diversity of habitat for wildlife. The area is located within the VeryHighFHSZ in Tuolumne County. This project is designed to achieve the following: 1) Establish viable forested condition. 2) Restore and improve forest health. 3) Protecting water quality by maintaining vegetative debris and minimize potential for movement of herbicides downstream through use of no application buffer strips. 4) Help reduce the risk of catastrophic stand replacement wildfires through maintenance and establishment of forested landscapes. Pg. 4: Participant certifies that the parcel of forestland to which the Forest Improvement Program applies will not be developed for uses incompatible with forest resources management within 10 years following recordation date, as explained below. If the parcel of forestland is	

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
	zoned other than TPZ, pursuant to provisions of Chapter 67 (commencing with Section 52200) of Part 1 of Division 1 of Title 5 of the Government Code, a Land-Use Addendum shall be signed by the Participant and shall be incorporated in and made a part of this agreement. Said Land-Use Addendum shall be recorded in the office of the County Recorder of the county of the affected land and shall be a covenant running with the land. Pg. 10: (d) Number of acres under the Management Plan: 149 How is the project area zoned? Check one of the following and answer pertinent questions: TPZ Agriculture Preserve Other: AE Is there a Conservation Easement, CC&R's, or a petition for rezoning from TPZ to other uses, existing, underway, or contemplated, which would restrict resource management activities for the period of time during which the grant is administered (10 years)? Yes No X Will the landowner agree not to put CFIP land to any use incompatible with forest resource management for 10 years? Yes X	
PUB116-12	So after reading and analyzing these documents I'm now sitting here asking myself "is this hotel/recreation land or is this timberland? As long as we've owned our property, again, directly adjacent to the subject property, all we've observed is it's use as Timber Preserve. We saw a large logging operation in 2013, we see the recorded CFIP document stating the property owner will receive grant money for reforestation and that the land will remain in use as Timberland through at least 2025, we see the property use described as Agricultural on the County's tax roll, and we think this is Timberland, not Commercial. In fact, so does the State of California. It appears the property was intended to be converted from Timberland ten years after the 1991 zone change. According to the State of California, up through the date of the writing of this letter a Conversion permit has not been submitted and applied for. As the 1991 Initial Plan stated, "the project site would ordinarily be tun through the General	The opinion of the commenter is noted. The project site is not currently used or zoned for timber production, and tree density is diminished due to the previous Rim Fire; therefore, the project is not considered forestland or timberland. The project's non-compliance with the CFIP contract is noted in impact discussion FOR-2. However, non-compliance with a contract is not a physical impact on the environment.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
	Plan Decision Matrix (Appendix A) following cancellation of the Williamson Act contract, in order to determine the appropriate General Plan land use designation."	
PUB116-13	We feel that's where things stand today. The property owner should first complete the Conversion permit with the State of California and, IF approved, should THEN proceed to apply for a zone change with the County, based on the conditions in effect today, not thirty years ago. It is not "automatic" that the State will approve a Conversion permit. In fact the Conversion permit applied for by Yosemite Under Canvas, on the other side of the site, was rejected by The California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection just last week due, in part, to concerns stated by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife's concern "concerned with potential impacts to special-status bat species, State Species of Special Concern northern goshawk (Accipiter gentilis), avian species, and stream and riparian resources." (See Exhibit Seven – Cal Dept of Fish & Game Letter). Additionally, the impact of Conversion of Timber Preserve is in itself a serious impact. Due to extreme reductions in the availability of Federal Timberland and the loss of substantial amounts of private Timberland the remaining inventory is treasured, as are the benefits of carbon sequestering and the reduction of greenhouse gasses. We feel the County is putting the cart before the horse and should table this Application until when, and if, the property is successfully converted from Timber Preserve through the State of California, THEN perform the due diligence to evaluate the appropriate zoning in this current era. It is quite possible the outcome would be different, and the determination following an Environmental Impact Report could well be that the current appropriate land use is either Residential, to conform with the surrounding community (and not the underlying zoning of Highway 120), or some other appropriate use. It is actually highly questionable that this is an appropriate site for Commercial zoning, given the severe fire risk and what we've learned (hopefully) from The Rim Fire and The Camp Fire, the absence of public water and sewage, the traffic concerns, the impact on the migration patterns of the wildlife present in the area currently (not what was or was not here thirty years ago) . Let's look at the reasons why this might be the case:	The opinion of the commenter is noted. Regarding timberland, please see Response PUB116-12. Regarding the appropriate land use for the project site, this EIR considers the proposed project in the context of baseline conditions, under which the project site is zoned Commercial Recreation.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
