57

Office Outlook Web Access | Type here to search | This Folder | Address Book | Options | Log Off

Mail
Calendar
Contacts

Deleted Items
Drafts
Inbox (78)
Junk E-Mail
Sent Items

Click to view all folders

Manage Folders...

Reply | Reply to All | Forward | Move | Delete | Close

FW: HOMEWOOD MOUNTAIN RESORT

57

David Landry

Sent: Thursday, March 03, 2011 8:42 AM
To: carsdaddy@sbcglobal.net
Cc: Homewood DEIS Comments

Thank you for your comments, they will be addressed in the final EIR/EIS.

-----Original Message-----
From: Bruce Carswell [mailto:]
Sent: Friday, February 11, 2011 11:29 AM
To: David Landry
Subject: HOMEWOOD MOUNTAIN RESORT

DEAR SIR.

OUR FAMILY HAS OWNED PROPERTY ON THE LAKE AT HOMEWOOD SINCE THE 1910'S AND HAVE HAD A SUMMER HOUSE THERE SINCE IT WAS BUILT IN 1937. IT WAS OFTEN TENTING PRIOR TO THAT.

IN OUR EXPERIENCE THE NEIGHBORHOOD HAS ALWAYS BEEN RESIDENTIAL WITH ONLY THE SWISS LAKEWOOD RESTAURANT AND THE OBEXER AREA HAVING ANY COMMERCIAL OFFERINGS. THE SKI AREA WAS DEVELOPED AND TWO SMALL MOTELS, PLUS HOMEWOOD HIGH AND DRY. THESE WERE FOLLOWED BY EVER INCREASING TRAFFIC.

1 NOW THE PROPOSED HMR DEVELOPMENT (IT IS BLATANTLY RIDICULOUS TO CALL IT "REDEVELOPMENT") WOULD ADD TO THE CURRENT TRAFFIC LOAD, BRINGING MORE AND MORE
2 POLUTANTS TO THE AREA. TO ASSERT THAT IT WOULD BE A DESTINATION RESORT IS ALSO RIDICULOUS. HOMEWOOD IS NOT A FIVE STAR HILL AND WILL NOT BECOME ONE. PEOPLE WHO STAY AT THE PROPOSED HOTEL WOULD WANT TO SIGHT SEE IN THE SUMMER AND TRY THE OTHER SKI HILLS IN SEASON. THEY WOULD ALSO DRIVE TO RESTAURANTS IN TAHOE CITY OR TRUCKEE OR EVEN DRIVE TO RENO FOR EVENING ENTERTAINMENT.

3 THE PROPOSE DEVELOPMENT AREA CONTAINS SOME SENSITIVE LAND THAT SHOULD BE RETURNED T IT NATIVE STATE, NOT PAVED OR EXCAVATED FOR A PARKING GARAGE.

4 THESE ARE SOME OF THE REASONS OUR FAMILY IS AGAINST THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT. WE ARE NOT AGAINST DEVELOPMENT, THOUGH, AND WE BELIEVE THE PROPOSED PLAN COULD BE SCALED BACK TO AN ACCEPTABLE SIZE.

SINCERELY,
BRUCE M. CARSWELL AND FAMILY.
4840 WEST LAKE BOULEVARD, HOMEWOOD, CA.

Connected to Microsoft Exchang

From: diane casagrande [mailto:dianecasagrande@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, February 26, 2008 10:04 PM
To: Richard Brown
Subject: JMA Venture/ Homewood Mountain Resort

To Rick Brown
Thank you for the gathering of Homewood Residents at Spataro's Restaurant. We enjoyed the presentation. The proposed project of Homewood Resort will be destination friendly and also an asset to all residents on the westshore of Lake Tahoe. As it stands now,if you do not have a home,boat,or visiting friends on the westshore of the lake you probably would not even venture over to the westshore.The proposed project will offer a wonderful family atmosphere for residents as well as visitors.
Our family supports the proposed development and look forward to all families enjoying our beautiful westshore.
Dr. & Mrs. Stephen Casagrande

Judy Nikkel **59**

59

From: Mary Case-Liebhold <mtnmimi7@hotmail.com>
ent: Tuesday, April 19, 2011 12:04 PM
To: Judy Nikkel
Subject: Homewood DEIS Comments

Judy Nikkel

Dear TRPA,

PLEASE take into consideration the objections and concerns of The League to Save Lake Tahoe's prime concerns which are as follows:

1 2

* The project will worsen traffic on the West Shore, which will contribute to air pollution. Tahoe is already violating standards for ozone, a gas that is harmful to people, wildlife and vegetation.

3 * This large project will urbanize a part of Tahoe that is treasured for its serenity and natural beauty.

4 * The project should follow rules that all other property owners at Tahoe must follow.

5 * The project wants to permanently change the rules for height, which will allow for taller development throughout Tahoe in the future.

6 * This project is so large that it will transform and define its surrounding community, rather than being defined by a community plan.

7 * Although the project provides some environmental benefits, they are outweighed by its detrimental impacts.

8 The League supports projects that revitalize Tahoe's communities while following region-wide rules meant to protect the lake. In the case of Homewood, the League could support a project that conforms with Tahoe's current regional plan, is proven to reduce traffic, and includes irrevocable commitments to enhance and protect environmental values.

(Signed) Mary Case-Liebhold, Zephyr Cove, NV

Mary Case-Liebhold
208 Gold Hill Rd
Zephyr Cove, NV 89448

60

60

Monday, May 02, 2011

RECEIVED
MAY 05 2011
PLACER COUNTY
TRPA/MOU

Allen Breuch
Supervising Planner - Lake Tahoe
County of Placer -Community Development Resource Agency
P.O. Box 1909
Tahoe City, CA, 96145

Dear Allen,

As a full time resident and local business owner, I wanted to show my support for the Homewood Mountain Resort Ski Area Master Plan.

I am convinced that this renovation and enhancement project will bring new life to the West Shore by modernizing the infrastructure of the Resort and bolstering the local economy. In addition to create much needed new jobs and additional tax revenue, this project will bring tangible changes that will have a real and positive impact on the environment and the land restoration.

Most importantly, it will keep Homewood Mountain Resort at a human scale and preserve the unique identity of the West Shore while upgrading service, esthetics, and safety at the Resort.

Considering the positive outcomes of this project, it is a pleasure to support such a well thought-out and professional endeavor.

Should you have any question, please feel free to contact me at 530-386 6400.

Thank you for your consideration.

Michel Chalon

Homewood DEIS Comments

61

Joseph Chambers [joeshmoeb@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, April 19, 2011 9:05 PM
To: Homewood DEIS Comments

Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
Boulder Bay CEP
PO Box 5310
Stateline, NV 89449-5310
US

Dear TRPA,

Please do not build hundreds of new condos in the Tahoe area. Lets not disturb the natural beauty of the Lake Tahoe area. New condos are bring more people, more traffic, more pollution, new rules, more safety concerns, and it will piss people off. These concerns of many are not worth making a quick greedy buck for the few. Do not ruin sacred Tahoe.

If the greedy become selfish and some how plan to build, they better make DAMN sure they introduce as little impact as possible (visually, construction, end result, idea of increase influx more people)

Joseph Chambers
7303 Birchcreek Rd.
San diego, CA 92119

62

Office Outlook Web Access | Type here to search | This Folder | Address Book | Options

Mail
Calendar
Contacts

Deleted Items
Drafts
Inbox (217)
Junk E-Mail
Sent Items

Click to view all folders

Manage Folders...

Reply | Reply to All | Forward | Move | Delete | Close

FW: Homewood

David Landry

02

Sent: Tuesday, February 22, 2011 6:57 AM
To: Homewood DEIS Comments

From: Joanne Marchetta
Sent: Monday, February 21, 2011 9:37 PM
To: David Landry
Cc: Jerry Wells; Judy Nikkel
Subject: FW: Homewood

David: Copy for the project file.
Judy: Copy for the Board with other public comment letters.

Joanne S. Marchetta
Executive Director
(775) 589-5226

TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
P.O. Box 5310
Stateline, NV 89449
office 775-588-4547
fax 775-588-4527
www.trpa.org
imagine. plan. achieve.

From: Arthur Chapman [mailto:achapman@jmaventuresllc.com]
Sent: Monday, February 21, 2011 9:12 PM
To: Joanne Marchetta
Subject: Homewood

Joanne: Several years ago we initiated a policy that all active duty servicemen and women would be offered skiing at Homewood at no cost. It was a small contribution to make to those who sacrifice so much for all of us. We also adopted a policy that their dependents would similarly be offered skiing at dramatically reduced rates. Too often we forget the sacrifices that they make as well.

Over the years, we have received a large number of thank you letters from active duty members who have taken advantage of the program. This is the first we have received from a someone actually deployed in Afghanistan or Iraq thanking us for remembering their family and loved ones. It is but a small part of the tradition at Homewood and one we will continue to provide in future years if Homewood can remain viable.

Art Chapman

Connected to Microsoft Exchan

63

Judy Nikkel

L03

From: Julianna Chequer <Juliannacousins@hotmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, April 19, 2011 1:34 PM
To: Judy Nikkel
Subject: Homewood DEIS Comments

Judy Nikkel

Dear TRPA,

My family has been coming to Tahoe since the 50's. As the years go by traffic gets worse, pollution rises, and the tranquility of Tahoe disappears.

I think adding more lodging would continue to negatively impact all the greatness of the West Shore. Also, Homewood is one of my favorite ski resort because it's a reasonable size with reasonable prices and you can avoid crowds on many weekends. This would be a huge deterant and I would be less likely to visit the resort.

Julianna Chequer
2360 pleasant hill Ed #2
Pleasant Hill, CA 94523

64

Judy Nikkel

From: Kelley Clare <kelleyclare@hotmail.com>
Sent: Monday, April 18, 2011 3:26 PM
To: Judy Nikkel
Subject: Homewood DEIS Comments

604

Judy Nikkel

Dear TRPA,

As a long time resident of the west shore of Lake Tahoe, I am opposed to the current scale of the Homewood expansion project. I love Homewood Mountain Resort and would love to see it's continued success in the future. The size of this plan however, does not coincide with the scale and capacity of the west shore itself. One of my major concerns, aside from all of the environmental impacts and traffic, is one of light pollution. I fear the expansion plan will destroy our night view from the west shore and across the lake. The glow of Squaw Valley is a perfect example of this. You can see this glow at night from miles away. The darkness and star filled skies that we are so fortunate to have here in the mountains are in danger of disappearing if this plan goes through as is. I do not want to see the lights of an over developed resort from my deck at night instead of stars, let alone while camping in the desolation wilderness area. Please take this and all considerations seriously in your decision making process as most impacts will be irreversable.
Thank you for your time.
Sincerely,
Kelley Clare
Tahoe City

Kelley Clare
PO Box 809
Tahoe City, CA 96145

65

Reply Reply All Forward

Homewood DEIS Comments

Sue Clark [sueclark@suddenlink.net]

Sent: Saturday, April 23, 2011 5:59 PM

To: Homewood DEIS Comments

Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
Boulder Bay CEP
PO Box 5310
Stateline, NV 89449-5310
US

Dear TRPA,

I implore you to please vote against the Homewood project. We do not need this type of construction at the Lake. This lake is a sacred place, and to destroy the environment like it would is horrifying. The highway will NOT support the kind of traffic this new building project would require. It's already a gridlock on summer weekends. As a former owner of a Tahoe residence, and as a time share owner at the lake at Red Wolf Lodge, and a lifetime vacationer at the lake, I urge you to vote no on this project!
Sincerely,
Sue Clark

Sue Clark

Homewood DEIS Comments

David Coglizer [dave@westlygroup.com]

Sent: Monday, April 18, 2011 9:01 PM
To: Home

ERROR: invalidfont
OFFENDING COMMAND: xshow

STACK:

Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
Boulder [/ true] CEP
PO Box 5( )0
Stateline, NV 89449-5310
US

Dear TRPA,

My family and I are multi-generation enjoyers of Lake Tahoe. And, we have been homeowners in Rubicon Bay since 1984 and consider Tahoe one of the most beautiful places on earth.

As such, we are extremely distraught over the mega-development plans at Homewood resort as yet another defilement of such a beautiful place as Tahoe.

My question to you, the TRPA, is when are we going to improve the eco-system of Lake Tahoe rather than continually making it worse by continually building more and more structures and urbanizing it? Why make West Shore more like South Shore? Donâ€™t we already have enough urbanization/congestion/pollution at Lake Tahoe as it is? And, why do we need to financially â€œbail-outâ€

Homewood DEIS Comments

Carol Coleman [cttcesq@aol.com]
Sent: Monday, April 18, 2011 11:41 AM
To: Homewood DEIS Comments

67

Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
Boulder Bay CEP
PO Box 5310
Stateline, NV 89449-5310
US

Dear TRPA,

Anything which will increase the trafficis unthinkable.

Summer or Winter we have out of area people who refuse to obey the speed limit and ride your bumper until you pull over.

Dead of Winter I have had people who are driving at least twenty miles over the speed limit coming up behind me and riding my bumper until I pull over and let them pass. Which is not something one can do quickly.

Am seriously thinking of selling my home after twenty five years of home ownership.

Carol Coleman

Carol Coleman
8660 Cutthroat Ave
box 2131
Kings Beach , CA 96143

Judy Nikkel

68

68

From: Annette Coleman <annettecoleman@juno.com>
ent: Monday, April 18, 2011 3:11 PM
To: Judy Nikkel
Subject: Homewood DEIS Comments

Judy Nikkel

Dear TRPA,

I would strongly disagree with a huge project such as being proposed on the West Shore of Lake Tahoe, specifically Homewood. There is no need for a high rise hotel and retail village. First of all the 2-lane road would not accommodate the extra traffic. Why ruin the best part of the lake where there is quiteness and beauty without a huge development - save that for South Shore and the North Shore. I would not support such a development. Please reconsider where you put developments like these - no need for buildings and smog and pollution and traffic etc.

