

From: [Kit Elliott](#)
To: [Julie Patterson-Hunter](#)
Subject: Fwd: Rincon del Rio project modification
Date: Tuesday, May 11, 2021 8:35:44 AM

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Rhetta VanderPloeg <Rhetta.VanderPloeg@co.nevada.ca.us>
Date: May 11, 2021 at 8:33:49 AM PDT
To: Marsha Burch [REDACTED], Bruce Inman [REDACTED]
Cc: Kit Elliott <kit.elliott@co.nevada.ca.us>
Subject: FW: Rincon del Rio project modification

More comments for today's hearing.

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This communication with its contents may contain confidential and/or legally privileged information. It is solely for the use of the intended recipient(s). Unauthorized interception, review, use or disclosure is prohibited and may violate applicable laws including the Electronic Communications Privacy Act. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender and destroy all copies of the communication.

From: suareztribe [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, May 11, 2021 7:43 AM
To: Matt Kelley <Matt.Kelley@co.nevada.ca.us>
Subject: Rincon del Rio project modification

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of County of Nevada email system. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Matt here are my comments regarding the Rincon del Rio project.
This project is wrong for the area on so many points.

Farmlands- It is a good grazing area. If not cattle then deer and other wildlife. The Heritage oaks in the area (that they haven't already cut down) are treasures. As well directly uprooting the wildlife under the project the air and light pollution generated by it in this vicinity will harshly impact the rest of the wildlife along the river canyon and on surrounding lands.

Affordable Housing- At a \$525,000 median price! Older folks in our county don't

From: [Kit Elliott](#)
To: [Julie Patterson-Hunter](#)
Subject: Fwd: KNCR Rincon del Rio BOS Meeting Comments 5-11-21
Date: Tuesday, May 11, 2021 8:34:33 AM

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: "Karen M. Abbott" [REDACTED]
Date: May 11, 2021 at 5:53:26 AM PDT
To: Matt Kelley <Matt.Kelley@co.nevada.ca.us>, Kit Elliott <kit.elliott@co.nevada.ca.us>, Rhetta VanderPloeg <Rhetta.VanderPloeg@co.nevada.ca.us>, Heidi Hall <Heidi.Hall@co.nevada.ca.us>, Ed Scofield <Ed.Scofield@co.nevada.ca.us>, Dan Miller <Dan.Miller@co.nevada.ca.us>, Sue Hoek <Sue.Hoek@co.nevada.ca.us>, Hardy Bullock <Hardy.Bullock@co.nevada.ca.us>
Subject: KNCR Rincon del Rio BOS Meeting Comments 5-11-21

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of County of Nevada email system. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Esteemed Supervisors and all concerned parties,

First I must apologize in advance for the lateness and broken text of this correspondence. I had meant to send it last week but serious family issues kept me from doing so.

My mother went into hospice and passed away on May 7th. I am currently in Vancouver Washington attending to the painful details of her passing. I have very limited internet access here and can only send emails using my small cell phone. I am not able to prepare a proper Word document to send to each of you individually. I will however attempt to convey the information to all of you as efficiently as possible via cell.

That said, I am writing today to implore you all to seriously consider compelling the developer of the proposed Rincon del Rio project to abide by the 2013 Settlement Agreement between KNCR, Nevada

County and Young Enterprises, which was signed in good faith by all parties.

That 2012/2013 lawsuit was undertaken not to stop the project from being built, but to ensure that the Rincon del Rio development that eventually was built remained the same full service Continued Care Retirement Community (CCRC) that was advertised and approved from 2009-2013.

The previously approved Rincon del Rio CCRC allowed for seniors 55 and older to pay an entrance fee to join the community and live out the remainder of their lives without having to deal with “home ownership” responsibilities and stressors such as paying property taxes, home owners’ insurance (almost impossible to acquire in the proposed high fire hazard area) and sewer or water utility fees. Most importantly those seniors would never have to suffer the stress or expense of tedious real estate transactions each time they needed to move within the continued care community as they aged and their abilities and needs changed.

If you compare the project that was approved in 2013 with the project currently proposed you will see that it is not the same community. They tout the same 345 unit count and 415 population density, but the proposed amendments turn the development from an age-in-place Continued Care Retirement Community (CCRC) into an active 55+ Senior Living Retirement Community (SLRC).

That entrance fee based (care-free) element was heavily advertised and promoted as the most essential and beneficial feature of a CCRC environment. The previous Board was led to believe that the CCRC designation was worthy of being inserted into the Nevada County General Plan and allowed within the sensitive rural areas of our County because it would “provide essential Senior housing while reducing excessive subdivision within rural zones.”

