

From: Antionette Rudnick

Sent: Wednesday, July 22, 2020 11:45 AM

To: Cindy Gustafson <cindygustafson@placer.ca.gov>; Placer County Board of Supervisors <BOS@placer.ca.gov>

Subject: [EXTERNAL] Potential Alcohol Ban Truckee River

Cindy,

Per our conversation yesterday, we would like to offer our support for a temporary (Covid induced) alcohol ban on the Truckee River for the balance of this summer. Surely, the parameters of public safety would allow such a ban under the auspices of a health concern during the Covid pandemic.

The purpose of the ban is an attempt to both curtail the gathering of people floating on the river and the problems that arise when public rafters arrive at our docks inebriated and refuse to comply with requests from our staffs. As one of the two raft rental companies, we can attest to the additional difficulties we have experienced this summer from the increase in public rafters. Since both raft rental companies have reduced our capacities for customers in order to create more space on our shuttles, at our kiosks and parking lots, it has driven even more folks to buy a cheap pool toy and hit the river.

At the rental companies, part of our "package" is a safety speech that explains what to do if there is a problem with your raft, a medical emergency etc. As a part of this speech, as well as our posted "Rules to Raft By" we ask our customers to be mindful of and respect private property, stream bank erosion, **and this year to please AVOID STOPPING on the islands and gathering in the river.**

We recognize that tensions are high in the world today; people are weary of rules that they disagree with, and that are basically unenforceable. I answer the phone and deal with our customers firsthand and I can tell you that the pandemic and isolation has not made people kinder, or more tolerant. When times are difficult, we all seek relief. That said, public intoxication is a problem that should be enforceable and if a means to curtail this activity is to ban open containers in the hopes it will reduce the problem then we are in support of a temporary ban.

I am cc'ing this email to the Board in full. Thanks for your help with this.

Sincerely,

Toni Rudnick

Truckee River Raft Company

From: Doug Cole
Sent: Wednesday, July 22, 2020 10:44
To: Placer County Board of Supervisors <BOS@placer.ca.gov>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Truckee River Rafting Company

To Whom it May Concern:

I am writing to declare my support for the Truckee River Rafting Company and their ability to retain their permit for the next three years. As a long-term resident of Placer County, I have seen the long-standing business of the Truckee River Rafting Company support both the local community and the local economy through visitor revenue. Revoking their permit will not only affect this business but also the nearby restaurants, gas stations, grocery stores, hotels, etc. Not to mention that many returning college and high school students that rely upon these summer jobs provided by the rafting companies.

Truckee River Rafting Company will be fully compliant with all government-mandated COVID-19 protections; they have proven their trustworthiness as a successful local business of over 40 years.

I strongly urge you to disregard the correspondence received from the law offices of Mr. Gatto and unanimously approve the Conditional Use Permit Modification and Rafting License before you on July 28th, 2020.

Sincerely,

Doug Cole
Chairman and CEO
American Battery Metals Corporation
Incline Village, Nevada 89451

The information transmitted, including any attachments, is intended only for the individual or entity to which it is addressed, and may contain confidential and/or privileged information. Any review, retransmission, dissemination or other use of, or taking of any action in reliance upon, this information by individuals or entities other than the intended recipient is prohibited, and all liability arising therefrom is disclaimed. If you have received this communication in error, please delete the information from any computer and notify the sender.

July 23, 2020

PLACER COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
via email only
EJivaldi@Placer.ca.gov

Re: OPPOSE Additional Information for Appeal of Truckee River Raft Co. Conditional Use Permit Modification and Rafting License (PLN19-00394)

Honorable Members of the Board:

My name is Ken Crawford and I have worked for Truckee River Raft (TRR) Company for the last six years.

My comments below address my concerns specifically in paragraphs B and E in the letter of Appeal from Law Office of Greg Gatto.

B. The County Must Consider the Applicant's Past Performance in Meeting Rafting License Requirements, and Appropriately Condition any Subsequently Issued Permit.

