



**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF
SQUAW VALLEY MUNICIPAL ADVISORY COUNCIL
August 1, 2013**

Pursuant to notice given, the regular meeting of the Squaw Valley Municipal Advisory Council (SVMAC) was held Thursday August 1, 2013 in the Squaw Valley Public Service District Community Meeting Room.

1. Call to Order

ROMACK called the meeting to order at 6:01 PM. A quorum was established.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Romack, Heneveld, Sheehan, Lange, Strange, Georgiu, and Adriani

MEMBERS ABSENT: None

STAFF PRESENT: Montgomery, Kastan, and Friedman

2. MAC Member Introductions

Everyone introduced themselves. There were 32 members of the audience at the beginning of the meeting.

3. Approval of Agenda

STRANGE/SHEEHAN/UNANIMOUS

4. Approval of Minutes of June 6, 2013

Motion to approve as amended. SHEEHAN/LANGE/UNANIMOUS

5. Supervisor /Tahoe Field Representative Reports

SUPERVISOR MONTGOMERY said that because there are so many agenda items tonight, she would table her report.

6. Community Reports

There were no reports given.

7. Public Comment

FRED ILFELD of Incorporate Olympic Valley (formerly Squaw Alpine Association) reported that a survey of registered voters in Alpine Meadows indicated they did not want to be included in the incorporation effort. A petition has been circulated to voters in Squaw Valley and so far 51% of registered voters want the process to move forward. A presentation will be made at Good Morning Truckee on Tuesday August 13.

HENEVELD reported the Placer County Parks Department is considering installing three pickleball courts at Squaw Valley Park.

8. Update on Village at Squaw Valley Specific Plan and Phase 1A Project – Chevis Hosea, Vice President, Squaw Valley Ski Holdings, LLC

CHEVIS HOSEA explained that while plans for the project are fairly static as the draft Environmental Impact Report is being prepared, there are some process changes being made. Instead of a Project Level Analysis, a Project Specific Plan is being requested. Clarification of this change was made during ALEX FISCH'S report. HOSEA reviewed some of the "tweaks" being made, including inclusion of a public park, creek restoration, and changes to the Mountain Maintenance Center.

The Council asked questions clarifying the report, including the seasonality of the proposed park, building heights, location (or locations) of member locker rooms, the proposed fire substation, and emergency use helipad. In response to questions about including a swimming pool, HOSEA explained Placer County would not support the facility in the proposed public park without maintenance costs and liability being covered. HOSEA invited everyone to visit Basecamp in the Village to see the new model of the project.

The topic was open to Public Comment.

BOB GEBHART asked about fractional ownerships. HOSEA said the number will be determined in part on demand and research being done.

JUDY STEPNER asked for clarification on who would maintain a pool in a public park.

KAREN SCHWEITZER asked for clarification on parking at the Shirley Canyon trailhead.

SUSAN THOMPSON asked about the vision for the 43,000 sq. ft. ballroom area.

DAVID STEPNER noted that with the change to the application, phased plans will not be approved. He asked how that may impact the plans. HOSEA said certain specifications will be outlined in the Specific Plan, such as setbacks, height restrictions, and parking requirements, and each phase will have to adhere to the guidelines approved. The public will have an opportunity to comment on each phase.

JOHN SHANSER said this is a moving target as a different plan is submitted at every meeting. He voiced concern about “restoring” the creek and suggested “improvements” are being made, not restoration. SHANSER asked about the location of the helipad.

JAN ROSSER asked about phasing the project.

GLEN SPILLER asked about zoning changes.

9. Information Non-Action Item

A. Status of Village at Squaw Valley Draft Environmental Impact Report and Related Issues – Alex Fisch, Senior Planner, Placer County Planning Services

ALEX FISCH gave a status report on the draft EIR, what a Specific Plan is, and how the project has evolved to this point. He said Placer County has requested a lot of technical information, such as the background and setting of the project, biological, and cultural details based on existing environmental conditions. Every time something changes, new information needs to be submitted. Included in the Phase 1 analysis was a review of many of these technical details, architectural plans, parking, drainage, utilities, etc. and at this point, the applicant has determined to just focus on the Specific Plan. In addition, negotiations with the Squaw Valley Public Service District (SVPSD) on water, sewer, and garbage have not moved as quickly as had been hoped. The Water Supply Assessment should go to the SVPSD Board in September or October. An assessment of the interceptor line to the Truckee Tahoe Sanitation Agency is still being done, as are negotiations with adjacent owners, civic groups, and others.