The proposed amendments attempt to subdivide the project into 323 fee-simple parcels, rather than the previously approved 14 corporation owned/controlled parcels, thereby subjecting residents of the community to the same “home ownership” related responsibilities CCRCs were originally created to alleviate.

Not only are they attempting to remove the entrance fee based (care-free) element,

they have also removed the assisted living, hospice and skilled nursing elements that are so crucial within all full service CCRCs, and which Rincon del Rio was advertised and approved with. The developer's architect admitted during the Planning Commission meeting that there was no assisted living element within the proposed community. He said "residents could hire in-home care and then go to the Memory Care facility if they needed it." That is NOT a legitimate Assisted Living element, and certainly not what was approved in 2013. The settlement agreement specifically states the development must be a CCRC...a Continued Care Retirement Community.

In order to qualify as a CCRC the developer must be required to "officially" change the 22 unit/88 bed memory care unit to an assisted living/memory care/hospice facility with all related previously approved amenities (skilled nursing, 4000 sq ft kitchen/dining facility, bistro, ice cream parlor, post ofc, salon, gym, small movie theatre, ofc space for administration and visiting physician(s) etc) all included within the "lodge" structure as was also previously approved.

The county must also require the developer to provide a valid floor plan of all floors/functions of the assisted living/memory care/hospice facility, not a blank rectangle with 88 dots on it with a "TBD" caveat. A legitimate floor plan is the only way for the developer to justify the 1.2 person factor for the project and for the county to enforce what is actually proposed.

There is always a "minor change" clause with any floor plan, but there must be a best estimate floor plan required. Blank rectangles with dots are unenforceable and therefore unacceptable. All 5 lodges in the previously approved RDR project included floor plans, and so should the one single lodge in the currently proposed RDR facility. Please make a valid enforceable floor plan of the memory care facility a condition of approval.

To qualify as a full fledged CCRC the “lodge” facility should also encompass approx 30% of the project’s population which equates to approx 103 units (the majority being single occupancy) in order to justify their 1.2 per person population density statute.

All 4 CCRC examples the developer’s architect utilized in an attempt to justify that very low 1.2 population density factor to the Planning Commission have at least a 30% assisted living/memory care/hospice element within them, and they include all amenities within a central building (lodge) within the assisted living, which further justifies that very low 1.2 factor. The proposed RDR does not.

Add to that, the 4 person per unit factor being attached to the Memory Care Facility to quantify the 88 beds is not realistic. No assisted living facilities nor memory care facilities house 4 people per room, in fact they never house more than two persons per room/unit. The majority of assisted living units are single occupancy and house persons 75+ years of age, the majority of those well over 80 years of age. It is important to note that seniors aged 75 and older residing in an actual assisted living facility impact the environment far less than those 55-74, especially with regard to traffic and noise. That is the most important factor with regard to the 1.2 population density statute.

We suggest that the developer could meet this 30% demographic requirement by deleting the proposed 24 rental units from the project. Rental units were not part of the approved project and should not be allowed. There is no valid reason for them to be included. The “we can leave them empty to adjust for headcount” reason is not realistic. The unit counts for those 24 deleted rentals would then go towards the approx 103 unit assisted living portion of the development.

The “open air” condos over retail units located in the center of the development should be deleted as they were also not part of the previously approved project, and most certainly interfere with the original CCRC spirit of the community, specifically the assisted living portion. The unit counts for those deleted open air condos would

then go towards the approx 103 assisted living portion of the development and the businesses below them could then reside within the assisted living/memory care/hospice lodge allowing the unit count for them to also go towards the 103 assisted living portion of the community.

The lodge should also be centered within the community as was previously approved...located where the condos over retail units are proposed, not isolated at the entrance of the project. The isolation of the elderly portion of the community at the outskirts of the younger community changes the project from the care-free all-inclusive age-in-place Rincon del Rio CCRC that was previously approved into a Sun City active 55+ senior community with a memory care facility next door to it.

As currently proposed, if seniors within RDR want or need to live in an actual assisted living environment with all amenities included within it they would have to move out of the development to do so, and likely out of Nevada County. Also very important, construction of the "lodge" and all of the "village center" amenities should be started in Phase 2 as was previously approved and completed no later than phase 4 so that the "assisted living" demographic and support is actually included in the development before the 415 population cap is exhausted.