In the second paragraph, the Appellant states that TRR raft busses were routinely using the Bechdolt property for a turnaround area for its shuttles. This is an exaggeration. During the 2018 rafting season bus drivers were given notice by management that we needed to use this route because the current route was an illegal traffic maneuver and CHP had informed management that our drivers would be cited. The other company, Mountain Air Sports (MAS) did NOT comply with this direction, nor were they cited. I am not sure they were ever informed. Was this some sort of harassment because the Rudnick's were at odds with the Kila Tahoe project? We never received an answer, but returned to using the original. This temporary diversion, going around the Bechdolt building was no more than five days. The only time I have ever gone around the Bechdolt building for the last five years was during that unusual directive from the CHP. To my knowledge, the Bechdolt route has not been used since that time, and the assertion it is routinely used as a turnaround is false.

When the Planning Commission gave both companies permission to begin this season, they put into motion the startup operation for both companies to conduct business. Employees were hired with the expectation of work until the season ends around Labor Day. We, the TRR employees, are proud of the work we do, and consistently receive great reviews about our customer's satisfaction. We succeed because we work as a team.

The Appellant was apparently not satisfied with the decision of the Planning Commission and decided to no longer focus on both rafting companies but go after just Truckee River Raft Co. They managed to acquire the ear of the Placer County Board of Supervisors (BOS) and now those jobs are in jeopardy.

E. Granting the Appeal Will Not Negatively Impact Overall Rafting Operations or Have Any Negative Economic Impact on the Surrounding Community.

In the second paragraph, the Appellant states they will initiate a workaround maneuver to quell the outcry of lost jobs. The Appellant had a conversation with MAS about them taking over TRR's share of the Truckee River rafting business if the Appellant wins the appeal at the BOS meeting. MAS claims they can seamlessly shift their operations to 100% capacity. However, they may not be taking into account

any customer requiring a vehicle with a wheelchair lift. How do they plan to increase their operations and continue to maintain the required COVID-19 distancing? Will they have the staff and vehicles to accomplish this? The token gesture of hiring current TRR staff may not go as planned.

This is appalling, bordering on collusion, to put an end to TRR. This would essentially allow TRR's competitor to establish a monopoly. The claim about seamless is dubious at best.

This season will only remain seamless if you Do Not approve this appeal.

I don't think many, if any, of the TRR employees would have a "warm, fuzzy feeling" working for the company that colluded to eliminate their job? However, if all of the TRR employees did agree to work for MAS, would their wages, hours, job duties and possible seniority be left in tact? Would MAS have the ability to employ them in like-positions? Will there be enough legal, available parking for additional employees and customers? How will the MAS employees accept the former TRR employees?

Make no mistake, if Placer County approves the Appellant's request, you will be throwing the TRR employees into a very disruptive situation. Some may not be hired and no longer have income for paying rent, buying food, paying utilities, because you approved the Appellant's request. That will not be seamless for anybody.

The seasonal worker has been put through enough disruption this year; beginning with the abrupt end and closure of food and beverage establishments, ski areas and other non-essential businesses. This left a lot of those employees in an economically precarious position prior to the rafting season, and those closures continue!

Don't forget the TRR customers. It won't be seamless for them either. They have made reservations with TRR, planning and assuming all is well. If the Appellant wins, they will need to scramble to see if there is availability at the other company. Or not raft at all (additional loss in tax dollars). Many of our reservations come from returning customers. Seamless? No.

It is common knowledge that this complaint likely stems from the continuing saga of the Hotel vs. Bechdolt building dispute. The TRR employees do not deserve to be caught in the middle.

This request for appeal lists all sorts of alleged violations, lapsed permits and other bureaucratic issues that are just now coming to light. Which is additional cause for suspicion.

The only compelling issues that should warrant an emergency **STOP** of operations are violations that threaten the imminent Health & Safety of the public. Nothing in this document addresses that amount of urgency.

The Planning Commission decision, putting into motion the okay for both companies to proceed, should be stand. After this season, maybe a review of regulations needs to happen. Perhaps there are regulations that are decades old and need to be removed or modified.

It is hard not to describe this new, additional appeal, as nothing more than the Appellant's attempt to put a financial hit on the owners of the Bechdolt building. The employees of TRR should not have their employment and lives upended over this dispute.

Please **do not approve** this request.

Ken Crawford

Tahoma

From: Matt Daniels

Sent: Wednesday, July 15, 2020 9:34 AM

To: Placer County Board of Supervisors <BOS@placer.ca.gov>

Subject: [EXTERNAL] Fwd: Rafting

Matt Daniels

Tahoe Marine & Excavating

Begin forwarded message:

From: Susan Daniels

Date: July 15, 2020 at 9:29:54 AM PDT

To: Whale

Subject: Rafting

Sent from my iPad

Placer County Board of Supervisors July 28, 2020
Matt Daniels for the Record

My family history goes back to 1868. I've lived here for 58 years and have seen it change throughout time. My first job was with Bob Bell and family and we became good friends.

