

From: Carol Jenkins [mailto:carol_jenkins@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Monday, February 20, 2017 10:30 PM
To: Crystal Geysler <crystalgeysler@analyticalcorp.com>
Subject: CGWC draft EIR-Aesthetics

Comments on the Crystal Geysler EIR

Section 4.1 – Aesthetics

Long-range Views of the Project Site

The project site is within scenic vistas from recreational trails and areas along the southwestern slopes of Mt. Shasta looking into the valley and City. The existing warehouse building, which is the most dominating visual feature within the project site due to its reflective white paint surface and expansive scale, would not be altered from existing conditions as a result of the Proposed Project. Proposed Project components, including the caretakers residence, generators, juice tanks, chillers, propane tanks, and wastewater treatment facilities that have been or would be installed as part of the Proposed Project would not likely be visible within existing scenic vistas of the valley floor, given the distance and relatively small size of the proposed facilities. Project facilities along the southern façade of the building would likely be shielded from view from surrounding recreational trails and long-range viewpoints by the building itself. The proposed facilities along the eastern and northern portions of the building would likely blend into the view of the existing building, resulting in little or no perceptible change to the visual character of the project site and its surroundings from long-range views. Potential impacts to long-range scenic vistas of the valley floor would be **less than significant** and no mitigation is required.

Driving on Ski Village Dr. I can easily see the project site and consider it visually much too prominent in our community. Saying that buildings installed as part of the Proposed Project would *not likely* be visible within existing vistas of the valley floor, offers no guarantee of mitigating the visual impact of an already much too prominent project site. The claim that the visual impact of the project site is less than significant and that no mitigation is required is inconsistent with the equivocal statement that the proposed project would *not likely* be visible. If the visual impact can not be determined in a definitive way, a more thorough review must be done of the aesthetic problems with this project and the visual impact on a community that revolves around its visual grandeur.

Carol Jenkins

1815 Shasta Acres Rd,

Mt. Shasta, CA 96067

CarolJenkinsPhD.com

CarolJenkinsArt.com

 [CarolJenkinsStudio](https://www.instagram.com/CarolJenkinsStudio)