Annette Coleman
3395 SE Shoreline Dr
Corvallis, OR 97333

69

Judy Nikkel

69

From: Jennifer Comeau <jennzkewl@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, April 18, 2011 12:32 PM
To: Judy Nikkel
Subject: Homewood DEIS Comments

Judy Nikkel

Dear TRPA,

1 Please, leave Homewood Alone. I'm sure that environmental issues have been addressed and researched, but has the carbon footprint of the construction of the structure been established? by bringing in cargo and construction on a daily basis, the emissions being released from the project is not beneficial to the air in Tahoe. Nor will the additional car traffic help any to this issue. Has an efficient site plan lighting layout been produced? Have concerns about light pollution reduction been addressed? The Homewood area is so dark at night; I feel that a resort built into the community is going to create havoc on the native wildlife, not just at night but at all hours.
Being a local ski resort, it is nice to go to Homewood and know that prices in ski packages will continue to be lower then many of the surrounding mountains. Not to mention our family has grown up skiing there since it's so close to our cabin. With the new establishment, it's obvious that prices are to increase. For the folks like me that live in Sacramento, why would we bother driving all the way to Homewood for a day of skiing, when we can pay the same prices and go to mountains of the same nature closer to home, and pay the same amount? The 'feeling' of the mountain is going to change, and I don't believe for the better. The idea of keeping it 'local' will be eliminated, and, that is really sad. Every other resort in the area caters to tourists; it would be nice to keep something for the 'locals.'

Jennifer Comeau
5123 Adelina Way
Carmichael, CA 95608

70

Judy Nikkel

70

From: Peggy Cooley <pegcooley@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Tuesday, April 19, 2011 7:16 PM
To: Judy Nikkel
Subject: Homewood DEIS Comments

Judy Nikkel

Dear TRPA,

Regarding the proposed Homewood project.

Surely this is just too big a project for this area. When you think about the traffic this road already supports - and the limited flat ground on which cars would park, this is unreasonable.
I could imagine 60 units, but certainly not over 100. Our lake does not need the pollution that this many people and cars would add.
Please re-consider.
Thank you
Peggy A. Cooley

Peggy Cooley
883 Secret Harbor Dr
South lake Tahoe, CA 96150

71 71

March 21, 2011

Tahoe Regional Planning Agency

PO Box 5310

128 Market Street

Stateline, NV 89449

Dear Mr. Landy and Mr. Krach,

Re: Public Comments-Homewood Mountain Resort, Homewood, CA

1 Although I support the development and revitalization of the Homewood Mountain Resort, I do not support the current scale of the proposed development for the reasons stated below.

Traffic and Safety.

2 Increased traffic is already a concern in Homewood. As I understand the HMR proposed project, at peak hours, this development could add up to 1,400 additional guests in Homewood, not including HMR employees. 1,400 guests mean approximately 400 additional cars (this is a conservative estimate) in Homewood driving to various destinations around the Tahoe basin. Highway 89 is a 2-lane road and cannot handle this increase in traffic without obvious delays. As it stands right now, many times during peak summer days, traffic going into Tahoe City stops and starts at Sunnyside. These additional vehicles will only exacerbate the existing traffic situation.

3 Furthermore, this traffic problem will only make it more difficult for emergency vehicles to respond to emergencies on the West Shore. Additionally, in the event of a mandated fire evacuation, how quickly can the local and summer residents, including the 1,400 from HMR, get to safety? These issues require careful consideration with the obvious conclusion that this project, as it stands right now, is too large.

Compatibility with Existing Neighborhood.

4 Homewood is a small town with both local and summer residents. Many of these homes were built in the early 20th century. In other words, it is not a new development, but one of age and history. The quiet nature of this community will be negatively impacted by the noise, light and activity generated from this project as it is currently proposed. Furthermore, introducing 77-foot buildings would dwarf the existing structures. To date the largest buildings are the boat storage units, which are carefully camouflaged behind buildings and away from the highway.

4 Most importantly, the increased population of Homewood will substantially change from a small town to one of the most "urban" centers on the Tahoe basin. As far as I am aware, there is no community plan for Homewood, but I doubt that any of these plans would ever consider a project so large, since, objectively speaking, it is not compatible with the current scale and character of Homewood.

Run Off.

5 The clarity of Lake Tahoe could be compromised with the development of this project as it is currently proposed. One of the reasons Lake Tahoe is so clear is due to its many natural filtering systems, such as wetlands and grasses. Increasing the hardtop on the HMR property eliminates this natural filtering system and all the ecosystems dependent on it. I am not a scientist, but it is not hard to envision a detrimental impact to the Lake's clarity.

As my first sentence stated, I am not opposed to this project. I support it, but it needs to be smaller. I hope you seriously consider these concerns and concur.

Thank you.

Respectfully submitted,

Menda Cooley

Tahoe address: 4950 West Lake Blvd.

Homewood, CA

Home address: 3179 Somerset Drive

Lafayette, Ca 94549

72

72

April 19, 2011

Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
128 Market Street
P.O. Box 5310
Stateline, NV 89449

Re: Homewood Draft EIS

Dear TRPA & Placer County officials,

I am writing this letter in support of the proposed redevelopment project at Homewood Ski Resort located on the beautiful west shore of Lake Tahoe. As a property owner in Tahoe Pines, only 1 mile north of the ski area, I am excited about the future potential for Homewood laid out in JMA Ventures' proposal.

As a life long skier and snowboarder – and a former resident of Colorado, I have seen many small "mom and pop" ski areas go out of business over the years. Unfortunately, this trend is the result of high insurance costs, lawsuits and other factors that have raised operating costs and has led to a loss of small and medium sized ski areas nationwide, while larger "mega resorts" have prospered and expanded.

Small ski resorts contribute to our ski history and culture here in the Tahoe Basin. Not only does skiing and snowboarding bring vital business to the region, but it is the reason many of us moved here in the first place. In addition, mountain resorts create jobs, support local businesses, and provide an amenity to the public. I would hate to see Homewood close, and be developed into large luxury estates that provide nothing to the public, and deteriorate Lake Tahoe's charm.

I can empathize with concerns from my neighbors about traffic and overdevelopment – however I believe many of them are misinformed on the details of the project. The owner's of Homewood do not intend to create a mega resort. The other ski areas they own are small in scale and provide good services to their customers. The mountain at Homewood is simply not large enough and does not have the diversity of terrain to accommodate that type of resort.

The Homewood redevelopment will provide housing on-site for employees, provide goods and services closer to Tahoe Pines and West Shore residents, preventing many from having to make the drive into Tahoe City, and also provide an outdoor music venue, bringing another cultural amenity to our side of the lake. Overdue on-mountain improvements will be made, including new chair lifts and a mid-mountain lodge. Acres of surface parking will be removed, which is detrimental to lake water quality. LEED ND design will ensure that Homewood is redeveloped over the years as a sustainably minded ski resort that will be the envy of other ski areas.

I encourage TRPA & Placer County commissioners and officials to certify the Homewood EIS and approve the redevelopment of Homewood Ski Resort. I think the project strikes a good balance of both revitalizing an aging ski area, while preserving the charm and small scale that has attracted us all to it in the first place.

Sincerely,

Christopher Corrao

4270 Interlaken Road
Homewood, CA 96141

(323) 208-1131
chris.corrao@gmail.com

Comments on Homewood Mountain Resort from Lisa Cosby

73

Lisa Cosby [lm_cosby@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, April 19, 2011 7:50 AM
To: Homewood DEIS Comments; cdraecs@placer.ca.gov

Dear TRPA and Placer County,

1 Regarding the Homewood Mountain Resort, I am writing to express support of **Alternative 2 (No Project).** I secondarily support **Alternative 4 (Close Ski Resort and allow 16 estate lots)**.

Alternative 1 – the proposed project – does **not** belong in the beautiful and fragile environment of the West Shore.

Let us keep this project to a level that will not cause significant erosion which would adversely affect the clarity of the lake water.

Let us protect the West Shore as we do the undeveloped coast of California. The idea that we must have economic growth is questionable. We need to maintain the roads and forests and support emergency services, and we can do that in other ways. Let us not allow the economic desires of a developer to supercede the protection of this natural place. Big Sur and Point Reyes are priceless not because of developments, but because of lack of developments.

Regarding the idea that the ski resort can only exist if developed, we have plenty of other ski resorts. The continuation of a ski resort is far less important than the preservation of the lake water and beauty of the west shore.

Let us not develop any undeveloped land. There are many houses on the market in the Lake Tahoe basin – if people want to buy a residence, let them buy one that already exists. The impact on the lake water, the traffic, and the blight of development on beautiful open space are all reasons I oppose the proposed project.

Thank you for your careful consideration of this very important matter.

Lisa Cosby

483 Lakeridge Court, Meeks Bay

1503C San Anselmo Ave, San Anselmo, CA 94960

Judy Nikkel

74

From: Mary Costa <costamary62@hotmail.com>
ent: Tuesday, April 19, 2011 8:25 PM
To: Judy Nikkel
Subject: Homewood DEIS Comments

Judy Nikkel

Dear TRPA,

How can you possibly think that building 350 unit condo/hotels and a lodge will be better for the west shore? Apparently you want to make the pristine west shore like the over populated south shore. What about traffic?? We have a 2nd home in Tahoma for 35 years, and just in the last 10 years more homes have been built and what would normally take 10 minutes to TC, now will take 30-40minutes. HELLOOOO it's a 2 lane highway!!!!!

I urge you NOT to build this monstrocity which is obviously another form of greed from the greedy developer. Cmon, TRPA, Tahoe doesn't need this in order for it to bring revenue to the city.

Wake up people, if you do this, you will regret it for the rest of your lives knowing that you ruined what is the most beautiful place in the world.

Mary Costa

Mary Costa
21 Lauren Avenue
Novato, CA 94947

75

Judy Nikkel

75

From: ian cracchiola <iane88@gmail.com>
ent: Tuesday, April 19, 2011 11:47 AM
To: Judy Nikkel
Subject: Homewood DEIS Comments

Judy Nikkel

Dear TRPA,

1 As a former lake tahoe resident it would make me very sad to see the amazing west shore of Lake Tahoe turned into another stateline. Since I've moved to NY i've always ket a "keep tahoe blue" sticker close. I hope its blue for the rest of my days and projects like this endanger that.

Best,
Ian

ian cracchiola
182 norfolk st
#3
new York, NY 10002

76

Office Outlook Web Access | Type here to search | This Folder | Address Book | Options | Log

Mail
Calendar
Contacts

Deleted Items
Drafts
Inbox (230)
Junk E-Mail
Sent Items

Click to view all folders

Manage Folders...

Reply | Reply to All | Forward | Move | Delete | Close

FW: Homewood Mountain Resort EIS/EIR Response

76

David Landry

Sent: Wednesday, February 16, 2011 10:12 AM
To: Homewood DEIS Comments

From: LCress7199@aol.com [mailto:LCress7199@aol.com]
Sent: Tuesday, February 15, 2011 8:20 PM
To: David Landry; cdraecs@placer.ca.gov; Jeff Cowen
Subject: Homewood Mountain Resort EIS/EIR Response

Please include this email in the packets to the TRPA Gov. Board Members and the Placer County Board of Supervisor members regarding the Homewood Mountain Resort EIS/EIR . Please acknowledge that you received this email.

To: TRPA Governing Board
Placer County Board of Supervisors

RE: Homewood Mountain Resort EIS Hearings

I own a second home at 5250 W. Lake Boulevard approximately 1/2 block across the street from the proposed new hotel and development. We have had our family home for 65+ years and have enjoyed skiing at Homewood since its inception. I do not want to loose the ski area which I know is the carrot or threat that has kept most Homewood residents from voicing concerns about development. But, to increase the size of Homewood by triple the amount of people that currently reside here.....how can anyone see this as environmentally feasible?

We don't want the problems of Squaw Valley, North Star, Old Greenwood, Grays Crossing and Lahonton. We need a project that works both environmentally and financially and will be agreeable to everyone.

I am going to be brief and only comment on a few of the items of concern in the EIS/EIR, although each item is significant and of great importance to the environment of Lake Tahoe.

1 The Draft EIS/EIR refers to the need to amend the Plan Area Statement to allow for increased density. I'm okay with development in Homewood and I understand personal property owner's rights, but why not stick with the density and uses developed in the PAS. The PAS was developed based on the needs of Homewood, not the needs of the developer.

2 The Draft EIS/EIR refers to mitigation fees. How do these fees help the residents of the West Shore? These fees go into the funds of government agencies. However, the development is in our backyard and we will suffer the consequences not those who are making the decisions.

3 The number of units in the proposed project should be reduced by at least 150

units. The proposed size is incompatible with the neighborhood. The size will change the West Shore of Lake Tahoe and forever impact the traffic & congestion, housing, air quality & water quality, public services and fire protection.

Traffic & Congestion: Highway 89 is a two lane road. Its not like South Shore with four lanes of traffic to and from the casinos. The report refers to an increase of 1,466 trips per day in the area. The traffic problem on the West Shore is already intolerable. Homewood is gridlock in the summer and during ski season and now you are introducing at the very least 1,466 more trips per day. Emergency services will be at a standstill. If you allow for this huge development I can picture a 4 lane highway as your next plan. Auto exhaust fumes will queer the air to a degree that no mitigation fee would quell.