Through them I got to know Nick Fuller when rafting started back in the day. Then with Nicks passing I got to meet the Rudnick family starting with children and then the parents. This family has done nothing but good for this community and provide jobs while maintaining the health of the river recreation. Could you imagine what the river would look like if they were not allowed to operate. The Rudnick's and the Bells are assets to our town.

I'm a long-time resident to Tahoe City and would hate to see them shut down for any reason.

So, for the record PLEASE DENY THE APPEAL

Thanks,
Matt Daniels
Tahoe Marine & Excavating

From: Richard

Sent: Wednesday, July 22, 2020 9:04 AM

To: Placer County Board of Supervisors <BOS@placer.ca.gov>

Subject: [EXTERNAL] Truckee River Rafting

Hello,

Attached is our letter of support for Truckee River Raft Company.

Thank You,

Richard Courcier

July 15, 2020



Placer County Board of Supervisors
c/o Planning Director
3091 County Center Dr.
Auburn, CA 95603

Dear Honorable Members of the Board:

Truckee River Rafting would like to offer a note of support for the rafting businesses operating on the Truckee River. Both businesses work together to do a complete and detailed job of daily river cleanup and trash removal to ensure the river is preserved in its natural beauty. For example, both companies provide and maintain trash bins and porta potties along the river, all of which are heavily used by our private customers as well as the public, who have grown tremendously over the years. Together, our companies act jointly to remove trees and other obstructions on the river for commercial and public rafting. In addition to river clean up and maintenance, the rafting businesses offer a great economic boost to the local community by providing over 150 combined jobs for locals, as well as a steady flow of tourists who go on to contribute to the support of local shops and restaurants. As being one of Tahoe's top tourist attractions, taking away these businesses would be absolutely detrimental to the local environment and economy. These two businesses have been working adjacent to one another for over 45 years and Tahoe City can support both companies to operate successfully.

Sincerely,

Truckee River Rafting

From: Sam Rudnick
Sent: Wednesday, July 22, 2020 11:55 AM
To: Placer County Board of Supervisors <BOS@placer.ca.gov>
Cc: EJ Ivaldi <EJIvaldi@placer.ca.gov>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Appeal PLN-19-00394

Placer County Board of Supervisors

Dear Honorable Members of the Board:

This is to address the appeal for permit # PLN 19-00394 filed by Greg Gatto on behalf of Samir Tuma and Kila Tahoe LLC.

We are Truckee River Raft Company. We have been a fixture in Tahoe City since the mid-1970's first by our founder Nick Fuller and for the past 12 years since his passing his heirs David, Aaron and Rachel Rudnick.

Rafting on the Truckee River, as you all well know, is a huge draw to recreation in Tahoe City. The two raft companies employ a great many people, supply commodities to all users of the river (Porta-potties and cleanup) and have for over 45 years.

We have properly applied for permits, monitored river traffic, and cared for the environment all while providing wholesome recreation to hundreds of tourists. We have narrowly survived years of drought and water issues. Some of our seasons have been 14 days long, or shuttered for 18 days in July or as in 2015, no rafting at all. We have complied with every directive Placer County has ever asked of us.

Today we find ourselves fighting for survival, not because of non-compliance, not because we fail to provide a healthy and enjoyable service to our patrons, but because we refuse to cede our private property to a developer. Mind you the property in question is distant from and completely unrelated to the raft business whose permit is being appealed.

To answer Mr. Gatto's points:

- **The Planning Commission lacked jurisdiction to modify the conditional use permit as the permit had expired pursuant to its terms under County Code section 17.58.160**

The permit application was properly submitted before the end of 2019. While expiration was in May, the Placer County Planning Commission did not schedule the hearing to grant the permit until June 11, 2020. The hearing has taken place in June many times over the past without a problem.

- **The site located at 243 N. Lake Blvd., Tahoe City, APN 094-540-004 is not an authorized site for any use or operations as part of the Project**

APN 094-540-004 is wholly owned by the Applicant. We were not aware that we could not use our own parking.