For us, the assisted living element is the most important part of the project. Without it the development does not qualify as a CCRC. Our settlement agreement states throughout it that the project must remain a CCRC. The proposed project is not a CCRC (Continued Care Retirement Community)...it is an SLRC (Senior Living Retirement Community) and the developer now even describes it as such on her website.

It is very important to us that you understand we are not trying to stop the project. We know the County is desperate for housing. We are only attempting once again to insure that Rincon del Rio is built as a legitimate Continued Care Retirement Community (CCRC) that will allow seniors 55 years and older to age-in-place safely and comfortably the rest of their lives, without

ever having to move out of the community if they need a legitimate assisted living, memory care or hospice environment with all of the amenities, as was previously approved and settled upon.

Please do what you can with the power you have been given to help assure the Rincon del Rio project is what is best for our seniors aged 55 - 100+ and for the surrounding communities.

We hope you will listen to us and work with us to avoid future litigation caused by any approvals that would breach the 2013 Settlement Agreement. Thank you in advance for your prompt attention to this matter.

Best regards, Karen Abbott for KNCR

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: [Kit Elliott](#)
To: [Julie Patterson-Hunter](#)
Subject: Fwd: Rincon del Rio project modification
Date: Tuesday, May 11, 2021 8:35:44 AM

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Rhetta VanderPloeg <Rhetta.VanderPloeg@co.nevada.ca.us>
Date: May 11, 2021 at 8:33:49 AM PDT
To: Marsha Burch [REDACTED], Bruce Inman [REDACTED]
Cc: Kit Elliott <kit.elliott@co.nevada.ca.us>
Subject: FW: Rincon del Rio project modification

More comments for today's hearing.

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This communication with its contents may contain confidential and/or legally privileged information. It is solely for the use of the intended recipient(s). Unauthorized interception, review, use or disclosure is prohibited and may violate applicable laws including the Electronic Communications Privacy Act. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender and destroy all copies of the communication.

From: suareztribe [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, May 11, 2021 7:43 AM
To: Matt Kelley <Matt.Kelley@co.nevada.ca.us>
Subject: Rincon del Rio project modification

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of County of Nevada email system. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Matt here are my comments regarding the Rincon del Rio project.
This project is wrong for the area on so many points.

Farmlands- It is a good grazing area. If not cattle then deer and other wildlife. The Heritage oaks in the area (that they haven't already cut down) are treasures. As well directly uprooting the wildlife under the project the air and light pollution generated by it in this vicinity will harshly impact the rest of the wildlife along the river canyon and on surrounding lands.

Affordable Housing- At a \$525,000 median price! Older folks in our county don't

have the money for that and the \$5,000 monthly “Continuing Care” costs.

Fire Danger-

This project is right on the canyon- a firestorm waiting to happen. Look at the 49er fire. In just the a snap of the fingers many houses and acres were gone. If you look at an aerial of Hilltop you will see that it is in a high fire danger area.

Traffic-

This section is not set up to handle the additional traffic. Caltrans says no Traffic light. Add 900 trips per day and a little age and what do you get? Caltrans says if it becomes a problem the will make it a right turn only exit.

Zoning-

Smart people got together and made a Master Plan for Nevada County. On the other side of the River, Placer County has planned a green zone. The Bear River corridor is a mitigation preservation zone for the development going on across the River in Placer County. The preservation of the wildlife and the River riparian ecology is the primary focus for the Bear River corridor in that area.

Making this area a high-priced private reserve for the wealthy is not in line with today's values and the enlightened way forward for our counties.

Thank you for considering my input, Dianna Suarez

Sent from my Galaxy

have the money for that and the \$5,000 monthly “Continuing Care” costs.

Fire Danger-

This project is right on the canyon- a firestorm waiting to happen. Look at the 49er fire. In just the a snap of the fingers many houses and acres were gone. If you look at an aerial of Hilltop you will see that it is in a high fire danger area.

Traffic-

This section is not set up to handle the additional traffic. Caltrans says no Traffic light. Add 900 trips per day and a little age and what do you get? Caltrans says if it becomes a problem the will make it a right turn only exit.

Zoning-

Smart people got together and made a Master Plan for Nevada County. On the other side of the River, Placer County has planned a green zone. The Bear River corridor is a mitigation preservation zone for the development going on across the River in Placer County. The preservation of the wildlife and the River riparian ecology is the primary focus for the Bear River corridor in that area.

Making this area a high-priced private reserve for the wealthy is not in line with today's values and the enlightened way forward for our counties.

Thank you for considering my input, Dianna Suarez

Sent from my Galaxy