PUB116-14	Water: Please see the attached letter (Exhibit Eight) from top hydrogeology expert Kenneth Schmidt (Bio attached as Exhibit Nine). Mr. Schmidt's concluded that the DEIR statement that the proposed development doesn't appear to place a burden on the available groundwater supply in the project vicinity was not supported by the report. In fact the pump testing had several major failures including, but not limited to: Drawdowns were significant, especially since the residential properties were mostly uninhabited and not utilizing water during the time of the test. The discharged water may have re-entered the water table during the pump test. Testing was not performed in a cumulative manner, with the proposed Yosemite Under Canvas Project across the road. Incomplete and missing information.	The commenter incorrectly states that the drawdowns were significant. Typically drawdowns in fractured rock wells can far exceed those shown by the testing. The key issue for fractured rock wells is the ability of the wells to recover after pumping. The ability of the wells to recover after a 10-day continuous pumping test demonstrates that there is groundwater in storage to refill the fractures that provide water to the well. With regard to the impact of water discharged to ground surface on the groundwater levels, See also Responses ORG5-03 and PUB92-05. All of the neighboring wells that were equipped with transducers were pumped during the testing period. See Figures 14 to 18 of the project Hydrogeology Study contained in Appendix G of the Draft EIR. Please see Responses ORG6-42 and PUB68-14.
PUB116-15	Fire: This impact is so obvious it's barely worth discussing. Just the concept of inserting several hundred hotel guests into the middle of an Extreme Fire Hazard Zone / dry forest. Not to mention this area is prone to frequent fires and has been burned in: The Rim Fire of 2012 The Rogge Fire of 1995 The Complex Fire of 1987 Again, in the 1991 Initial Study the Tuolumne County Fire Department's stated that the project "may create a significant adverse impact as far as TCFD's and CDF's ability to provide fire protection within this area."	The comment does not address the analysis in the Draft EIR, therefore no further response is required. Wildfire impacts are included in Chapter 4.17, Wildfire, of the Draft EIR. Please also see Master Response 5.

Comment #	Comment	Response
	And that was with the Smith Station Fire Station year-round and a 20 minute response time, plus they required a 1,250 gpm 20 psi fire system which could operate for two hours and a 150,000 gallon dedicated water tank. Is there less risk of fire now than in 1991? All reports I've read say there is now a greatly heightened risk of fire. I keep hearing about Cal-Fire's plans to freeze developments in the high fire risk areas. Is this rush to approve the project for the purpose of beating those restrictions?	
PUB116-16	Traffic: The cumulative impact of this project combined with the re-opening of Berkeley Camp, expansion of Yosemite Lakes and proposed adjacent Yosemite Under Canvas MUST be evaluated with a Traffic Study as well as the design of Hwy 120 to allow pull-outs for YARTS, turn lanes on both sides of Hwy 120 and a center lane. CalTrans was apparently not consulted in the 1991 zone change to commercial but they must be now. Rather than utilizing a dead-end Forest Route with a sharp turn as the drivers are exiting a sharp curve along Hwy 120 the main entrance and exit for the project should be located at the site's sixty foot opening onto Hwy. 120, further to the east, where the line of sight is much better (Exhibit Ten).	The commenter expresses concerns regarding traffic but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. Traffic, including related cumulative impacts, is evaluated in Chapter 4.15, Transportation, of the Draft EIR. The cumulative impacts analysis under impact discussion TRANS-5 identifies the Berkeley Camp, Yosemite Under Canvas, and the Thousand Trails/Yosemite Lakes RV Expansion projects as other present or reasonably foreseeable projects and analyzes cumulative transit and VMT in accordance with CEQA Guidelines. The analysis resulted in a significant and unavoidable impact.
PUB116-17	Sewage: Even the top of the line sewage treatment centers fail and the concept of a giant leechfield for a development of this scale is disgusting. What happens when the waste cannot percolate, and where does it go when it does percolate? The project map depicts the flow going south, towards Hwy 120, which is uphill. Since underground flow typically follows the terrain it is much more likely the sewage would flow downhill through the meadows, springs, streams and wells of the neighboring properties then into the stream 300' away which flows into the middle fork of the Wild and Scenic	Please see Response ORG6-32 and Master Response 2.