- **Subsequent environmental review is required prior to any Project approval under 14 Cal. Code Regs. §15162 and *Friends of the College of San Mateo Gardens v. San Mateo County Community College Dist.* (2017) 11 Cal.App.5th 596;**

Environmental review has been conducted by the County for the past 45 years and we have always complied.

- **Changes to the project associated with any onsite food operations must be evaluated as part of any subsequent environmental review**

There are no changes to the project associated with onsite food operations.

- **Potentially significant impacts and associated mitigation measures resulting from changed circumstances of the SR89/Fanny Bridge Community Revitalization Project improvements must be evaluated as part of any subsequent environmental review;**

The changes in roadway only enhance the project as attested to by the County Planning Commission.

- **Potentially significant impacts and associated mitigation measures resulting from changed circumstances and operations as part of COVID-19 measures must be evaluated as part of any subsequent environmental review;**

Our protocols meet or exceed all guidelines and we have reduced our capacity by half in order to offer a safer experience with less crowding on shuttles, parking lots and kiosks.

- **The off-site parking sites located at APNs 095-050-052 and 095-050-058 are zoned single-family residential and cannot be used for rafting parking or other commercial operations**

The parcel used for parking has been in use, approved by the County for the last 30 years and is zoned C-1

- **Existing code and condition of approval violations by the Applicant preclude approval of the Project pursuant to Placer County Code sections 5.16.290.L., 17.58.040(C), and 17.62.170;**

We have not been notified that we are in violation of any agreed upon conditions

- **The application submitted for the Project is incomplete and does not contain the information required by the County Code for approval of the Project;**

The application was properly submitted to the County in a timely manner, has been reviewed and approved by County staff

- **The Planning Commission's decision is an abuse of discretion, arbitrary, capricious, lacking in evidentiary support, and the Commission failed to follow the procedure and give the notices required by law;**

We disagree with that opinion and stand with County Counsel and Planning Commission's decision.

- **The Planning Commission's decision violates Appellant's substantive and procedural due process rights (U.S. Const. amend XIV, §1; Cal. Const. art. 1, §7);**

We disagree with that opinion and stand with County Counsel and Planning Commission's decision.

This appeal is a backhanded attempt to coerce our family into settlement of an unrelated dispute. We trust that Placer County will recognize the motive behind it, evaluate the service and long-standing symbiosis that rafting, our family and the river share, and deny this appeal outright.

Sincerely,

July 15, 2020



Placer County Board of Supervisors
c/o Planning Director
3091 County Center Dr.
Auburn, CA 95603

Dear Honorable Members of the Board:

Truckee River Rafting would like to offer a note of support for the rafting businesses operating on the Truckee River. Both businesses work together to do a complete and detailed job of daily river cleanup and trash removal to ensure the river is preserved in its natural beauty. For example, both companies provide and maintain trash bins and porta potties along the river, all of which are heavily used by our private customers as well as the public, who have grown tremendously over the years. Together, our companies act jointly to remove trees and other obstructions on the river for commercial and public rafting. In addition to river clean up and maintenance, the rafting businesses offer a great economic boost to the local community by providing over 150 combined jobs for locals, as well as a steady flow of tourists who go on to contribute to the support of local shops and restaurants. As being one of Tahoe's top tourist attractions, taking away these businesses would be absolutely detrimental to the local environment and economy. These two businesses have been working adjacent to one another for over 45 years and Tahoe City can support both companies to operate successfully.

Sincerely,

Truckee River Rafting

From: Aaron Rudnick
Sent: Friday, July 24, 2020 4:55 PM
To: Placer County Board of Supervisors <BOS@placer.ca.gov>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Comment for Bos Meeting 7/28/202

Regarding the July 28th 2020 Placer County Board of Supervisors meeting.

Placer County Board of Supervisors

Dear Honorable Members of the Board:

This is to address the appeal for permit # PLN 19-00394 filed by Greg Gatto on behalf of Samir Tuma and Kila Tahoe LLC.

We are Truckee River Raft Company. We have been a fixture in Tahoe City since the mid-1970's first by our founder Nick Fuller and for the past 12 years since his passing his heirs David, Aaron and Rachel Rudnick.

Rafting on the Truckee River, as you all well know, is a huge draw to recreation in Tahoe City. The two raft companies employ a great many people, supply commodities to all users of the river (Porta-potties and cleanup) and have for over 45 years.

