

To: Analytical Environmental Services,  
1801 7th Street Sacramento, CA 95811  
Attention: Ryan Sawyer AICP.

Feb. 23, 2017

Hello,

I am writing in regards to the Crystal Geysers Draft EIR and have the following comments.

I have lived in Siskiyou County since 1969. I am a property owner within the sphere of influence of Mt. Shasta. Along with my husband, I owned a business in Mt. Shasta since 1983. I sold the business in 2013, and the business still exists today. As a business owner, I was well aware of the importance of tourism for the economic wellbeing of my business and the business community as a whole. Approximately 60% of our business was derived from tourists, primarily in the summer and fall seasons. It was always clear to me that visitors came to enjoy the beauty of Mt. Shasta and to enjoy the many recreational activities in our area.

I have 2 areas of concern regarding the Crystal Geysers Draft EIR:

**1. Draft EIR 4.1 Aesthetics:**

As per Mt. Shasta's General Plan:

"The City of Mt. Shasta is located in an area of substantial scenic variety and beauty. Policy OC-7.1 of the City's General Plan Open Space and Conservation Element is intended to "promote the protection of the scenic beauty of the Mt. Shasta area through appropriate zoning, development standards, and the development review process involving lands in both the City and outside the city limits. The County is encouraged to support and help implement this policy."

In considering Section 4.1-3 Aesthetics, there are two issues I would like to address. The first is the reflective white surface of the existing warehouse and rooftop. Under Section 3.0 of the Project Description, Section 3.6 states:

"As the successor in interest to CCDA Waters, CGWC has committed to implementing measures within the 1998 Mitigation Agreement that are applicable to the Proposed Project, including the following...Aesthetic Resources:

- Building and free-standing signage will be constructed of non-reflective materials and will not be internally illuminated.
- Elevations and specifications will describe materials and color selection.
- The applicant will work with the City and County to determine a mutually acceptable theme."

This mitigation has not to date been met. Not only does the reflective white surface create glare during the daytime for residences and business in the area, it is an eyesore from Ski Village Drive, a main collateral roadway that routes locals and visitors alike, particularly coming from the north, up to Mt. Shasta. Additionally, as travelers ascend Everitt Memorial Highway and look down at the City and its surroundings, CG stands out as a very large, glaring distraction in an otherwise peaceful setting.

The color of the building and rooftop should blend in with surrounding natural colors of the landscape. Because this is not located in an urban area, there is no need for a corporation to emblazon its brand and color to distinguish itself from other similar sized large warehouse facilities.

The second issue I have regarding Section 4.1.3 Aesthetics has to do with the landscaping along Ski Village Drive. Section 4.1-3, Local Views of the Project Site states in regards to landscaping:

“Once mature, this landscaping will screen views of the project site from nearby residential sites and Ski Village Drive when compared to baseline conditions.”

- It appears that CG has done the absolute minimum in the way of landscaping the north, most visible side of the property. “Once mature” may be 20 years or more; surely CG could, at very little cost, do more with landscaping to rapidly screen the north side of the project site.

## **2. Draft EIR 4.11 Transportation and Circulation:**

In the original presentation by Crystal Geysler on March 24, 2014, the hours of proposed operation were to be Monday-Friday 7:00am-7:00PM. Yet in the Draft EIR Section 3.5.1, Bottling Facility and Proposed Operation the hours of operation have been summarily changed:

“In its daily operations, CGWC plans to operate the Plant up to 24 hours per day (depending on demand), Monday through Friday, with one day shift on Saturday from 7:00 am to 3:30 pm and one swing shift starting Sunday evening at 11:00 pm. Analyses of the Proposed Project’s potential impacts are based on this level of production, which conservatively assumes continuous operation of the Plant at 90 percent capacity of the installed bottling equipment (Weklych, 2016a). At full production, Plant operations are estimated to include up to 100 truck trips per day (up to 50 round trips per day) and up to 181 employee vehicle trips per day (approximately 60 employees); some of these trips may occur during weekday nights as the Plant is planned for 24-hour operations.”

Given the extent of the increased hours of operation and number of trucks trips per day, I, as a twice daily traveler on this route, am concerned about the safety of increased traffic at the Study Area Intersections #1 and #2.

At Intersection #1 (Mt. Shasta Blvd, Spring Hill Rd., I-5), although the posted speed limit is 45 mph, cars both leaving and entering the City consistently drive much faster than this posted speed limit. This makes it dangerous for vehicles on Spring Hill Rd. to turn left onto Mt. Shasta Blvd. Because Spring Hill Rd. is a side road that is not clearly marked and is so close to the I-5 north onramp, it is easy for unsuspecting motorists to speed past at near highway speeds.

Intersection #2 (Mt. Shasta Blvd., Ski Village Rd, Nixon Rd.) is a safety concern as well. The Mt. Shasta City brings many people to the Park for year round use of its facilities and frequently hosts large groups for major events. The City Park is the location of the headwaters of the Sacramento River. Bicyclists and pedestrians routinely access the Park, and families come with children to play and picnic outdoors. Although studies have been done analyzing LOS for traffic delays, safety at this intersection for pedestrians and bicyclists should be carefully examined as well to determine if with the increased truck traffic crosswalks across Mt. Shasta Blvd. are necessary, and if bike lanes and sidewalks or walking paths are warranted.

I appreciate the extensive review your firm is doing in order to examine and analyze all potential impacts associated with the plant operations of Crystal Geyser. I am sure you are aware of the enormous effort our local citizens have gone to in studying and presenting the potential effects of this project on our community. I trust that you will come to some reasoned conclusions that will be a win-win for all sides.

Respectfully,  
Jane Prestegard  
Mt. Shasta, Ca.