Comment #	Comment	Response
	Tuolumne River. It's preposterous to think there is no substantial impact created. When it fails, then what? How does that get removed from the river? There are confirmed reports of COVID19 in the water exiting Yosemite Valley from the Merced River. Do we want COVID19 in The Wild and Scenic Tuolumne River as well? As stated in Dr. Schmidt's letter (Exhibit 7) a careful hydrogeologic evaluation needs to be performed on the impact of wastewater on the project's and neighboring property owner's water supply.	
PUB116-18	Evacuation: The residents of Sawmill Mountain have one, and only one, evacuation route, along Forest Route I-S03 past the proposed resort and onto Hwy 120. How are the residents, as well as visitors to Stanislaus National Forest, supposed to reach the highway when hundreds of fleeing and likely panicked hotel guests are between them and the highway? Eight homes have only the use of the easement across the NW corner of this site just feet from the proposed Heli-pad, which means they would likely be stopped until the helicopters have completed their landings and take-offs.	Helicopter landing and takeoff for the helipad included in the proposed project would not impair use of the roadway, and the helipad location would not block the roadway. Use of the helipad would also be rare as it would be during emergency situations only. Please see Master Response 4 for more details on evacuation.
PUB116-19	Eco-Friendly: How Eco-Friendly is it to destroy a forest of mature trees which were among the relative few in the area to survive the Rim Fire, adjacent to the boundary of a National Forest?	The commenter expresses concerns regarding wildfire but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. This topic is evaluated in Chapter 4.17, Wildfire, of the Draft EIR. Please also see Master Response 5.
PUB116-20	The bottom line here is that, yes, Tuolumne County needs additional revenue. But at what point do you sacrifice what you're all about? This project will have a severe detrimental impact on the scenic corridor into Yosemite National Park.	The comment is noted. The comment does not address the adequacy of the Draft EIR.
PUB116-21	It creates serious safety and environmental impacts which cannot be mitigated.	The comment states an opinion that the cannot be mitigated, but does not provide specific information to support the claim.
PUB116-22	This is the wrong place for a large commercial development of this scale. There are alternative locations which are served by the Groveland Community Service District	The commenter states a concern regarding the location of the project. The Draft EIR

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
	with running water, sewage, in closer proximity to the scarce emergency services. These locations, including "The Scar" and the Deardorfer *[sic]* property along Hwy 120 near Smith Station, will generate the same tax revenues for the County without destroying this beautiful but fragile environment and putting so many lives at risk.	evaluated an Alternate Location Alternative which determined that an alternate location would yield relatively similar results as the proposed project with reduced impacts in regard to noise, public services, parks and recreation, and utilities and service systems. Please see Chapter 6, Alternatives, of the Draft EIR, for more information. Please also see Master Response 7.
PUB116-23	The zone change to Commercial Recreation was performed almost thirty years ago without an EIR. Conditions have changed. Indeed, it seems impossible for this site to now satisfy the conditions of the 1991 approval. The property has continued to be utilized as Timberland the entire time through current. There is currently a Timber Harvest Plan proposed. I urge the County to put aside the temptation of substantial TOT income for a minute and look at this proposed project solely with regards to it's merits vrs it's potentially extremely serious negative impacts. Find a more appropriate location for the lodging establishments. Allow the property owner to obtain the financial reward they deserve through profitably developing the site in character with the long-term existing residential community it sits in the center of. Conduct a feasibility study to examine other potential uses, such as creating single family homes to blend in with the neighborhood and to assist with the County's serious affordable housing crisis. After all, theres no guarantee this project will be successful or survive for more than a few years. Then what? PLEASE consider all the input, observations and suggestions you are receiving from your constituents and tax payers.	The commenter's concerns largely focus on planning issues and not the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. The comment refers to a previous rezoning of the project site. This EIR considers the proposed project in the context of baseline conditions, under which the project site is zoned Commercial Recreation. Regarding the location of the development, the Draft EIR includes an Alternate Location Alternative.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
PUB116-24	*Attachment: Exhibit 1, August 19, 1991 letter from Gene and Joann Pfeiffer*	The comment provides an attachment which includes stakeholder comments. No response is required.
PUB116-25	*Attachment: Exhibit Two, Certificate of Compliance Documents*	The comment provides an attachment which includes certificate of compliance documents. No response is required.