We have properly applied for permits, monitored river traffic, and cared for the environment all while providing wholesome recreation to hundreds of tourists. We have narrowly survived years of drought and water issues. Some of our seasons have been 14 days long, or shuttered for 18 days in July or as in 2015, no rafting at all. We have complied with every directive Placer County has ever asked of us.

Today we find ourselves fighting for survival, not because of non-compliance, not because we fail to provide a healthy and enjoyable service to our patrons, but because we refuse to cede our private property to a developer. Mind you the property in question is distant from and completely unrelated to the raft business whose permit is being appealed.

To answer Mr. Gatto's points:

- **The Planning Commission lacked jurisdiction to modify the conditional use permit as the permit had expired pursuant to its terms under County Code section 17.58.160**

The permit application was properly submitted before the end of 2019. While expiration was in May, the Placer County Planning Commission did not schedule the hearing to grant the permit until June 11, 2020. The hearing has taken place in June many times over the past without a problem.

- **The site located at 243 N. Lake Blvd., Tahoe City, APN 094-540-004 is not an authorized site for any use or operations as part of the Project**

APN 094-540-004 is wholly owned by the Applicant. We were not aware that we could not use our own parking.

- **Subsequent environmental review is required prior to any Project approval under 14 Cal. Code Regs. §15162 and *Friends of the College of San Mateo Gardens v. San Mateo County Community College Dist.* (2017) 11 Cal.App.5th 596;**

Environmental review has been conducted by the County for the past 45 years and we have always complied.

- **Changes to the project associated with any onsite food operations must be evaluated as part of any subsequent environmental review**

There are no changes to the project associated with onsite food operations.

- **Potentially significant impacts and associated mitigation measures resulting from changed circumstances of the SR89/Fanny Bridge Community Revitalization Project improvements must be evaluated as part of any subsequent environmental review;**

The changes in roadway only enhance the project as attested to by the County Planning Commission.

- **Potentially significant impacts and associated mitigation measures resulting from changed circumstances and operations as part of COVID-19 measures must be evaluated as part of any subsequent environmental review;**

Our protocols meet or exceed all guidelines and we have reduced our capacity by half in order to offer a safer experience with less crowding on shuttles, parking lots and kiosks.

- **The off-site parking sites located at APNs 095-050-052 and 095-050-058 are zoned single-family residential and cannot be used for rafting parking or other commercial operations**

The parcel used for parking has been in use, approved by the County for the last 30 years and is zoned C-1

- **Existing code and condition of approval violations by the Applicant preclude approval of the Project pursuant to Placer County Code sections 5.16.290.L., 17.58.040(C), and 17.62.170;**

We have not been notified that we are in violation of any agreed upon conditions

- **The application submitted for the Project is incomplete and does not contain the information required by the County Code for approval of the Project;**

The application was properly submitted to the County in a timely manner, has been reviewed and approved by County staff

- **The Planning Commission’s decision is an abuse of discretion, arbitrary, capricious, lacking in evidentiary support, and the Commission failed to follow the procedure and give the notices required by law;**

We disagree with that opinion and stand with County Counsel and Planning Commission’s decision.

- **The Planning Commission’s decision violates Appellant’s substantive and procedural due process rights (U.S. Const. amend XIV, §1; Cal. Const. art. 1, §7);**

We disagree with that opinion and stand with County Counsel and Planning Commission’s decision.

This appeal is a backhanded attempt to coerce our family into settlement of an unrelated dispute. We trust that Placer County will recognize the motive behind it, evaluate the service and long-standing symbiosis that rafting, our family and the river share, and deny this appeal outright.

Sincerely,
Aaron Rudnick

--



Placer County Board of Supervisors

Dear Honorable Members of the Board:

This is to address the appeal for permit # PLN 19-00394 filed by Greg Gatto on behalf of Samir Tuma and Kila Tahoe LLC.

We are Truckee River Raft Company. We have been a fixture in Tahoe City since the mid-1970's first by our founder Nick Fuller and for the past 12 years since his passing his heirs David, Aaron and Rachel Rudnick.

Rafting on the Truckee River, as you all well know, is a huge draw to recreation in Tahoe City. The two raft companies employ a great many people, supply commodities to all users of the river (Porta-potties and cleanup) and have for over 45 years.