Further, How will charging a mitigation fee to the developer for The "Tahoe City Bi-pass offset the traffic impact to the West Shore? It might help Tahoe City but it wi do nothing for traffic congestion on the West Shore.

Housing: The idea of a "Homewood Employee/workforce Housing Plan" only works as long as the current developer is in control and wants it to work. How do the government agencies intend to moniter this plan?

In addition, the granting of approval of the 3 story parking garage with 13 employee housing units should be denied because that parcel is a wetlands and has been since I was a child.

Air Quality & Water Quality: 40 acres of land will be disturbed. During the construction phase: buildings will be torn down, huge holes (up to 40' deep) will be dug into the ground, highrise buildings will be constructed, dump trucks, trucks loading equipment, heavy equipment kicking up dust and debris,, vehicles carrying building materials, construction workers driving to and from work, yet all that will be required to mitigate this is a **monitoring system.** What about the environmental damage to the air and water quality of the residents of the West Shore during this construction phase?

More important are the lasting long term effects this project will having on the Wes Shore: increased exhaust from automobiles, increased exhausts from the new residents boats, and all the services and service vehicles that goes along a development of this magnitude. The pollutant effects cannot be monitored or fee'd to solve the problem.

Public Services: We have obtained our water from Madden Creek Water District for as long as I recall. I do not believe that by adding hundreds of home that our water tables will not be affected and that somewhere down the line our water bills will be greatly increased because of the burden on the systems from HMR. So what if there is water conservation built-in to the project that cannot possibly make a dent in the usage vs. the size of the project.

Fire Protection: Do any of you recall the Sunnyside or the Angora Fires? Now imagine that we have an additional 900+ people in Homewood on any given day and a fire is approaching. The North Tahoe Fire Protection District is to provide a **"Will Serve" letter**.....how does that help if there is traffic gridlock?

20

I believe that a new and improved development in Homewood is much needed, however the project as proposed is just too big for the West Shore. The effects both in the short term and the long term cannot be mitigated away. I'm not asking you to deny the project. Simply reduce the project by about 50% and thus create a development that is in tune with the environment and setting of the Homewood community.

Thank you, Lorie Cress

5250 Westlake Boulevard, Homewood, Ca

Connected to Microsoft Exchang

77

Judy Nikkel

77

From: Jen Crook <jcrook@jdcrook.com>
Sent: Monday, April 18, 2011 10:45 AM
To: Judy Nikkel
Subject: Homewood DEIS Comments

Judy Nikkel

Dear TRPA,

I am very concerned about the project proposed for Homewood Ski Resort on the West side of Lake Tahoe. While I can see a resort owner's desire to make money rather than lose, adding that many more people in an area without the proper facilities, or even a big enough road for the traffic, is irresponsible. It is all well and good that he has "plans" for shuttles, water taxis, free bikes, etc, however people take the easiest route whenever possible, so for them to add another dimension to just going skiing that includes another transportation process is going to be hard to put into action.

I am curious - the conditions have not changed in the 4 years since JMA purchased this property, so the owner was well aware of the situation even then. This is like buying a home in a flight path near an airport, and then complaining about the noise. The noise from an airport won't go away just because a new owner bought the house, and the lack of interest in an older, smaller, ski run won't chance just because someone new owns it. Tell him to start with an improved ski lift, then update the lodge without changing the footprint of the lodge.

2 Lastly, TRPA, do your job, and make sure that the building that you approve meets the agreed upon guidelines of the Tahoe Basin.

Sincerely,

Jen Crook
1038 Fair Oaks Ave
Alameda, CA 94501

Maywan Krach

78

From: Jmtornese@aol.com
Sent: Thursday, February 24, 2011 12:40 PM
To: dlandry@trpa.org; Placer County Environmental Coordination Services
Subject: Fwd: Petition from THOMAS & CATHERINE CRUMPTON

From: petition@friendswestshore.org
Reply-to: crumpton3@verizon.net
To: grasslandlady48@yahoo.com, jmtornese@aol.com
Sent: 2/22/2011 8:00:31 P.M. Hawaiian Standard Time
Subj: Petition from THOMAS & CATHERINE CRUMPTON

I am opposed: yes

Name: THOMAS & CATHERINE CRUMPTON

Email: crumpton3@verizon.net

Address: 4840 WEST LAKE BLVD, HOMEWOOD

State: CA

Zip: 96141

Comments: WE BELIVE THAT THIS PROPOSED PROJECT WOULD HAVE LASTING NEGATIVE IMPACT ON THE BASIN'S, WATER, AIR AND NOISE POLUTION.THE QUALITY OF LIFE FOR THE HOMEOWNERS WILL BE DAMAGED IMMEDIATELY AND FAR INTO THE FUTURE.WE ARE VERY DISAPPOINTED THAT IT IS EVEN BEING CONSIDERED.

79

Reply Reply All Forward

FW: Homewood Ski Resort

Crumpton [crumpton3@verizon.net]

Sent: Wednesday, March 30, 2011 11:03 AM

To: Homewood DEIS Comments

We do not support **a revitalized redeveloped Homewood ski resort, The current size and scale of the proposed project is too big for the area. We do not want another Incline Village or anything increasing crowds, noise, air and water pollutions!** We should not sacrifice our unique West Shore character, community and environment for a development.

Crumpton, Cathy, Tom & Will
CFT Investments, LLC
6160 Flicker
Homewood, CA
(408) 356-3632
crumpton3@verizon.net

please help- www.ehclifebuilders.org

80

Office Outlook Web Access | Type here to search | This Folder | Address Book | Options | Sign Off

Mail
Calendar
Contacts

Deleted Items
Drafts
Inbox (243)
Junk E-Mail
Sent Items

Click to view all folders

Manage Folders...

Reply | Reply to All | Forward | Move | Delete | Close

Homewood Mountain Resort

80

Crumpton [crumpton3@verizon.net]

Sent: Wednesday, February 09, 2011 11:23 PM
To: Homewood DEIS Comments

Dear TRPA,

TRPA has been a valuable custodian of the fragile environment of the Lake Tahoe Basin for many years. It is with great respect and gratitude that we express to you our concerns, beliefs and comments.

The proposed multi-million-dollar overhaul of Homewood Mountain Resort on Lake Tahoe's West Shore presents a level of environmental harm that outweighs potential economic good. Additional numbers of visitors with their automobiles traveling to and from Homewood equates to more noise, air, and water pollution. We believe this statement is an indisputable fact and is of great concern to us.

5 The scale of the project is to large and is incompatible with the neighborhood of Homewood. The JMA "preferred redevelopment" is a possible Gehenna from which we may never be released. It would overcrowd our community and change the quality of life that we have worked so hard to create and maintain.

If approved, this project, during the summer and winter months, will create long, uncomfortable and potentially dangerous, traffic jams on State Route 89 from Highway 50 to Tahoe City. One only needs to experience the winter traffic into and out of the larger ski resorts in the area, and the overcrowded Homewood to Tahoe City route in the summe to realize that this could be a major problem for the entire area.

8 We are opposed to any (re)development at Homewood Mountain Resort that will bring mor polluting automobile traffic and degrade the Natural Environment and Beauty of Lake Tahoe Basin.

Respectfully,

Catherine, Thomas & William Crumpton

West Lake Blvd.
Homewood, CA
Los Gatos, CA
(408) 356-3632
crumpton3@verizon.net

please help- www.ehclifebuilders.org

Connected to Microsoft Exchan

Judy Nikkel

81

81

From: Peggy Cullinane <torrey1658@sbcglobal.net>
ent: Wednesday, April 20, 2011 10:21 PM
To: Judy Nikkel
Subject: Homewood DEIS Comments

Judy Nikkel

Dear TRPA,

1 The west shore, and specifically Homewood, does not need this type of development. It has a hugely harmful effect to the fragile Lake Tahoe environment. It is irresponsible of TRPA to approve this type of development for soley commercial gain. The long term preservation of this natural gem must be taken into consideration. Do not approve this development of Homewood Mountain Resort.

445 Upper Snow Bird Loop, Chamberlands, Homewood

Peggy Cullinane
9032 Cabin Creek Trail
Reno, NV 89523

82

HENRY P. C. CULP
5237 Montecito Avenue
Santa Rosa, California 95404
(707) 546 7015
Cell: (707) 321 2651
Email: pluc@att.net

MAR 22 2011

March 17, 2011

Mr. David Landry
Project Manager
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
P.O. Box 5310
128 Market Street
Stateline, NV, 89448

Mayan Krach
County of Placer
Community Development Resource Agency
Environmental Coordination Services
3091 County Center Drive, Suite 190
Auburn, CA 95603

Re: Homewood Mountain Resort, CEP Project

Gentlemen:

As we are unaccustomed to addressing matters such as this, please forgive us if we appear uninformed about some of the procedures. We or members of our family have been residents on a part time basis in Homewood since 1959 when our home was built. We have used the residence as a gathering place for our entire family (which is now extensive) since then and have enjoyed the ambience of Homewood and its environs and anticipate continuing to do so. While older folks such as we sometimes resist change with a passion, reality always creeps into the picture and we all have to accept the inevitability of it. Having said this, the magnitude of this project is intimidating. We would strongly welcome a great improvement in the ski area since our children spent much of their time there learning how to ski and presumably our grandchildren will do the same. It would be most unfortunate if the ski area would disappear as is put forth in one of the alternatives. However, the vastly increased number of residential units in addition to the proposed hotel rooms is something that we believe would seriously change what our family and those families around us in Homewood have enjoyed so much: the small lazy neighborhood we have come to love. We have read as much of the EIR as we could dealing with the things which impact us the most. Please let us address some of those issues.

First: In reading the document it seems that the project would require substantial amendments to the building, lot size and other environmental codes which were in place and identifiable at the time the property was purchased by the developer (JMA). It seems

reasonable to us to assume that the applicant acquired the property understanding the development potential as permitted by existing plans and policies, and should consider an alternative compliant with existing regulations. If one of the Project Objectives is to maintain consistency with the scale and character of Homewood, we think (with the exception of Alternative 2) all alternatives fail to do so.

2

Second: As we understand from CEQA and TRPA codes there is a requirement for the proposal to include a reasonable reduced project alternative. As we read the EIR there are no reduced alternatives from the 316 onsite tourist and residential units. Perhaps there is a reasonable alternative which would include a residential/tourist occupancy density and foot print consistent with the existing TRPA and Placer County codes.

3

Third: We are more than a little concerned that the EIR does not mention anywhere the impact the project will have on the lake itself. Will the new residents/tourists be putting in more boats/buoys (which will have an impact on water quality, water traffic, noise and parking problems for trailers)? The influx of up to 500 new users to the shoreline of the West Shore Café (which is about 150 feet long and 20 feet wide) cannot avoid some unintended negative consequences from swimming, bathroom facilities, pet waste, and fishing and the associated waste and debris of that many users. The mitigation measures do not seem to adequately address this issue.

4

Water quality is also a serious concern. Many residents of the West Shore (including our family) get their drinking water either unfiltered, or minimally filtered directly from Lake Tahoe immediately down slope of the project area. The EIR failed to analyze the potential impacts on these drinking water supply sources. Nor does it appear to include real time water quality monitoring at creek outlets for potential hazardous spills or excessive erosion runoff. If a hazardous spill was to occur or construction dust enters the lake due to technical failure of controls to prevent such an occurrence, the quality of drinking water could be compromised without residents knowing. The EIR should analyze these eventualities.

5

Fourth: Traffic: All of the residents of Homewood have undoubtedly experienced the substantial increase in the traffic along HWY 89. (Westshore Blvd.) While we do not totally understand the traffic studies in the EIR, we find it very difficult to believe that the building of up to 316 residential units in Homewood would not substantially increase the traffic problem we now face especially in the summer.

6

If in fact it is found the mitigation (shuttles and water taxi's etc.) is found to be adequate to mitigate the increase, is there any guarantee of continued service beyond the initial development of facilities. If these services become financially burdensome to HMR or their successor in interest, would they be permitted to discontinue or reduce service? It seem essential that as a condition of permitting a project that has substantial traffic impact, the developer of subsequent owner be required to maintain the service in perpetuity.

7

Fifth: Water supply: It appears to us that the impacts to the water supply are essentially unmitigable. The EIR does not have a sufficiently complete Water Supply Assessment and does not appear to meet the requirements under the codes. The document in several instances references HMR diversion rights on Homewood and Madden creeks as though they could be used for enhanced snowmaking. However the document also states that no in stream flows in the creeks would be reduced which appears to conflict with the earlier statement. As the Lake volume and quality is essential to everyone in the basin, the EIR needs to consider the amount

8

of water potentially removed from creeks flowing into the lake and also the potential volumes to be pumped out of the lake for both snow making and domestic use in order to consider the potential impacts. Neither is it clear whether additional snowmaking would be an authorized use under the existing water rights.

There is also consideration of the building of a Water Treatment Plant in connection with some of the alternatives. Does the EIR consider the construction and operation of this facility as part of the project in order to adequately analyze the potential effects on water supply and public hazards/ chemical disposal, especially if this is to occur at the South Base?

PSU-1 defers project impact mitigation to a later date. This assumes but is not supported by the data presented that everything will work out fine and that adequate supplies will be found. Without a final water supply assessment, the County and TRPA cannot accurately assess potential impacts of the project on water supply.

We are sure that we have not mentioned many things about which we will have questions later. Let us just say that while we have many objections to aspects of the project we would welcome some improvement in the commercial facilities of Homewood. This would include a smaller version of the hotel and some reasonable residential facilities just not to the scale of that which is proposed. The improvements to the ski area would certainly be welcome as long as they do not impact the water quality of the lake and environment. We would NOT welcome a closing of the ski area at all.