PUB116-26	*Attachment: Exhibit Three, Manly Subdivision Documents*	The comment provides an attachment which includes subdivision documents. No response is required.
PUB116-27	*Attachment: Exhibit Four, County Surveyor Documents*	The comment provides an attachment which includes county surveyor documents. No response is required.
PUB116-28	*Attachment: Exhibit Five, Lot Line Adjustment Map*	The comment provides an attachment which includes a lot line adjustment map. No response is required.
PUB116-29	*Attachment: Exhibit Six, CFIP document*	The comment provides an attachment which includes Certified Forest Improvement Plan documents. No response is required.
PUB116-30	*Attachment: Exhibit Seven, Yosemite Under Canvas Timber Harvest Plan Letter*	The comment provides an attachment which includes a letter in regard to the Yosemite Under Canvas Timber Harvest Plan. No response is required.
PUB116-31	Pursuant to your request, I reviewed the Hydrology and Water Quality section of the DEIR and Appendix G (Hydrogeology Study) for the Terra VI Lodge project. First, I discuss major issues and this is followed by other comments.	The comment provides an introduction to the comments below. Please see Responses PUB116-32 through PUB116-48.
PUB116-32	*Major Issues* *1. The disposition of the water pumped during the pump tests wasn't discussed in the report, which is a serious omission. Was it handled so it didn't percolate back to the groundwater during the tests? The flattening in the drawdown plots (Figures 10 and 12) could have been caused by recirculation of the discharged wa ter.*	Please see Response PUB68-14.
PUB116-33	2. The additional drawdowns in the 26G(B) and 26G(C) wells of 54 feet and 24 feet after only 10 days of pumping for the pump tests are significant. The total drawdowns in these wells after pump ing for the project for the whole summer and during drought peri ods weren't provided.	Please see Response ORG6-42.
PUB116-34	3. The testing procedure called for in the 22 CA ADC §64554 are far from ideal for hardrock wells in the foothills and mountains of the Sierra Nevada. Constant rate pump tests have been known	Applicable regulations for Tuolumne county were used. Please see Response ORG6-42.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
	for decades to not indicate long-term well yields in this situa tion. Rather, constant head tests of 20 to 30 days in duration are needed to determine long-term yields. This is what a number of counties required when evaluating proposed subdivisions in such areas for use in CEQA evaluations.	
PUB116-35	4. A table should have been prepared clearly indicating the drawdowns in all of the wells due to pumping of these two wells. Figures 14-16 are problematic in this regard.	The impact of pumping of the neighbors wells cannot be removed from the observed drawdowns. Figure 17 and Figure 18 of the project Hydrogeology Study (contained in Appendix G of the Draft EIR) show approximate recovery of nearby wells after the Terra Vi wells stopped pumping.
PUB116-36	5. The impact of wastewater on groundwater quality wasn't discussed in Appendix G. There was also no meaningful discussion on this impact in Section 4.10.	Please see Response ORG6-32 and Master Response 2.
PUB116-37	6. A cumulative impact evaluation needs to be done for the pump age for the Under Canvas and Terra VI projects and the existing water supply wells in the vicinity. Conditions at the end of the dry season should be evaluated.	Please see Response ORG6-42.
PUB116-38	Other Comments 1. The water samples from the wells should have been collected near the end of the pump tests, not before and after as indicated on Page 8. Purging of multi borehole volumes (Page 10) isn't suitable practice for obtaining representative samples from hard rock water supply wells.	The extended pumping test procedure was modified from regulation to increase the demand on the fractured rock aquifer. Pumping rates were several times higher than calculated demand. Water quality samples were collected to more closely reflect planned well operation (shorter duration pumping to fill storage tanks).
PUB116-39	2. There wasn't much discussion of the fractured zones that pro vided most of the water from the various wells. Also, MW-1 only produced 1 gpm by airlifting, and was almost a dry hole. It is thus of limited value. Depth and water production for the three private wells weren't discussed. What happened to the yields of these wells during the pump tests?	Monitoring well MW-1 showed water level response to pumping in Terra Vi and Neighbor wells. It is sufficiently connected to the fractured rock system to serve as a monitoring well. Well 26G(B) was observed to be pumping at approximately 13 gpm during the testing, above flow reported by the well owner in personal communication.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
PUB116-40	3. There was no discussion of a water budget and groundwater re charge, such as was provided for the project to the south. The explanation of the DDW approach mentioned on Page 15 is flawed, primarily because DDW staff aren't hydrogeologists or experienced in hardrock evaluations. When the counties such as Fresno han dled the evaluations, a much more thorough approach was required, particularly in terms of impacts on other wells.	Please see Response ORG6-42.