About 2 weeks ago the applicant notified the County they are focusing on the Specific Plan, rather than Phase 1 so the draft EIR will be programmatic only. FISCH explained the Program Level Analysis will be more detailed; for example an interactive 3D computer model is being developed so esthetic and visual impacts can be considered. A Park and Recreation Plan is being developed and the transportation and traffic plans will be highly detailed. The proposed mix of land uses for Lot 4 (across from the Fire Station) is also being analyzed. FISCH and HOSEA recapped the changes made from when the process began in December 2011, including land uses, number of bedrooms, parking, building heights, and communication with neighbors and other agencies.

The Council asked questions about the presentation.

HENEVELD asked what this change in submittal means. FISCH said an Addendum Notice of Preparation (NOP) will be released in about 8-12 weeks and will be available for public review and comment. Just as with the original NOP, comments are reviewed by staff and as appropriate incorporated in the environmental documents. He described the Conformity Review process, including phasing approvals and anticipated levels of reviews based on the Specific Plan.

ADRIANI asked for clarification on how the County considers heights when there are no restrictions in the General Plan. FISCH said there is a set of existing circumstances for commercial land uses that are established through the design review process.

SHEEHAN noted SVPSD is considering water and sewer needs and TTSA is looking at an interceptor. He said the community depends on FISCH since things are moving so quickly. He asked that traffic and parking continue to be evaluated.

The topic was open for public comment.

JUDY STEPNER asked about including a public pool. FISCH relayed his conversation with Placer County Parks when concerns were raised about liability and maintenance funding issues. SUPERVISOR MONTGOMERY added that often it is not the construction of amenities that is the issue, but funding for on-going maintenance. Neither Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) nor Park Dedication Fees can be used for maintenance.

STEVE SHORT asked if building heights were established when Intrawest built the Village. FISCH said a height survey was done. Intrawest built according to approved plans.

DAVID STEPNER asked that as new versions of the Specific Plan come out, changes from previous versions be noted. He asked FISCH to elaborate on what the 3D model will include.

KAREN SCHWEICHERT asked for clarification on public access to proposed amenities and how maintenance could be funded. FISCH explained there are 3 options: 1) a public park; 2) a private park for an Association formed within the Valley to do maintenance; or 3) a private park for the development only.

TOM MOOERS with Sierra Watch acknowledged this is very complicated and asked how to insure meaningful public participation going forward. He outlined his understanding of the process and asked how a Specific Plan differs from a General Plan. FISCH explained a Specific Plan is more specific to the project than a General Plan and forms a structure to guide future development.

JOHN SHANSER asked if the Squaw Valley Design Review Committee will have input. FISCH said this project has been forwarded to them. SHANSER asked for clarification of the Specific Plan approval process.

FISCH was asked to clarify rezoning.

B. The role of the Squaw Valley Design Review Committee – Jennifer Montgomery

SUPERVISOR MONTGOMERY reported it was brought to the County's attention that the Design Review Committee (DRC) should be brought into the process for the proposed Village project and should be analyzing it through their lens. She distributed and reviewed the "Role of the Design Review Committee" and explained how and why the DRC and SVMAC were formed in order to give the community a voice in what happens in their area. The DRC addresses issues such as signage, height, landscaping, and other aesthetic features to insure the proposed project harmonizes with existing structures and is in scale with immediate surroundings. The guidelines are not applicable to structures on Squaw Valley Road or commercial buildings. Members of the DRC are subject to the Brown Act and conflict of interest considerations.

The Council members were generally pleased to hear the DRC will be involved. KASTAN will try to schedule DRC meetings just prior to SVMAC meetings. The topic was open to public comment and there were some questions clarifying the role of the DRC.

C. Review of the MAC Handbook – Jennifer Montgomery

MONTGOMERY presented the revised Handbook and reviewed specific sections. She reminded SVMAC members that she depends on them to talk to others in the community so they can make informed decisions on behalf of their constituents. MONTGOMERY reviewed what may and may not be heard by a MAC and noted members are subject to Brown Act open meeting laws. She discussed what constitutes a conflict of interest and the process to run an effective meeting.

Brief discussion followed. The Council asked that all variance requests be forwarded to MAC members.

10. MAC Member Reports / Sub-Committee Reports

There were no reports given.

11. Future Agenda Items

- Pickleball Courts at Squaw Valley Park
- Presentation from Liberty Energy
- Presentation from Suddenlink

12. Date and Time of Next Meeting – September 5, 2013 at 6:00 PM

13. Adjournment

There being no further business to come before the Council, the meeting was adjourned at 8:46 PM.

Respectfully submitted,
Judy Friedman, Recording Secretary