We are also concerned with the time necessary to build out this project. Will the residents be dealing with large construction vehicles and equipment for years to come? If so, it could seriously impact the enjoyment we have during the summer months which is probably when most to the construction will take place. A smaller project would be of shorter duration.

We hope our comments will be taken to heart and not just ignored. We know that several other residents of Homewood also have concerns and assume (perhaps we should not) that they are voicing their opinions as well. We wish you well in your deliberations and trust that you will do everything necessary (as is your responsibility) to insure the pristine quality of the air, the lake and the integrity of the Homewood area. Should you have any questions of us you may contact us at the address on this letterhead. Thank you.

Very truly yours

Henry C. Culp Susan Culp

Henry Culp, Susan Culp
Residents of Homewood
5520 Westlake Blvd
Homewood, California

CC: Senator Ted Gaines
Senator Noreen Evans
Assemblyman Wesley Chesbro

Homewood DEIS Comments

Monique Dagher Sass [monique_dagher@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, April 18, 2011 11:58 AM
To: Homewood DEIS Comments

83

Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
Boulder Bay CEP
PO Box 5310
Stateline, NV 89449-5310
US

Dear TRPA,

As a former Nevada resident, I have many concerns over the Homewood Expansion Project. I have been spending my summers at Lake Tahoe for the last 32 years. I plan on bringing my children and grandchildren to Lake Tahoe, but fear that the Expansion Project have serious repercussions on the Lake. This Project will have a serious negative impact on the traffic which will contribute to more air pollution; this is extremely harmful to people, wildlife and the natural vegetation (if the Expansion Committe does not know that already, they should not be involved; why is that not a concern?). The West Shore has a natural and beautiful serenity to it; by adding a 77-foot tall lodge and retail village it will DESTROY the West Shore. There are already more than enough lodges and retail villages - whoever decided this project is a good idea should stop being greedy and think of the Lake, the people that have and will continue to vacaction there WITHOUT a new resort as well as the wildlife.

KEEP TAHOE BLUE!!

Monique Dagher Sass
455 E. 168th Place
South Holland, IL 60473

84

Judy Nikkel

84

From: Shelley Dalton <shelleyloveland@yahoo.com>
ent: Wednesday, April 20, 2011 7:55 AM
To: Judy Nikkel
Subject: Homewood DEIS Comments

Judy Nikkel

Dear TRPA,

We are absolutely opposed to the Homewood Project. This area of west shore is one of the very few remaining serene areas. Those of us who are not fortunate enough to live in Tahoe sincerely appreciate the beauty and serenity of west shore. Please do not turn this area into another south shore or even north shore. Those who live and vacation at west shore do so specifically to AVOID the type of monstrosities Homewood now wants to turn into. Please have respect for the area, the residents, the LAKE itself and those of us who vacation and adore this beautiful area.

Shelley Dalton
169 North Grant Lane
Folsom, CA 95630

Judy Nikkel **85**

85

From: John Dalton <Apollorods@yahoo.com>
Sent: Friday, April 22, 2011 7:57 AM
To: Judy Nikkel
Subject: Homewood DEIS Comments

Judy Nikkel

Dear TRPA,

It is very interesting to hear that TRPA is considering this expansion in the homewood area. There is no reason to expand there. I look at it this way. When I was a very young boy my parents owned a condomium at Crystal Shores East in Incline Village. I spent the first 7 years of my life all summer long and at least two weekends a month durring the winter until around 1972. My parents for financial reasons, thinking that had done exceptionally well in doubling their initial investment with that property in only a few years and in need of an infussion of cash into the family business, decided to sell. That may have been the worst day of my young life. I am now 46 years old. Tahoe is my second home. I go there for the beauty of the takes and mountains, the peice and quite that can be found around 'MOST" of the Lake. I am a renter. My wife and I come up to Tahoe at least 4-5 times every year. We would come more often if finances allowed. We love Tahoe. Over the last ten years we have stayed on West Shore probable 50 + times and love the pecefulness, the feeling of being remote even though you are only a few miles out of Tahoe City. . Look we have southsore, stateline and incline for all the big resorts, that is not to mention Alpine, Squaw Valley. We do not need any more large resorts. Let the resorts stay where they are, let the areas of piece and quiet continue to exist. If you allow this to move foward you will loose many of us, who come to relax, enjoy family, enjoy a night out at an outstanding resturant. Tahoe has a balance right now between those who would build on every inch and those who would not build anything at all. If this project goes foward I will have to say goodbye to a family member, a friend,my second home I have known my whole life. When I leave the Tahoe basin, I stop get out of my car and take one last look. It actually brings a little tear to my eye. I never know if it is tahe last time I will see it. I pray that I will. I hope this is actually read. Tahoe is a treasure, not just for those with in driviing distance but for the whole world. In a time when, we can not drill for our own oil, we can not cut down a tree that my threaten our homes, we want to build a 400 room resort. All for the love of some campaign contribution. If you would like to speak to me I would be happy to contribute. Sincerley, John Dalton 916-792-3629 (Cell), 916-987-0679 (home), 916-361-9585 (work)

Thank you for your Time. I hope this reaches you, as much as Tahoe reaches into my sole and refreshes it ever time I am there.

John Dalton
169 N Grant Lane
Folsom, CA 95630

86

Judy Nikkel

86

From: Nicole Damaschino <ndamasch@cisco.com>
Sent: Monday, April 18, 2011 1:53 PM
To: Judy Nikkel
Subject: Homewood DEIS Comments

RECEIVED
APR 18 2011
TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY

Judy Nikkel

Dear TRPA,

I am a very loyal and constant weekend visitor of the West Shore during all 4 Seasons of the year. I am VERY against this expansion proposal. Not only would it add significant amounts of traffic - there is no guarentee that this plan would be successful. Look at Northstar. Homewood is not the type of Mountain to draw the crowd that you are looking for. Even if you do put in high speed chairs.

I strongly disagree with this and hope that it does not go through.

Nicole Damaschino
72 Highbridge Ct.
Danville, CA 94526

Judy Nikkel **87**

87

From: Herbert Danielsen <herb.danielsen@gmail.com>
ent: Monday, April 18, 2011 2:12 PM
To: Judy Nikkel
Subject: Homewood DEIS Comments

Judy Nikkel

Dear TRPA,

I have been vacationing, camping, hiking, fishing, and swimming in Lake Tahoe since my childhood in the 1950's. I have skied several times at the Homewood Ski hill. I appreciate their entrepreneurial spirit, but in my opinion the impact of a large resort so near to the lake shore, and Highway 89 is not feasible. The impact on the lake, the current residents, and the current infrastructure of sewage, water, traffic, air quality, and lake clarity is too great. Please stop this project in its tracks.

Herbert Danielsen
1683 Kingwood Ave.
Manteca, CA 95336-2810

88

Judy Nikkel

88

From: Denis De Luchi <jraeden@msn.com>
Sent: Monday, April 18, 2011 11:26 AM
To: Judy Nikkel
Subject: Homewood DEIS Comments

Judy Nikkel

Dear TRPA,

1 Homewood is in a particularly sensitive area. Filtering bogs aren't present to clear sediment from drainage, much of the mountain is exposed to the lake, making any construction there unaesthetic by definition. This is simply not an area for any sort of further development.

Denis De Luchi

Mr. Denis De Luchi
7849 Tamara Drive
Fair Oaks, CA 95628

9169619644

89

Reply Reply All Forward

Homewood DEIS Comments

Dorothy Dean [dcdeanrn@yahoo.com]

Sent: Tuesday, April 19, 2011 7:31 AM

To: Homewood DEIS Comments

Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
Boulder Bay CEP
PO Box 5310
Stateline, NV 89449-5310
US

Dear TRPA,

Living in the most urbanized part of Tahoe, I have always loved the peace and beauty of the West Shore. Please do not allow the Homewood project to move forward as it is currently planned. The buildings are too tall, and too large. There should be a moratorium on all development other than redevelopment of existing eyesores, utilizing their current footprint only. Protect the lake!

Dorothy Dean
220 Logging Road
Stateline, NV 89449

Homewood DEIS Comments

Nicole Deas Kimsey [deasnicole@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, April 19, 2011 7:37 AM
To: Homewood DEIS Comments

90

Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
Boulder Bay CEP
PO Box 5310
Stateline, NV 89449-5310
US

Dear TRPA,

I am writing to voice my concern about the proposed Homewood Project. As someone who was born and raised on the less developted shores of Lake Tahoe I am 100% against this project. If this project goes through, Homwood will be one step closer to becoming more like Southshore, with all its ugly casinos and hotels. The villages at Squaw Valley and Northstar also come to my mind as terrible, ugly building projects that were too expensive, poorly planned and very unnecessary. Building a hotel etc... at Homewood will not only create more extreme summer traffic issues for the West Shore, but will degrade the beauty and value of the West Shore. This project will shatter the idea and reality that the West Shore is the best shore. This project is an act of pollution both environmentally and visually. Having worked on watershed issues around Lake Tahoe I know that you can not have a project this big that does not impact the environment no matter how eco-friendy your planning. Lake Tahoe does not need another hotel. It won't create local jobs and it won't help the local economy. Again look at Northstar and Squaw. Please stop allowing Lake Tahoe to become a playground only for the rich, catering only to their needs. Look to the comunities that live around the lake. The people who live here value the natural beauty and so do the visitors. If something must be built, I suggest building a campground or park but please do not allow this hotel, homes and other nonsense to be built at Homewood. It would be a diservice to all the locals and the environment.

Thank you for your time,

Nicole Deas Kimsey

Nicole Deas Kimsey
675 Estates Drive
Tahoe Vista, CA 96148

Judy Nikkel

91

91

From: Richard Dekruyf <dekfam4@charter.net>
ent: Monday, April 18, 2011 11:21 AM
To: Judy Nikkel
Subject: Homewood DEIS Comments

Judy Nikkel

Dear TRPA,

1 Please don't ruin our beautiful town

Richard Dekruyf
10th st
tahoma, CA 96142

Homewood DEIS Comments

92

Olivia Diaz [odiaz@foothill.net]
Sent: Tuesday, April 19, 2011 10:17 AM
To: Homewood DEIS Comments

Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
Boulder Bay CEP
PO Box 5310
Stateline, NV 89449-5310
US

Dear TRPA,

What a terrible idea to build such a large addition to the Lake!

I drive that road for various reasons all year long and in the summer I creep along in traffic much too dense for such a narrow road.

How can you think of adding development that would bring hundreds more?

You must only be thinking of the tax revenue. You certainly aren't thinking of quality of life, the environment, the clarity of the lake.

The lake is like the goose that lays the golden egg. Why would you want to kill the goose?

Olivia Diaz

Ms. Olivia Diaz
16914 Pasquale Road
Nevada City, CA 95959

93

Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
Homewood CEP
PO Box 5310 Stateline, NV 89449-5310

April 4, 2011 93

RECEIVED
APR 08 2011
TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY

Maywan Krach
Community Development Community Development Resource Agency
Environmental Coordination Services
3091 County Center Drive, Suite 190 Auburn, CA 95603

Re: Homewood Mountain Resort Development Comments and Concerns

Dear TRPA and Placer Co.,

I have been a full-time resident of Tahoma for the past 16 years. In addition, I camped in Lake Tahoe for 15 years before moving. I love it here and would not live on any other part of the lake. The West Shore has a very special unique atmosphere and community different from other parts of the Lake. A reason for moving here was to get away from the fast encroaching development that faces so many of our beautiful places in this country. I particularly love the West Shore for its rustic appeal and old Tahoe feeling- so quiet and peaceful. I would really hate to see that go away. The West Shore of Lake Tahoe is well known for being the last place where "old Tahoe" can be found.

After recently researching and educating myself on the proposed Homewood Mountain Resort development I have formulated some concerns and reservations. I feel that some growth is necessary to sustain the local economy and look forward to more jobs in the area. However, I have many *fears and issues with the proposed Homewood Resort Plan. My concerns* are as follows:

- 1 Traffic: Currently there is traffic back up during peak times during Winter & Summer, on Highway 89 and the bike path (an already congested area). As someone who rides the bike path frequently I feel that the DEIR/S does not give it an adequate analysis of foot and bike traffic. Also, I do not feel that Homewood Mountain is a "destination resort" for extreme skiers. I feel people that come here to visit also want to see the sights and go around the lake- on their own schedules and ski Squaw, Heavenly, Kirkwood, etc., creating more congestion. 2

3 If this plan were to go through, I shudder to think what would happen during an evacuation if a fire were to start. Overall, after reviewing the DEIR/S I still feel that the traffic analysis is grossly inaccurate. As a full-time resident I experience West Shore traffic frequently and know it intimately.

- 4 Water usage: The current HMR project proposes three swimming pools and a skating rink in the DEIR/S alternative 1. Already, we have several skating rinks in the area. I do not feel we need another, nor do I agree with the need for three more swimming pools. According to the Sierra Nevada Alliance's *Planning for Water-Wise Development in the Sierra*, "water originating in the region (Sierra Nevada) provides more than 60% of California's and most of Northern Nevada's developed water supply, and drives the majority of California's 386 hydroelectric power projects" (Planning for Water Wise Development in the Sierra, Sierra Nevada Alliance, p. 1). As Sierra residents we need to be especially mindful of our water usage.

- Height: After reading DEIR/S p. 3-42 and understanding the proposed project heights I have particular concern that the project is not sticking with the CEP height standards. I'm sure people boating here in the summer would not want the view of the woods from the lake to be *interrupted by a 77 ft. building. The same goes for hiking above* Homewood. Hikers would have to look down onto a tall building- no longer the sweet uninterrupted view down to the lake.