PUB116-41	4. Figures 14-16 are difficult to follow. For example, on Fig ure 14, the symbols under the explanation for each well can't be determined on the water-level plots.	The comment is noted.
PUB116-42	5. I reviewed the transducer measurements for the G. Pfeiffer well at 11360 Sawmill Road. First, the well identification for the transducer measurements does not follow that used in the text (26GB). Second, the pages of transducer measurements don't indicate when the pump tested wells started and stopped pumping, or when the private domestic well itself started and stopped pumping. Also, the water-level changes shown under the Depth (ft) column don't agree with those under the Groundwater Elevations column.	During testing and in data provided to well owners, the well owners names were used to designate wells. In the publication of the report, wells were referred to using a modification of the State Well Number to preserve owner privacy. Raw transducer data was provided are request of the participating neighbors. Pressure transducer reported depth is depth of water above the transducer. It must be added to the transducer elevation to determine a groundwater elevation.
PUB116-43	Recommendations 1. Separate water-level plots for each well should be provided (i.e. for Well 26GB). On each plot, the times should be shown for when Wells 1 and 2 started and stopped pumping, and when private domestic wells such as 26GB started and stopped pumping.	Figures 17, 18, and 19 of the project hydrogeology study (contained in Appendix G of the Draft EIR) show groundwater elevation in both of the Terra Vi pumping wells and one of the neighboring wells. Start and stop of Terra Vi wells is clearly indicated. Known pumping of the neighboring wells is indicated. Additional pumping must be inferred at the times of sharp increase in drawdown of the well. Neighbor's well use was not monitored on a constant basis.
PUB116-44	2. Transmissivity and storage coefficient can be readily deter mined from the pump test results. They should be used to calculate long-term drawdowns in the private domestic wells, for a whole period of seasonal pumping in the absence of recharge.	Volume of groundwater in storage was tested under these procedures and is more relevant than transmissivity and storativity in

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
		determining capacity of fractured rock aquifers systems.
PUB116-45	3. A careful hydrogeologic evaluation of the impact of wastewater disposal on groundwater quality (including on private domestic wells) needs to be done, rather than relying on bureau cratic procedures to handle the issue.	Please see Response ORG6-32 and Master Response 2.
PUB116-46	4. The accumulative impact evaluation should be done for the pumpage for the Under Canvas and Terra VI projects and the existing water supply wells.	Please see Response ORG6-42.
PUB116-47	*Attachment: Exhibit Nine, Kenneth D. Schmidt Bio*	The comment provides an attachment which includes information from a biologist. No response is required.
PUB116-48	*Attachment, Exhibit Ten, Caltrans Document*	The comment provides an attachment which includes Caltrans documents. No response is required.
PUB117	**Rich Hill, July 31, 2020**	
PUB117-01	Than you, for taking emails regarding this issue. All it takes is a drive around this are to understand that there really cannot be any further discussion about any increased water usage, residential, commercial, or otherwise...., until such time as another "for sure" source of fresh water is deveveloped or found. The only other real answer is to have the devevelopers or new residents bear all costs for their projects water needs. There is currently a rather extensive water sortage up here, that almost ALL who alread reside here ARE CURRENTLY PAINFULLY DEALING WITH.	The project sponsor will be responsible for ensuring safe and adequate water for the proposed project consistent with applicable regulations and standards.
PUB118	**Sarah Sutton, July 31, 2020**	
PUB118-01	I have reviewed the Draft EIR for Terra Vi Lodge Yosemite and think the project can provide many benefits to vacationers and the local residents. I do have a few concerns, however, that I would like to see addressed more thoroughly and would like to see specific mitigation measures addressing my concerns included in the final document and MMRP.	The comment provides an introduction to the comments below. Please see Responses PUB118-02 through PUB118-6.