We have properly applied for permits, monitored river traffic, and cared for the environment all while providing wholesome recreation to hundreds of tourists. We have narrowly survived years of drought and water issues. Some of our seasons have been 14 days long, or shuttered for 18 days in July or as in 2015, no rafting at all. We have complied with every directive Placer County has ever asked of us.

Today we find ourselves fighting for survival, not because of non-compliance, not because we fail to provide a healthy and enjoyable service to our patrons, but because we refuse to cede our private property to a developer. Mind you the property in question is distant from and completely unrelated to the raft business whose permit is being appealed.

To answer Mr. Gatto's points:

- **The Planning Commission lacked jurisdiction to modify the conditional use permit as the permit had expired pursuant to its terms under County Code section 17.58.160**

The permit application was properly submitted before the end of 2019. While expiration was in May, the Placer County Planning Commission did not schedule the hearing to grant the permit until June 11, 2020. The hearing has taken place in June many times over the past without a problem.

- **The site located at 243 N. Lake Blvd., Tahoe City, APN 094-540-004 is not an authorized site for any use or operations as part of the Project**

APN 094-540-004 is wholly owned by the Applicant. We were not aware that we could not use our own parking.

- **Subsequent environmental review is required prior to any Project approval under 14 Cal. Code Regs. §15162 and *Friends of the College of San Mateo Gardens v. San Mateo County Community College Dist.* (2017) 11 Cal.App.5th 596;**

Environmental review has been conducted by the County for the past 45 years and we have always complied.

- **Changes to the project associated with any onsite food operations must be evaluated as part of any subsequent environmental review**

There are no changes to the project associated with onsite food operations.

- **Potentially significant impacts and associated mitigation measures resulting from changed circumstances of the SR89/Fanny Bridge Community Revitalization Project improvements must be evaluated as part of any subsequent environmental review;**

The changes in roadway only enhance the project as attested to by the County Planning Commission.

- **Potentially significant impacts and associated mitigation measures resulting from changed circumstances and operations as part of COVID-19 measures must be evaluated as part of any subsequent environmental review;**

Our protocols meet or exceed all guidelines and we have reduced our capacity by half in order to offer a safer experience with less crowding on shuttles, parking lots and kiosks.

- **The off-site parking sites located at APNs 095-050-052 and 095-050-058 are zoned single-family residential and cannot be used for rafting parking or other commercial operations**

The parcel used for parking has been in use, approved by the County for the last 30 years and is zoned C-1

- **Existing code and condition of approval violations by the Applicant preclude approval of the Project pursuant to Placer County Code sections 5.16.290.L., 17.58.040(C), and 17.62.170;**

We have not been notified that we are in violation of any agreed upon conditions

- **The application submitted for the Project is incomplete and does not contain the information required by the County Code for approval of the Project;**

The application was properly submitted to the County in a timely manner, has been reviewed and approved by County staff

- **The Planning Commission's decision is an abuse of discretion, arbitrary, capricious, lacking in evidentiary support, and the Commission failed to follow the procedure and give the notices required by law;**

We disagree with that opinion and stand with County Counsel and Planning Commission's decision.

- **The Planning Commission's decision violates Appellant's substantive and procedural due process rights (U.S. Const. amend XIV, §1; Cal. Const. art. 1, §7);**

We disagree with that opinion and stand with County Counsel and Planning Commission's decision.

This appeal is a backhanded attempt to coerce our family into settlement of an unrelated dispute. We trust that Placer County will recognize the motive behind it, evaluate the service and long-standing symbiosis that rafting, our family and the river share, and deny this appeal outright.

Sincerely,
Aaron Rudnick

From:
To: [Megan Wood](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Rafting permit Truckee River Raft Company
Date: Monday, July 27, 2020 2:28:24 PM

I moved to Tahoe in 2008 because of the wonderful sense of community I found here after spending so much of my life in large cities. I still feel that way but have to admit that petty pursuits like this complaint by Mr. Tuma really begin to tarnish the joy of being a Tahoe full time resident.

Rafting is very important to this community and a much beloved experience for visitors and locals alike. I spoke in support of the new development in general that Mr. Tuma is attempting to get constructed in Tahoe City. I have a business office in the building next door and just asked for parking to be a serious consideration but was excited about the potential for our town.