- Scenic: I feel that cutting 195 trees (DEIR/S 8-55, Table 8-6) will impose upon Vegetation, Scenic, and Wildlife thresholds in the Tahoe Basin. I also think this would drastically affect the view from the lake, once again to people boating. I have concerns of seeing "Now Renting" *or "For Sale" banners on the way to Tahoe City, once* a scenic and homey drive.

- Wildlife: We have a big bear population at Lake Tahoe, and particularly on the West Shore. I feel a resort of this size would definitely impact them in a negative way, probably to the point of extinction in this area. That is the same with the other wildlife here. Although not cited in the draft for negative impact, I feel the osprey and eagles that nest here will be negatively impacted by the size of this proposed project.

- Code amendments: A high concern of mine I read about in the DEIR/S is the amendment to the TRPA Code Chapter 64 on page 3-34 of the DIER/S. This amendment asks for ground water interception, which I feel violates the TRPA water quality threshold. I also fear this sort of construction is dangerous in an active fault area.

With all these thoughts in mind, I would hope that TRPA would reconsider this plan and down size the proposed project drastically to suit the size of the community, and preserve this unique and beautiful area for our grandchildren in its pristine and untouched state. In the words of the famous biologist and conservationist, Adolph Murie, "Let our decisions be a measure of our growth".

I thank you sincerely for this opportunity to voice my concerns.

Sincerely,

Lorraine DiMaggio

Lorraine DiMaggio

Lorraine Dimaggio
PO Box 466
Tahoma, CA 96142-0466

Judy Nikkel **94**

94

From: Theresa May Duggan <teemayduggan@gmail.com>
ent: Monday, April 18, 2011 10:56 AM
To: Judy Nikkel
Subject: Homewood DEIS Comments

Judy Nikkel

Dear TRPA,

Please consider approving the Homewood Project! The project can probably be improved, but I have seen the drawings and the commitment of the developers to Keep Tahoe Blue!

I believe we are learning that developers can be the partners we need to maintain and in fact improve the clarity of the Lake.

Please give this project a good look, ask for improvements, but then please move forward with a good project, good for the Lake, the Community and the Economy!

Thanks for serving on TRPA, it can't be easy, but it is so important!

Sincerely,

Theresa May Duggan
Tahoe Vista

Theresa May Duggan
7201 Pino Avenue
PO Box 290
Tahoe Vista, CA 96148 0290

95

Judy Nikkel

95

From: Dewey DuMond <DDuMond1@aol.com>
Sent: Monday, April 18, 2011 7:17 PM
To: Judy Nikkel
Subject: Homewood DEIS Comments

Judy Nikkel

Dear TRPA,

I strongly urge TRPA to vote no on the Homewood expansion plan! The proposed expansion will create more traffic, congestion and pollution on the west shore and have an adverse effect on the quality of experience that is Lake Tahoe. Please help us protect the Lake from large scale developement. Keep Tahoe Blue

Dewey DuMond
1256 Sierra Mar Dr.
San Jose, CA 95118

96

96

Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
P.O. Box 5310
128 Market Street
Stateline, NV 89448
Contact: David Landry, Project Manager
Phone: (775) 589-5214
Fax: (775) 588-4527
Email: homewooddeiscomments@trpa.org

April 19, 2011

County of Placer
Community Development Resource Agency
Environmental Coordination Services
3091 County Center Drive, Suite 190
Auburn, CA 95603
Contact: Maywan Krach, Community Development Technician
Phone: (530) 745-3132
Fax: (530) 745-3080
Email: cdraecs@placer.ca.gov

Dear TRPA and Placer County,

I have been a full-time West Shore resident since 1982 and my family has owned property in Meeks Bay since the late 1960's. I am writing to express my concern with the proposed Homewood Mountain Resort Development. As a West Shore resident I feel that
1 the projects mass and scale does not fit in with our local community. Examples of the project that concern me include the building height, number of units, parking garage and the proposed mid-mountain lodge. The development as proposed is **too** large. Homewood needs to be redeveloped **but** the community MUST have a voice.

2 Discussion in my neighborhood regarding the project seems to focus on the issue of traffic- this is a high concern of mine. Traffic WILL increase because of this project, which will affect full-time West Shore residents. This must be addressed.

3 What will the emergency response time be with this increase in traffic and individuals on the West Shore? How will emergency evacuations occur during peak fire seasons? We must preserve the West Shore for it is in my opinion one of the last pristine area around the Lake.

I hope you take my comments and concerns into consideration.

Thanks, Robert Dunkel

Bob Dunkel
Meeks Bay, CA

97

97

Bill Easton
965 Snowshoe Road
Tahoe City, CA 96145
(mail to: POB 41, Fiddletown, CA 95629-0041)

Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
Homewood CEP
PO Box 5310
Stateline, NV 89449-5310
(775) 588-4547

Email: (Homewooddeiscomments@trpa.org)
Comments can be faxed to (775) 588-4527.

Dear Sirs:

As a homeowner in the Talmont Heights area of North Tahoe, I would like to express my concerns about the proposed Homewood development proposal (Homewood CEP and Master Plan).

1 At the current time, traffic on Hwy. 89 backs up several miles, both in the summer and in winter on weekends during ski season because of resort use in the West shore area. Attracting more people to the region with improved ski capacity, hotel, and parking structures in the Homewood area will only add to congestion in the area and make the region less attractive than it is now. The increased volume of traffic will make it even more dangerous for bike riders. Traffic is slowed now when bike riders walk bikes across streets. Traffic backs up from the Tahoe City Y to Sunnyside quite often in the summer and weekends in the winter. This will only get worse. Traffic to Tahoe City will even be worse when Hwy. 89 is closed South of Bliss Park as it was several times this Winter. Then there is only one way in and out of Homewood. If a snow or rock slide closes Hwy. 89 around Emerald Bay, there is only one way out of Homewood. Most people visiting Homewood from the SF Bay area will travel up Interstate 80 to Hwy. 89.

3 Air quality will diminish with all of this cars idling and trying to get through Tahoe City. People who will be staying in apartments or condominiums with cooking facilities will be making several trips to grocery stores or for other shopping in Tahoe City. They will also be driving to Tahoe City for recreational dining and drinking.

5 I do not feel that the Transportation, Parking, and Circulation report adequately expresses the impact that additional population increases will have on the surrounding community and environment. Nor does it address adequate mitigation of these issues.

It is a know fact that the affluent community that will be using the proposed new facilities at Homewood have an aversion to using public transportation (unless required) to get back to Tahoe City. It would be my suggestion that a off-site parking structure be required somewhere North of the Y in Tahoe City, perhaps underground, as in Vail, CO, for this project to be approved. Then those with Homewood as a destination would be required to park their cars here and take a Homewood electric tram or train or subway to these new proposed facilities.

This would lessen physical congestion, visual congestion, pollution, and noise. These are all of the things that those of us who purchased property here at Tahoe came here to avoid.

This is probably too costly a solution. It is my opinion that this project is the wrong project, for the wrong place, at the wrong time. Any mitigation efforts will not be able to correct the deficiencies of site location, existing terrain, its proximity to Lake Tahoe, and the simple, but barely adequate and existing human infrastructure.

For a balanced living environment,

Bill Easton

Bill Easton

Homewood DEIS Comments

98

Kathy Echols [kathyechols@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Monday, April 18, 2011 9:22 PM
To: Homewood DEIS Comments

Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
Boulder Bay CEP
PO Box 5310
Stateline, NV 89449-5310
US

Dear TRPA,

1 I do not agree with the expansion of the Homewood Resort. These are my concerns:
2 * The project will worsen traffic on the West Shore, which will contribute to air pollution. Tahoe is already violating standards for ozone, a gas that is harmful to people, wildlife and vegetation.
3 * This large project will urbanize a part of Tahoe that is treasured for its serenity and natural beauty.
4 * The project should follow rules that all other property owners at Tahoe must follow.
5 * The project wants to permanently change the rules for height, which will allow for taller development throughout Tahoe in the future.
6 * This project is so large that it will transform and define its surrounding community, rather than being defined by a community plan.
7 * Although the project provides some environmental benefits, they are outweighed by its detrimental impacts.

Please preserve the rural atmosphere of West Shore, and preserve the fragile environment of Lake Tahoe.
Thank you,
Kathy Echols

Kathy Echols
10595 Somerset Dr.
Truckee, CA 96161

99

99

David Landry

From: William Edic [wcedic@att.net]
Sent: Friday, May 21, 2010 10:46 AM
To: David Landry
Subject: Homewood Mountain Resort

WILLIAM & CAROLE EDIC
P.O. Box 325
5725 Sacramento Ave.
Homewood, California 96141

Phone (530) 525-9249
Fax (530) 525-0139
e.mail: wcedic@att.net

May 21, 2010

E-MAIL

To: David Landry **From:** Bill & Carole Edic

dlandry@trpa.org

We are full time residents at the above address a block south of the Homewood Mountain Resort. We would like to express our support for this project. It appears to be a very well though out plan that will help the area to maintain its classic Tahoe character.

William and Carole Edic

100

ELLIOTT REAL ESTATE, INC.

100

MAR 03 2011

March 1, 2011

Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
P.O. Box 5310
128 Market Street
Stateline, NV 89448

RE: Homewood Mountain Resort Ski Area Master Plan

Dear Sir or Madam:

We own a single family home at 5075 West Lake Boulevard in Homewood, which is four lots to the north of the Homewood Ski Resort so we are very close to the above referenced project. Homewood on the west shore has always been a quiet family oriented community. We feel that the size of this project and the density that comes with it is going to have a major impact on this neighborhood and ourselves. It is hard to believe that there are benefits with this project that could out-weigh the environmental impacts, especially the traffic it is going to generate so for these reasons I am strongly opposed to the project and I would appreciate it if you would so note my objection at the Public Hearings for me as I will not be able to attend these meetings.

Sincerely,

Stephen R. Elliott

Stephen R. Elliott

CC: County of Placer, Community Development Resource Agency, Environmental Coordination Services

1600 TENNESSEE STREET - VALLEJO, CA 94590 - (707) 552-8400 - FAX (707)552-0881
CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF REAL ESTATE LICENSE NUMBERS: WILLIAM G. ELLIOTT #00385448 / STEPHEN R. ELLIOTT #00365906

101

Judy Nikkel

101.

From: Sue Enger <suedick@comcast.net>
ent: Tuesday, April 19, 2011 4:24 PM
To: Judy Nikkel
Subject: Homewood DEIS Comments

Judy Nikkel

Dear TRPA,

1 Adding a large development in Homewood seems out of the question for a small area that is already congested with traffic a good deal of the time in summer and in ski season. Please keep Lake Tahoe the quaint and special destination spot that it is and do not turn it in to another large city resort and development. As a planning agency, it is difficult for us to realize you are approving this big project. If it goes through our destination will no longer be the west shore of Lake Tahoe. Please consider something other than money and large developers when you make your decision. Thank you

Mrs. Sue Enger
3501 Rubin Dr
Oakland, CA 94602-4145

102

Judy Nikkel

102

From: Warren Fallat <warrenusa@msn.com>
ent: Thursday, April 21, 2011 11:20 AM
To: Judy Nikkel
Subject: Homewood DEIS Comments

Judy Nikkel

Dear TRPA,

1 I am in favor of the Homewood project and feel it should be approved. As a lifelong part-time resident of Tahoe Pines, I think the West Shore area needs some positive things going on and the project should help.

2 I think that the traffic issues are not really related to the Homewood area, but rather, Tahoe City. If the Tahoe City issues can be resolved, that would make summer life on the West Shore much better. The year-round benefits that the Homewood Project would provide is significant. The lake needs projects like Homewood to make sure that responsible development is accomplished.

Our house is used mostly in Summer and even though I have not been much of a skiier this year, I think the Homewood Mountain Resort is a critical piece of the West Shore economy. To reject the Homewood Project, or make it uneconomical for JMA to continue operating the ski area would be a major mistake.

incerely,
Warren Fallat
PO Box 553
Loyalton, CA 96118

Warren Fallat
23 Pinto Trail
Loyalton, CA 96118

103

APR 15 2011

to whom it may concern —

I support Homewood Resorts Redevelopment plans. I think its a great example of a private sector stepping up to bring homewood into this century. With the downturn, it is great to see a company willing to spend money, re-develop and create buildings, development, etc. to benefit the future of the Greater Lake Tahoe area —

please vote Yes - to let homewood Mtn Resort Community Enhancement Project go forward.

Thanks

Jamie Fausold

P.O. Box 578
Tahoma CA 96142

Jfausold@jps.net
916.425 5784

a user of Greater Lake Tahoe.

Reply Reply All Forward

104

104

Homewood DEIS Comments

Shannon Fischer [shannonf_00@yahoo.com]

Flag for follow up. Start by Thursday, April 28, 2011. Due by Thursday, April 28, 2011.

Sent: Wednesday, April 20, 2011 11:42 AM

To: Homewood DEIS Comments

Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
Boulder Bay CEP
PO Box 5310
Stateline, NV 89449-5310
US

Dear TRPA,

Shannon Fischer
1139 Broadway St.
#103
San Francisco, CA 94109

Homewood DEIS Comments

105

Kristen Flance [tahoe1910@gmail.com]
Sent: Saturday, April 23, 2011 11:27 PM
To: Homewood DEIS Comments

Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
Boulder Bay CEP
PO Box 5310
Stateline, NV 89449-5310
US

Dear TRPA,

Please do not allow this project to proceed as planned. The amount of vehicular traffic it will generate will overwhelm the two lane road which is already backed up in the peak seasons. It is simply too much for the West Shore, and will impace the lake itself negatively. Pollution and runoff will be overwhelming. We all try so hard to take care of the lake and diminish our impact on the lake, and then this comes along a huge project like this that makes all our work for naught. Please don't let the West Shore become overbuilt and traffic-clogged like South Shore.