PUB118-02	Fire Risk, Emergency Response and Evacuation Planning The devastating urban interface wildfires state-wide over the past three years point to the critical need for detailed fire risk evaluation and planning, especially with all new developments. I urge the County to obtain a full Fire and Emergency services review at the State level due to the high wildfire potential in Tuolumne County. What plans will be put in place to facilitate rapid evaluation if needed, especially if fire teams are also coming up Priest Grade to fight the fire? How can we be assured the additional population and traffic from this project and cumulative impacts from the other proposed projects listed in the EIR will not put our community at much	The commenter expresses concerns regarding wildfire risk, emergency response, and evacuation planning but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. These topics are evaluated in Chapter 4.17, Wildfire, Chapter 4.15, Public Services and Recreation, and Chapter 4.9, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, of the

Comment #	Comment	Response
	greater risk of evacuating safely? How can avoid the sort of disaster, in terms of property damage and lost lives, experienced in Paradise in 2018? Highway 120 is the main access road to and from the west and is very narrow through Groveland, Big Oak Flat and the winding Priest Grade. Please require that the project prepare a detailed fire safety and mitigation plan, including emergency evacuation projections. Include number of vehicles (for this project and cumulative impacts) on the road all, at one time, heading west out of the region through Groveland, Big Oak Flat and down Priest Grade. Please take into account that the Highway 120/Ferretti Road intersection in Groveland already backs up as traffic along 120 increases during prime vacation season. Even if a stop light is eventually required at this intersection, how will that impact cross-traffic evacuation? Traffic back-up for basic roadwork at that intersection, as well as many locations along 120, already results in long wait times. If residents waiting at the intersection can't merge onto 120 to evacuate due to a long line of vacationers trying to escape on the highway, I envision wholesale panic and injuries, or worse if people can't exit in time. I realize I am painting a dire worse-case scenario, but recall that Paradise was destroyed in less than 24 hours! I lived in the Bay Area and remember how residents were trapped when trying to exit the Oakland Hills fire in 1991 along their narrow roads, which resulted in several deaths. I personally had to evacuate from the Rim Fire, and helped family leave the area from the Complex Fire. Wildfires in these steep canyons have proven repeatedly to be very difficult to contain, especially with the superheated dry winds fanning the fires from the east.	Draft EIR. Please also see Master Responses 5 and 6.
PUB118-03	Other Concerns In addition to my primary concern about addressing fire risk and public safety, I am concerned about the following: • Emergency Services: Fire (localized incidents in addition to forest fires, mentioned above) Medical services and evacuations, and Law Enforcement. How will the project contribute to necessary increases in staffing, equipment and services in all these areas? It is not sufficient to simply defer that decision to the County and ignore the increased demand from the project.	The commenter expresses concerns regarding emergency services on the project site but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. Emergency service and response is evaluated in Chapter 4.14, Public Services and Recreation, of the Draft EIR. Please also see Master Response 6.
PUB118-04	• Transportation and Services: How will increased traffic impact Groveland and Big Oak Flat? In the summer, traffic is already congested through our small town. I am also concerned about public safety – please address how to slow vehicles coming into Groveland from the west and east. Can rumble strips be installed? We were rear-ended by a truck barreling around the corner	The commenter expresses concerns regarding traffic but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comment #	Comment	Response
	into town and not stopping in time as we were waiting to turn left into Yosemite Bank. As noted above, the corner of Ferretti Road and 120 are already a congestion point when long lines of tourists are passing through. Also, our two small gas stations are already packed with vehicles on the weekends (and many choosing not to wear masks!) with long wait times.	EIR. Traffic is evaluated in Chapter 4.15, Transportation, of the Draft EIR.
PUB118-05	• Water Supplies: How will the project impact current and long-term supplies for existing residents? State-wide projections are showing water availability decreasing, even with current populations, let alone future development.	The commenter expresses concerns regarding water supply but does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. Water supply is evaluated in Chapter 4.10, Hydrology and Water Quality, of the Draft EIR.
PUB118-06	• Cumulative Impacts: the EIR mentions several projects that will increase the cumulative impacts. Please address the maximum expected impacts for all of the above at full build-out. Thank you for reading and addressing my concerns. I do think the project can provide a unique opportunity for visitors and also can potentially bring positive economic benefits to our historic Gateway Community to Yosemite.	The commenter expresses concerns regarding cumulative impacts. Refer to Chapters 4.1 through 4.17 of the Draft EIR, which each include a discussion of cumulative impacts related to each CEQA discussion topic.

This page intentionally left blank

PLACEWORKS

1625 Shattuck Ave, Suite 300
Berkeley, California 94709
510.848.3815
www.PlaceWorks.com