This attempt to have the permit pulled for the rafting company seems petty and vindictive as he is only targeting the one company that has a relationship to the building owners he can't seem to get an access situation resolved for his project.

Are we really that town? Let's put a stop to this kind of big city strong arm crap please.

Full time resident and business owner respectfully,
Morgahn Grey

--

MORGAHN GREY



mgrey@GreyBlueRealty.com
Broker/Owner
DRE Lic #01895556

From: Steve Topol
Sent: Friday, July 24, 2020 6:37 PM
To: Placer County Board of Supervisors <BOS@placer.ca.gov>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Fwd: Truckee River Raft Company letter of support. PLN 19-00394.

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Ellie
Date: July 24, 2020 at 6:28:25 PM PDT
To: Steve Topol
Cc: Sam Rudnick

Subject: Re: Truckee River Raft Company letter of support. PLN 19-00394.
Reply-To: Ellie

Please send to bos@placer.ca.gov

Please send tonight
Many thanks

Best ~Ellie

On Friday, July 24, 2020, 2:42:07 PM PDT, Steve Topol wrote:

My name is Steve Topol and I am the owner of The Blue Agave Mexican Restaurant and the Tahoe Inn property at 425 North Lake Blvd in Tahoe City.
I wish to lend my support for the issuance of the permit for Truckee River Raft Company to continue their operations in Tahoe City. For 40 years the Fuller/Rudnick family has continually operated at their location, without problem or turmoil. The appeal of the permit by the appellant is clearly transparent as being retaliation for the issues existing between them on another project. What the appellant thinks as leverage against the Fuller/Rudnick family is nothing more than harassment and bad faith legal maneuvering.
Please deny the appeal
Steve Topol

Sent from my iPhone

From:
To: [Placer County Board of Supervisors](#); [Megan Wood](#); [Cindy Gustafson](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Truckee River Raft Company Permit (PLN19-00394)- Public Comment from Mather
Date: Monday, July 27, 2020 5:58:24 PM

Board of Supervisors:

While I have had one phone conversation with Samir Tuma, I've also had a few with both Aaron Rudnick and Sam Rudnick regarding the BOS meeting last month. Further, I've read Mr. Tuma's initial complaint and his appeal letter that was filed soon after your decision. I understand the situation from both sides. To be fair, my office is located in one of the Rudnick's Tahoe City commercial buildings but let that not sway your view of my comments as I also am an extremely fair person. In fairness to Samir whom I know and am friendly, upon hearing randomly from other local business owners last month of "what Samir did" last month at the BOS meeting, I called him directly to discuss his stance. He confirmed to me that indeed he had submitted a complaint to the BOS regarding the Rudnick's rafting company permits and explained why he did so. Further, while the Rudnick's are my landlords, I have no concern any retribution or malice should I lean toward Samir's camp. To be clear, I don't.

I feel Samir's challenge to the county regarding any rafting company's permitting, or any business can be fair. While it may be, this is also malicious. Simply put, Mr. Tuma's complaint stems from his ongoing lawsuits with the Rudnick's over another matter.

Unfortunately, Mr. Tuma's challenge to the BOS has widespread community and business impacts should the county find that permits were issued improperly. As I understand the argument, both Tahoe City rafting companies may have issues with their permits. If that were to be the case, I'm quite sure the county would be able to work through these issues with the two rafting companies over the winter such that permitting for next summer's rafting season would be compliant. Clearly, the rafting companies both work diligently to provide safe, healthy and environmentally-friendly rafting services and encourage tourism. The tourism component has exponential ramifications to dozens of local businesses as you well know. Again, I am confident the county would receive nothing but these companies' full attention and impeccable detailing regarding permits for next summer's season should the county find anything to be out of order.

And really, the thing that is hard to swallow for me – and as discussed with Samir on the phone – is how ugly this whole thing seems given he has served-it-up on a plate to the county while he comfortably serves on the NLTRA ...promoting tourism and businesses right here in Tahoe City. I'm not sure how one can be trying so diligently with attorneys to shut down one Tahoe City-based business in particular, while potentially two rafting companies in one fell swoop, and then watch the trickle-down affects to all the other businesses from an NLTRA armchair. Now, of all times when every business is struggling day and night to survive, why is this coming to light? I trust the Board of Supervisors can see through this game and make the "right" decisions moving forward.

Sincerely,
Todd Mather