Kristen Flance
6912 Pomin Ave
Tahoma, CA 96142

106

Judy Nikkel

106

From: Paula Fleming <pfleming@glenrocknj.net>
ent: Monday, April 18, 2011 11:17 AM
To: Judy Nikkel
Subject: Homewood DEIS Comments

Judy Nikkel

Dear TRPA,

1 Please leave Homewood in it's natural, serene setting as it is. I skied at Homewood for the first time 15 years ago and have enjoyed its "peacefulness" ever since. Sometimes expansion and improvements are NOT the best!

Paula Fleming
1712 Erie Circle
S. Lake Tahoe, CA 96150

107

County of Placer
3091 County Center Drive, Suite 190
Auburn, CA 95603
ATT: Maywan Krach

Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
P.O. Box 5310
Stateline, Nevada 89449
ATT: David Landry

Re: Homewood Mountain Resort DEIR/EIS Comments

Date: April 4, 2011

We, Hal and Dolores Flinn, have owned our residence on parcel 77, 145 Tahoe Ski Bowl Way, Homewood, CA for 40+ years. Throughout this ownership, our family has maintained an amiable relationship with our Homewood / Tahoe Ski Bowl neighbor.

1 Our objective as homeowners is to sustain and prolong our family's quality of life in and around our Tahoe home. We are advocates of small scale enhancements to HMR (South) that respect present day zoning and are compatible with the size and scope of our residential neighborhood. While we appreciate JMA' s intentions to update their recreational facilities and property, the plan as presented in the DEIR/EIS overwhelms not only us, but
2 our parcel, block and surrounding neighborhood. We are highly concerned that the financial aspiration of a single company will become the source of permanent disruption to our home. We have been attentive, within our ability, to the progress of this project and have reserved many of our comments for this response period. Noted below are our to-date objections, concerns and a list of questions.

We respectfully:

3 1. Object , for reasons listed below, to the rezoned Special Area (South) which changes the scope of our immediate Chamberlands neighborhood from a single home residential area with an adjoining seasonal recreational business to a high density/rise, 15-unit per acre, year-round residential condo development with private access recreation.

- 4 Plan zoning conflicts with original PAS 157/158 designation. The planning statement for PAS 158 established this area should remain residential, with a density of one single family dwelling per parcel.
- 5 Proposed 3-story height and 15-unit per acre density plan design are incompatible with adjacent single home parcel(s) and inconsistent with subdivision.
- 6 50-99 year-round condos and associated vehicles will overpopulate the immediate community. This type of density and vehicle movement does not complement the existing neighborhood.
- 7 Proposed development will cause significant, irreversible, negative impact to Chamberlands Parcel 77, dwelling and homeowners.

8 Our request is that regulating agencies uphold the established community design and maintain the current land use criteria. We believe that rezoning should be driven by a community process rather than a private business plan.

9 2. Object to having overdeveloped structures positioned adjacent to our property (southwest) and along the Conservancy property's northern border parallel to our home. The proposed footprint grows closer to our property with each new rendering. We request consideration for a less invasive alternative design to the proposed South Area plan footprint.

10 3. Object to the inadequate scoping process of high impact property owners plus representation that sufficient solutions have been provided. We have not observed an unbiased, uniform survey method for gathering data to assess the socioeconomic impact of neighboring residents. Subsequently, upon review if the DEIR/EIS, we

11

interpret that stated, multiple "less than significant impacts" cumulate into a significant impact for us. The change of land use for HMR's adjoining property will allow for development that permanently damages the character and complexion of our parcel and quality of our private life at home.

Permanent impact concerns:

- Proposed building heights and footprint indicate direct, invasive views into all of our bedroom windows and decks.
- Addition of year round residual noise interference from increased population density, garage and commercial maintenance activity yards away.
- Addition of year round residual lighting interference from proposed condos and garage.
- Obstruction of our scenic view on the west and south sides of our parcel.
- Despite mitigation plans, additional density subjects us to increased risk of loss associated with human failures and negligence; for example, fire, theft, trespassing, garbage and bear issues.
- Conversion of dead-end Tahoe Ski Bowl Way to an access road to 16 condos provides an element of additional risk from increased traffic for current residents, children and pets.

Construction impact concerns:

- Project at the south base area might endanger the health of the homeowners near the construction zone. Plan fails to protect the aged and health compromised population from additional illness induced by construction disruption; will exacerbate existing medical conditions of resident(s).
- Mitigation appears to cover only 50% of the fugitive dust and fails to eliminate prolonged exposure risk to the remaining manipulated airborne particles.
- Plan does not adequately address the impact of the additional home and property maintenance cost burdens for adjacent homeowner(s) during years of prolonged construction (constant clean-up to exteriors, landscaping, parked vehicles, dwelling ventilation, etc.).
- Mitigation fails to adequately estimate the impact of heightened insect, rodent and raptor migration on and into adjacent property and dwellings. Homeowners may be subjected to additional extermination costs and home and health care preventative measures.

General impact concerns:

- Increased peak time traffic on the West Shore remains a significant issue. Notwithstanding mitigation from preceding area projects, traffic and vehicle congestion continues to get worse. Based on residential historical perspective, the plan fails to provide enough credible assurance that the proposed mitigation will be adequate.
- Potential medical emergency response delays during peak traffic times. Plan does not appear to assess impact of increased traffic and population on residents in need of urgent medical care.

We have the following questions:

- We are unable to locate a Financial Community Impact Report (FCIR) or a Community Impact Report (CIR). Was one or the other prepared? If yes, where can we access it? If no, what is the rationale for not incorporating this type of report into the process?
- The preparation time for the NOP, DEIR/EIS has covered several years. Where do these reports show adequate consideration for the interim impact of the current economic climate and recession?

- 30 Many tables and studies are outdated. What interim documents, if any, have been developed to equalize the results with present day conditions?
- 31 If current ski area operations have not been sustainable under HMR ownership for the past 5 years, how can we feel confident that post renovation, the objective to remain open will succeed? 32 In the event it does not, what protects the community from the developer financially and physically backing out on ski area operations, going bankrupt or leaving the community with an incomplete problem project?
- 33 During construction years when the north lot is not available, where will the skiers park when the south lot is full? Where will the winter workforce park?
- 34 Are there any anticipated future projects along and or adjacent to Tahoe Ski Bowl Way?
- 35 Would the extension of Tahoe Ski Bowl way change ownership of the street?
- 36 What is the amount and location of trees to be removed adjacent to our property and along Tahoe Ski Bowl Way?

37 In summary, the DEIR/EIS does not adequately address environmental impacts and community impacts of the proposed South Base development and privately executed Tahoe Ski Bowl Way extension. We are asking for you to respond back to us with answers to our concerns and questions.

Thank you.

Respectfully submitted by:

Hal and Dolores Flinn and Family
145 Tahoe Ski Bowl Way
Homewood, CA 96141

108

April 18,2011

108

APR 21 2011

Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
P.O Box 5310
Stateline, Nevada 89449

Att: David Landry

Dear Mr. Landry,

Previously, we sent a letter dated April 4, 2011, voicing our concerns about the size and scope of the Homewood Mountain Resort DEIR/EIS project. We think it also necessary to voice our opinion on another part of the plan that we did not include in our original letter.

Although we were told and shown by JMA staff that a gate would be installed on the 100 block of Tahoe Ski Bowl Way, they also indicated that this would not happen unless all the residents on the block approved. This appears to be not true. After talking with Placer County staff, we now understand that a gate is proposed to be installed at the Sacramento Street intersection and Tahoe Ski Bowl Way, originally called El Capitian Street, in doing so this it would privatize the street. This letter is written to strongly express our disagreement with any attempt to privatize the 100 block of Tahoe Ski Bowl Way. We would like to go on record that we do not approve of this part of the plan.

We hope this letter can be included with our original letter. Thank you in advance for your time and consideration.

Respectfully,

Hal and Dolores Flinn and family
145 Tahoe Ski Bowl Way
Homewood, CA. 96141

Cc: Allen Breuch

Maywan Krach

From: Allen Breuch
Sent: Thursday, February 17, 2011 8:29 AM
To: haroldflinn@comcast.net
Cc: Karenflinn2001@aol.com; Maywan Krach; Michael Wells
Subject: RE: HMR meeting on February 17, 2011

Hal and Dolores Flinn and family

Thank you for the e-mail and I will forward it to the appropriate people. The Planning Commission meeting is currently scheduled today for public comment at 10am. You can provide written comments on the Homewood DEIR/EIS by March 21, 2011.

Thank you,

Allen

Allen Breuch
Supervising Planner - Lake Tahoe
County of Placer -Community Development Resource Agency
565 West Lake Blvd., P.O. Box 1909, Tahoe City, CA, 96145
Direct (530) 581-6284
Fax (530) 581-6282
E-mail abreuch@placer.ca.gov

From: haroldflinn@comcast.net [mailto:haroldflinn@comcast.net]
Sent: Wednesday, February 16, 2011 10:26 PM
To: Allen Breuch
Cc: Karenflinn2001@aol.com
Subject: HMR meeting on February 17, 2011

Dear Mr. Breuch:

We are writing to let you know that our intentions were to attend the Homewood Mountain Resort Master Plan meeting on February 17, 2011. At this time, winter storm warnings and poor road conditions make travel precarious. When speaking with Maywan Krach, she indicated that weather may be a factor that could cause the cancellation of the meeting. Should this be the case, we would appreciate receiving notification of the rescheduled date.

We have many concerns about the proposal and will let them be known within the required time frame. Additionally, we would like to voice our support of those speakers at the February 9, 2011 TPRA meeting requesting a 30-day extension of the comment period due to the size of the EIR/EIS report.

Respectfully,

Hal and Dolores Flinn and family

110

Office Outlook Web Access | Type here to search | This Folder | Address Book | Options

Mail
Calendar
Contacts

Deleted Items
Drafts
Inbox (96)
Junk E-Mail
Sent Items

Click to view all folders

Manage Folders...

Reply | Reply to All | Forward | Move | Delete | Close

FW: Homewood Mountain Project

David Landry

110

Sent: Monday, February 28, 2011 9:13 AM
To: David Tirman (dtirman@jmaventuresllc.com)
Cc: achapman@jmaventuresllc.com; Robert Brueck (rbrueck@haugebrueck.com); Homewood DEIS Comments

Thought that I would forward this particular email to you as this comment came up a few times at APC, PC and GB.

From: haroldflinn@comcast.net [mailto:haroldflinn@comcast.net]
Sent: Saturday, February 26, 2011 6:07 PM
To: David Landry
Subject: Homewood Mountain Project

Dear Mr. Landry,

I tried calling you on Friday, Feb 26, 2011, however, I received the message that your offices were closed due to hazardous weather conditions,therefore, I decided to email you instead.

I did not think it appropriate to approach you after the meeting on Wednesday with my concerns since you had so many other things to think about.

I spoke at the meeting about my concern over the footprint of the condos on the South side o the project. It appears that the new plans call for the buildings to be much closer to our property line. Is there any chance that a change could be considered to move them in a different angle and also it will give us a little more privacy?

This project has taken a lot of our family's time and energy trying to understand how we can best accept JMA's project as well as protect our interest. During the meeting on Feb 9th I mentioned in my statement that we had serious health issues in our family. My husband has been diagnosed with Stage 4 lung cancer and I am fighting more acute asthma attacks lately. mention this only because I would like your opinion if we are wasting our time trying to accomplish something that has already been decided. As you can imagine time is very important to us....something not to be wasted.

Thank you for reading my message. I hope to hear from you.

Dolores Flinn
145 Tahoe Ski Bowl Way
P.O. Box 881
Homewood, CA 96141

Connected to Microsoft Exchar

111

Judy Nikkel

111

From: Brandon Fonteyn <oldschoolgvillain@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, April 19, 2011 11:30 AM
To: Judy Nikkel
Subject: Homewood DEIS Comments

Judy Nikkel

Dear TRPA,

I lived in the Tahoe Carson Vally area for nearly 14 years, it is with out a doubt one of the most beautiful untouched places ive ever been or lived, from the huge street gatherings on new years eve to the 4th of julys on the beach it just doesnt get much better. Gardnerville and the Carson valley area with the old rustic feel and then right up the mountain to beauty and serenity,, atleast when they put the skate park in it was half a block into the forest,, people can go consume and shop and be over weight over payed humans anywhere else in the country or world for that matter,, lake tahoes main attraction is that of a piece of mind and feeling of being in a nice quaint little mountain town,, dont turn into aspen!!!!!!!!!

Brandon Fonteyn
225.5 briggs
erie, CO 80516

112

Judy Nikkel

112

From: Sally Friedman <salval@aol.com>
Sent: Monday, April 18, 2011 9:02 AM
To: Judy Nikkel
Subject: Homewood DEIS Comments

Judy Nikkel

Dear TRPA,

Please carefully consider the long-term effects of the Homewood Project. The project will worsen traffic on the West
1 Shore, which will contribute to air pollution. Tahoe is already violating standards for ozone, a gas that is harmful to people, wildlife and vegetation.
3 This large project will urbanize a part of Tahoe that is treasured for its serenity and natural beauty.
4 The project should follow rules that all other property owners at Tahoe must follow.
5 The project wants to permanently change the rules for height, which will allow for taller development throughout Tahoe in the future.
6 This project is so large that it will transform and define its surrounding community, rather than being defined by a community plan.
7 Although the project provides some environmental benefits, they are outweighed by its detrimental impacts. Did Tahoe Keys not teach a lesson about harmful effects of development???
Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sally Friedman
1508 N. Boylston St.
Los Angeles, CA 90012-1019

113

Judy Nikkel

113

From: Beverly Fries <bevcharl@aol.com>
Sent: Wednesday, April 20, 2011 9:00 PM
To: Judy Nikkel
Subject: Homewood DEIS Comments

Judy Nikkel

Dear TRPA,

1 Tahoe is a national treasure not a personal goldmine or playground for the wealthy. I have either vacationed or lived at the less developed West Shore of this profoundly beautiful and ecologically unique lake each year of my 55 year life and each year despite continuing degradation, it becomes a more sacred and much beloved part of my life. This over ambitious project will further desecrate the ecology of lake and land, create traffic snarls rivaling Tahoe City and South Shore in summer, worsen the quality of air, construct even more barriers that inhibit the broader public from enjoying the serenity of Tahoe's shore and alienate the existing community all in the name of profit to a few investors.

2 Any development at Homewood should minimally have to conform to the current regional plan and improve upon the environmental quality that is currently sustained after the excessive development that has already occurred on the lakeside of the highway.

Beverly Fries
2981 Gilbert Station Rd
Harboursville, VA 22923

Judy Nikkel

114

114

From: Jack Fritschi <jackf@cfpinsurance.com>
Sent: Monday, April 18, 2011 10:40 AM
To: Judy Nikkel
Subject: Homewood DEIS Comments

Judy Nikkel

Dear TRPA,

I am totally opposed to this current plan. It is simply too big. The West Shore cannot even handle the current traffic problems during the summer. A water taxi? What a joke.
Jack Fritschi

Jack Fritschi
300 West Lake Blvd.
Tahoe City, CA 96145

115

Judy Nikkel

115

From: stuart fry <sfry07@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, April 18, 2011 9:54 AM
To: Judy Nikkel
Subject: Homewood DEIS Comments

Judy Nikkel

Dear TRPA,

Please don't expand and ruin the only great tranquil part of Lake Tahoe we have left. It not about us now it about the future generations. Don't blow it over greed.

stuart fry
2048 Roscomare Road
Los Angeles, CA 90077

Homewood DEIS Comments

116

Brie Fugate [bhardie8@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, April 18, 2011 12:09 PM
To: Homewood DEIS Comments

Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
Boulder Bay CEP
PO Box 5310
Stateline, NV 89449-5310
US

Dear TRPA,

I was born and raised in beautiful Lake Tahoe. In my adult life I have moved to Sacramento for work and convenience. The Tahoe area is an oasis for those of us living in the city now. It is our home. There is absolutely no need for more development on any shore, let alone one of the more reclusive areas. My vote is strongly against the development of this area.
Thank you.

Brie Fugate
8929 Salmon Falls Dr
Sacramento, CA 95826

Judy Nikkel

117

From: joan fury <jf4art@sbcglobal.net>
ent: Monday, April 18, 2011 10:40 AM
To: Judy Nikkel
Subject: Homewood DEIS Comments

Judy Nikkel

Dear TRPA,

Good Morning,

Yet another building project...and not for the best interests of our Lake Tahoe.

89 is already a well trafficked two lane road. Why add more traffic to it. And to have a retail center with the building of the residential units is rediculous, when we already have retail centers close by.

And the ozone factor and pollution is of utmost importance NOT to have added to the mix.

These building projects only account to the greed of the developers, AND NOT TO THE AESTHETIC BEAUTY of the lake and its surroundings.

.ll the developers are thinking, and I do reiterate, is the bottom line....and I mean there bottom line.

I am a homeowner in Incline Village...and CAST MY NEGATIVE VOTE TO THIS PROJECT AT HOMEWOOD.

Let's keep Tahoe alone, and think of the community and NOT the greed of the developers.

Thank you.

Joan fury jf4art@sbcglobal.net

joan fury
3203 lake garda drive
san jose, CA 95135

Judy Nikkel **118**

118

From: zone FUTCH <archerfutch@yahoo.com>
ent: Wednesday, April 20, 2011 11:51 AM
To: Judy Nikkel
Subject: Homewood DEIS Comments

Judy Nikkel

Dear TRPA,

1 The project will worsen traffic on Highway 89 which is a two lane road; therefore, it will contribute significantly to air pollution in the Tahoe basin that is already violating standards for ozone. Ozone gas is harmful to people, wildlife and vegetation. 2

3 A project this large will urbanize a part of Tahoe that is treasured for its serenity and natural beauty.

4 This project will violate existing rules for height, that will allow for taller development throughout Tahoe in the future.

5 The project must follow rules that all other property owners at Tahoe follow.

6 This project is so large that it will transform the surrounding community and contribute to the continued degradation of Lake Tahoe.

zone FUTCH
252 Westbrook PL.
Livermore, CA 94550

119

RECEIVED
APR 15 2011 119
REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY

Michael & Beverly Garton
1537 Atlas Peak Rd.
Napa, CA 94888
(707) 258-2111

April 5, 2011

Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
C/O David Landry, Project Manager
P.O. Box 5310
128 Market Street
Stateline, NV 89440

RE: Homewood Mountain Resort Ski Area Master Plan: Public comment on Homewood Project Draft EIR/EIS.

Dear Mr. Landry:

We would like to voice our concerns regarding the proposed development at Homewood Mountain Resort. We own the undeveloped parcel (5245 Westlake Blvd) east of the proposed parking structure/housing unit (between the bike path and Westlake Blvd., next to the Maritime Museum)

1 Our major concern is with the change in drainage/runoff due to the proposed parking structure. We have already seen a change in the direction and quantity of runoff due to the excavation work and filling of the parking structure area with gravel. Prior to these changes, runoff would run across the Homewood Resort property and into an inlet at the northwest corner of the Maritime Museum. It now runs across the bike path directly onto our property. We are requesting assurance that this issue will be resolved in future development.

2 Our second concern is with adequacy of parking for the proposed development. In addition to this property, we also own the house across the street (5220 West Lake Blvd.) and already experience periods of heavy traffic and parking congestion. The new development and its high number of housing units and lack of proportionate parking would seem to exacerbate an already troublesome issue.

We are generally in favor of most of what is proposed in this development, but request assurances that these issues will be dealt with satisfactorily.

Sincerely,

Michael Garton
Beverly Garton

Property Owners:
APN# 097-140-005
5245 West Lake Boulevard
Homewood, CA 96141

120

Judy Nikkel

120

From: Julie Lane Gay <jlanegay@gmail.com>
ent: Tuesday, April 19, 2011 11:04 AM
To: Judy Nikkel
Subject: Homewood DEIS Comments

Judy Nikkel

Dear TRPA,

As a homeowner and taxpayer on the West Shore (since 1928!), please do not allow the Homewood Project to go ahead.

This huge proposed development would dramatically, and adversely affect the West shore - it is simply way too large in size and impact for what we can absorb. This project would irrevocably change, and dramatically damage, the aesthetics, environmental impact, water pollution, traffic and ethos of the West Shore. As someone who has gladly spent tens of thousands of dollars re-painting my pier so it is less visually obtrusive, planting trees to avoid visibility of my home and remodeling to suit your low impact regulations, this project seems totally contradictory of all that TRPA has upheld, and asked of homeowners.

PLEASE do not allow the proposed project at Homewood.

Iulie Lane Gay

Julie Lane Gay
181 Paradise Flat Lane
Tahoma, CA 96142

121

Judy Nikkel

121

From: Craig Gay <cmgay@telus.net>
ent: Wednesday, April 20, 2011 6:39 PM
To: Judy Nikkel
Subject: Homewood DEIS Comments

Judy Nikkel

Dear TRPA,

1 I want to express my STRONG opposition to the proposed Homewood project. The size of the project is such that it will RADICALLY change the West Shore between Tahoe City and Emerald Bay, and NOT for the better!

2 The project can't help but DRASTICALLY worsen traffic on the West Shore.

3 This project will URBANIZE a part of Tahoe that is treasured for its serenity and natural beauty. The West Shore will NEVER BE THE SAME if this project is allowed to go forward.

4 The project should follow the SAME STRICT DEVELOPMENT rules that we have been made to follow and that ALL other property owners at Tahoe must follow.

5 The project threatens to PERMANENTLY change the rules for height, which will allow for taller development throughout ahoe in the future. This will RUIN the West Shore.

6 The proposed project is SO LARGE that it will transform and define its surrounding community, rather than being defined by a community plan.

Frankly I cannot believe you are EVEN CONSIDERING allowing this development to go forward!

Craig Gay
181 Paradise Flat Road
Three Ring Road
Tahoma, CA 96142

Homewood DEIS Comments

Andrew Gay [ahlgay@stanford.edu]
Sent: Tuesday, April 19, 2011 11:48 AM
To: Homewood DEIS Comments

122

Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
Boulder Bay CEP
PO Box 5310
Stateline, NV 89449-5310
US

Dear TRPA,

As a longtime Tahoe homeowner and community member, I am shocked and appalled at the audacity of the Homewood Expansion Project. It would appear that the TRPA has abandoned not only their rationality in this instance, but also their own bylaws and mandate.
The Homewood Resort Project explicitly outlines its plans to:
1) Exponentially increase traffic across a remote, already strained, two-lane country road;
2) Blatantly violate TRPA's own building restrictions on building height, creating a slippery slope, which the TRPA will invariably plunge into with the fervor of a mouse into a trap;
3) Show a staggering disregard for the remarkably fragile ecosystem of the Lake Tahoe basin by dramatically increasing pollution in the region. I would not be surprised if the TRPA next grants permission for toxic dumping into the Lake â€" Tahoe certainly makes an appealing tailings pond.
4) Destroy the local Homewood community and ethos that has been recognized for its serenity and tradition for decades.
In summary: Ruin already fragile infrastructure, violate TRPA bylaws, permanently damage environment, and destroy Tahoe heritage and community.
It would seem then that there is really only one viable motivation for the TRPA in this instance: Greed - Pure, unadulterated good old-fashioned greed, has infected and blinded the TRPA making them dangerously unaware of the imminence of their destruction and their disturbingly complicit role in it.
In many ways, I sympathize with their plight. I am a man, just as they; the lure of the Homewood Resort Project is surely intoxicating in itâ€™s scope and breadth. The pockets of the TRPA have never stood to be so deeply lined as they do now â€" their plight is as human as it is understandable.
It is also however, complete suicide for the TRPA and the Lake that brings its relevance. The shortsightedness of the TRPA is almost laughable. By recommending a project that not only threatens to contribute to the destruction of their only tangible asset and appeal â€" the Lake and it's ecosystem; but also violates the TRPAâ€™s own building codes, thus virtually invalidating their raison d'Ãªtre, the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency has effectively signed not only their own death warrant, but also the warrant of all those who love Lake Tahoe.
In light of this, I strongly recommend that the TRPA cease all plans for the Homewood Resort Project immediately. Their future, and the future of the Lake that we love, depends upon it.

Andrew Gay
7060 Prescott Street
Vancouver, BC V6N4K5

Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
P.O. Box 5310
128 Market Street
Stateline, NV 89449
Contact: David Landry
E-mail: Homewooddeiscomments@trpa.org
Fax: (775) 588-4527

April 20, 2011

County of Placer
Community Development Resource Agency
Environmental Coordination Services
3091 County Center Drive, Suite 190
Auburn, CA 95603
Contact: Maywan Krach
E-mail: cdraecs@placer.ca.gov
Fax: (530) 745-3003

Our Family Concerns with Homewood Mountain Resort

We are speaking as residents of Homewood. James and Susan Gearhart's family has owned a home on Sacramento St., in close proximity to the South Base of HMR, for over 50 years. We have raised eight children and 12 grandchildren and introduced them all to skiing at Lake Tahoe and have enjoyed the rural quality of life and quiet atmosphere of the Homewood area. Both James and I are in Tahoe all months of the year, especially the quiet off season months to enjoy the peaceful serenity of Tahoe and have been active in the establishment of Friends of the West Shore.

In the summer of 2008, West Shore community members attempted to have a Community Plan developed with Placer County and TRPA but both stated they were too busy to hear our concerns and dedicate staff hours to assist. We knew in September of 2007 that HMR was proposing a Master Ski Plan. In Oct. HMR was approved to be a CEP without requiring a Community Plan. Our West Shore General Plan in 1998 was never adopted by TRPA. Instead, the HMR Master Ski Plan was approved rather than a Community Plan. Homewood is too small to have elective representatives but we do have a community who has been ignored from the beginning. As residents, we believe we should be active in this planning phase. We certainly will hold the Governing Board to the CEP, the community was told that none of the CEPs were given any assurance of approval until the final TRPA Governing Board vote was done.

Our concerns are:

- **West Shore Residents have agreed:**

  A majority of the Homewood residents have expressed their concerns regarding the proposed Homewood Mountain Resort development. These residents are concerned about the projects size, scale, height, TRPA code amendments, and lack of compatibility with the community and traffic. We've had surveys/petitions in 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010 and 2011 all supporting various aspects of these problems. Survey petitions in 2009 signed by 350 residents stated: *"We promote sustainable communities and policies that enhance our natural resources without paving over*

our watersheds and wetlands. We can grow wisely be reinvesting in our existing communities and infill developments that closely mirror the scale and character of our historical West Shore. We the undersigned want to balance the protection of our rural communities while preserving our natural resources on the West Shore".

The negative impact of noise and light resulting from additional population

The proposed HMR development will block our views of the steep slopes of Mt. Ellis and for some residents the Lake view. The impact of 349 new units with a possible increase in population of 1,400 people on peak winter and summer days is a major impact to Homewood. This will be the largest development since TRPA was formed. As a redevelopment, the build-out should occur only on existing hard coverage, primarily the asphalted parking lots. Redevelopment should not sprawl into the watersheds. The proposed South Base community is not going to improve the surrounding residential homeowner's quality of life. Noise bounces off the steep mountain and into our community. The South Base is an amphitheater for all noise. In winter, there are sounds of skiers but they go home by 4:30 PM. The night lights will alter the starry nights and the sun light for many residents. We need the condos to be two stories high and off the slope of the watershed for Ellis Creek/Homewood Creek. Townhouses should reflect the residential neighborhoods.

- **Height**

The lowest point on the parcel to the highest point is 108.5 feet going up the mountain slope. HMR is requesting a "Special Height Amendment" from TRPA changing the Code of Ordinances with the way height is measured for their project only. Currently, according to TRPA, the highest building height is measured at 77 ft, including an amendment and combined buildings up the mountain. Regardless of the measurement, this won't change the visual impact from the Highway and Lake Tahoe plus hiking trails and from resident's homes, it will still appear 108.5 feet tall as the buildings step up the mountain, although not one building is that tall. Story Poles in the spring while help the community and decision makers understand the true massing of the north and south base as well as the 16 duplexes being requested at the continuance of Tahoe Ski Bowl Way and the impact of mid-mountain lodge proposed as the "Preferred Alternative". The tree tops will be interrupted from individuals homes by the skyscrapers looking north or south along the slopes. The Community has many concerns with this and several other amendments that HMR is requesting. Currently, our tallest two buildings are split level three stories. HMR is not compatible with the community or the intent of the CEP.

- **Increase Traffic Congestion with Neighborhood Parking Problems and Air Quality Impacts.**

The 349 units with a new hotel and residential, condos and TAUs will cause traffic problems on our already congested highways. Most ski resorts, NorthStar, Squaw Valley, Alpine and Heavenly in the winter all have access streets off the highway that can hold some of the traffic attempting to get into the parking areas. This allows the traffic to be clear of the main highways.

Not in this development, the highway will be congested with people coming early for the available public parking spaces. Even now on fresh powder snow, windy days or holidays, our neighborhoods become overflow parking lots including both sides of highway 89 and our side streets. This development will limit public parking dramatically and negatively impact our community. We know this because for the last three years, our family comes during Presidents week-end and we've cleared the driveway and stand watch to be sure our family can have a parking place. People park in our driveway and tell us to tow their car if we want. We've had the sheriff tell us that is our problem because it is on private property. The public has already found answers to the lack of adequate parking drastically impacting the Community. Traffic congestion increases ozone levels, a gas harmful to people, wildlife and the Tahoe basin.

- **Recreation**

This development is only considering the financial gain of winter skiing at HMR's. We have one of the best mountain hiking peaks and trails in all of Tahoe at our back door and south. HMR will visually alter this beauty. Cross country skiing and snow shoeing are also considered winter recreation. Kayaks that hug the shorezone as well as paddle boats and small sailing rigs, will only see buildings in the summer. McKinney Bay is known to have the quietest waters to ski and the greatest scenery. We have a history on the West Shore that is unique with the Ole Tahoe homes, the Pacific Crest Trail with State and Federal Parks. Economics must not be a priority over the environment and the community. The Ski Resort isn't the only recreation and should not negatively impact all other recreational needs with visual impacts.

- **Water Quality**

Groundwater impacts are a major concern which requires amendments and enforcement of TRPA Code of Ordinances. Urban run-off is a major contributor for decreasing water quality. Lahontan just passed the TMDLs Clarity Challenge but it doesn't provide the Counties with information from new developments. Why? All urban development causes negative impacts to Lake Tahoe and new developments should be required to be tested for TMDL impacts. Groundwater flow should not be an amendment to TRPA Code of Ordinances, it should be preserved and attain its thresholds.

- **Master Ski Plan: In 2007 the TRPA Governing Board approved the Master Ski Plan without a Community Plan for HMR. "Several benefits to both the ski area and the community can be realized from a master plan".**

They include among others "the ability for the community to understand the intentions of the ski area and to participate through public review and comment, in the master planning process. As a Master Ski Plan the process pursuant to TRPA Code of Ordinances, Chapter 16.7(2) *"A steering committee shall be formed representing community interests, and shall include a designee of the Executive Director, a representative of the local government in whose jurisdiction the specific or master plan area is located, and a representative of the U.S. Forest Service if federal lands are within the specific or master plan area. The steering committee shall establish a planning team to prepare the specific or master plan"*. Both Section 16.1 of the Code and Goal #2, Policy 11 of

the Conservation Element, Developed Recreation Sub-element of the Regional Plan Goals and Policies, require that a master plan be prepared, and adopted prior to the "expansion of the use of the ski areas, or the establishment of new ski areas". There are many areas in the Master Ski Plan that have failed to be adopted.

In conclusion, HMR is not a redevelopment; it is primarily a new development of Homewood Villages, a real estate venture capitalist investment which threatens many other recreational uses of the Tahoe Basin and the thresholds themselves. This is an attempt of HMR to achieve without a Community Plan or following the Master Ski Plan with community input. The visual, noise, traffic and parking, air quality and water quality will negatively impact the thresholds. TRPA needs to adhere to their obligation to achieve and maintain the thresholds. Many of HMR's required amendments are also threatening the Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacities. These "Special Projects" called CEPs were to focus growth for the new Regional Plan Update after Pathways 2007; however goals for the Regional Plan Update have been already completed and don't include these amendments. A redevelopment or infill must reduce the present hard surfaces of the present built area, primarily the parking lots. To build on vacant soft surface within a watershed **is sprawl.** As residents, we feel strongly that TRPA should be focused on achieving and maintaining the thresholds as a priority while Placer County should be working on a General Plan adopted by TRPA and Community Plans prior to allowing this massive development to alter our Community forever. The West Shore Community of Homewood resident's and their responses must be heard.

Sincerely,

James and Susan Gearhart
5520 Sacramento Ave.,
Homewood, CA 96141

Homewood DEIS Comments

Vernon Gebhardt [vernongebhardt@comcast.net]

Sent: Monday, April 18, 2011 4:57 PM
To: Homewood DEIS Comments

124

Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
Boulder Bay CEP
PO Box 5310
Stateline, NV 89449-5310
US

Dear TRPA,

I have a share in a cabin on 5th street in Tahoma. I am against any project that will increase traffic on Hyw. 89 on the West shore. With only a 2 lane road in and out of Tahoe City, and from South Shore, this project will increase the amount of time daily to and from our cabin from Tahoe City or South Shore even more than during the 4th of July weekend. This is not something we home owners want on the West Shore.

Vernon Gebhardt
1034 Plumas Way
5th Street, Tahoma
Manteca Ca, CA 95336

125

Judy Nikkel

125

From: Anne Genseal <agenseal@msn.com>
Sent: Tuesday, April 19, 2011 10:50 AM
To: Judy Nikkel
Subject: Homewood DEIS Comments

Judy Nikkel

Dear TRPA,

1 I am against the Homewood expansion for the following reasons:
2 * The project will worsen traffic on the West Shore, which will contribute to air pollution. Tahoe is already violating standards for ozone, a gas that is harmful to people, wildlife and vegetation.
4 * This large project will urbanize a part of Tahoe that is treasured for its serenity and natural beauty.
5 * The project should follow rules that all other property owners at Tahoe must follow.
6 * The project wants to permanently change the rules for height, which will allow for taller development throughout Tahoe in the future.
7 * This project is so large that it will transform and define its surrounding community, rather than being defined by a community plan.
8 * Although the project provides some environmental benefits, they are outweighed by its detrimental impacts.

Anne Genseal
3532 Mountain Park St
Las Vegas, NV 89129

126

Judy Nikkel

126

From: Fred George <fmgeorge@comcast.net>
Sent: Monday, April 18, 2011 10:29 AM
To: Judy Nikkel
Subject: Homewood DEIS Comments

Judy Nikkel

Dear TRPA,

1 I am very much against the new proposed development at Homewood. We don't need more development on the Lake; changing the height limitations; more traffic; more pollution; more people driving to and from an area that is already crowded as hell.

Mr. Fred George
527 McBride Drive
Lafyette, CA 94549

(925)2841763

Homewood DEIS Comments

127

Doug Gompertz [doug.gompertz1@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Monday, April 18, 2011 12:17 PM
To: Homewood DEIS Comments

Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
Boulder Bay CEP
PO Box 5310
Stateline, NV 89449-5310
US

Dear TRPA,

As a smmertime visitor to the West Shore of Lake Tahoe since 1950 and a former year around resident of the Tahoe City area, I wish to voice my objection to the proposed development at Homewood.

In my opinion, the fragle Lake Tahoe environment has been harmed by the development that has been allowed over the years.

If you were to allow the last remaining pristine area of Lake Tahoe - the West Shore - to fall victim and be ruined by this major development, it would be a criminal act!

The West Shore is the last remaining area of Tahoe where visitors can go and see what a beautiful area Tahoe really is.

We (the general public and the State Governments) failed years ago by not creating a National Park in the Tahoe basin and not allowing development

Please, vote NO on this project . . . Keep the West Shore natural, as it was and should be.

I beg you to VOTE NO on the Homewood Project!

Doug Gompertz
830 Morningside way
P.O.Box 28
Pleasant Hill, CA 94523

MAR 18 2011

March 15, 2011

Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
PO Box 5310
128 Market Street
Stateline, NV 89449

County of Placer
Community Development Resource
3091 County Center Drive, Ste. 190
Auburn, CA 95603

Dear Mr. Landy and Mr. Krach,

Re: Public Comments-Homewood Mountain Resort, Homewood, CA

1 Although I support the development and revitalization of the Homewood Mountain Resort, I do not support the current scale of the proposed development for the reasons stated below.

Traffic and Safety.

2 Increased traffic is already a concern in Homewood. As I understand the HMR proposed project, at peak hours, this development could add up to 1,400 additional guests in Homewood, not including HMR employees. 1,400 guests mean approximately 400 additional cars (this is a conservative estimate) in Homewood driving to various destinations around the Tahoe basin. Highway 89 is a 2-lane road and cannot handle this increase in traffic without obvious delays. As it stands right now, many times during peak summer days, traffic going into Tahoe City stops and starts at Sunnyside. These additional vehicles will only exacerbate the existing traffic situation.

3 Furthermore, this traffic problem will only make it more difficult for emergency vehicles to respond to emergencies on the West Shore. Additionally, in the event of a mandated fire evacuation, how quickly can the local and summer residents, including the 1,400 from HMR, get to safety? These issues require careful consideration with the obvious conclusion that this project, as it stands right now, is too large.

Compatibility with Existing Neighborhood.

4 Homewood is a small town with both local and summer residents. Many of these homes were built in the early 20th century. In other words, it is not a new development, but one of age and history. The quiet nature of this community will be negatively impacted by the noise, light and activity generated from this project as it is currently proposed. Furthermore, introducing 77- 7

foot buildings would dwarf the existing structures. To date the largest buildings are the boat storage units, which are carefully camouflaged behind buildings and away from the highway.

Most importantly, the increased population of Homewood will substantially change from a small town to one of the most "urban" centers on the Tahoe basin. As far as I am aware, there is no community plan for Homewood, but I doubt that any of these plans would ever consider a project so large, since, objectively speaking, it is not compatible with the current scale and character of Homewood.

Run Off.

The clarity of Lake Tahoe could be compromised with the development of this project as it is currently proposed. One of the reasons Lake Tahoe is so clear is due to its many natural filtering systems, such as wetlands and grasses. Increasing the hardtop on the HMR property eliminates this natural filtering system and all the ecosystems dependent on it. I am not a scientist, but it is not hard to envision a detrimental impact to the Lake's clarity.

As my first sentence stated, I am not opposed to this project. I support it, but it needs to be smaller. I hope you seriously consider these concerns and concur.

Thank you.

Respectfully submitted,

Carole J Gray

5040 West Lake Blvd.

Homewood, CA

305 Evergreen Drive

Kentfield, CA 94904

THOMAS F GREBITUS

February 25, 2008

Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
P.O. Box 5310
Stateline, NV 89449

Re: Homewood Mountain Resort development

To the members of the TRPA,

1 As a third generation Homewood property owner (4930 West Lake Blvd.), I strongly support the continued development of the Homewood Mountain Resort. Homewood's parent company, JMA, has gone to great depths to develop a master plan that attends to the concerns of the residents of Homewood, the Tahoe basin, the continued quality of Lake Tahoe, the environment and the guests to be served by this beautiful resort.

2 JMA has spent millions of dollars to improve what up to now has been an environmental and safety concern. (Some would say nightmare) They have taken the lead in repairing dangerous runoff areas on the mountain and have addressed runoff pollution though the installation of a filtration system that will catch damaging sediment and nutrients before they reach the lake.

3 JMA has been instrumental in implementing a fire suppression system through a selective vegetation eradication program (eliminating dangerous fuel for forest fires) and by developing a plan to use their winter snowmaking equipment (water) to help fight a summer fire, if one should occur. We are all keenly aware of the fire dangers a community faces after experiencing the Angora tragedy.

4 I believe JMA is making monumental efforts to not only comply with existing development regulations, but they are pushing the envelope to lead the way to a better Homewood and a better Lake Tahoe. And, I should add, all of this has been done BEFORE the project has received full approval. I call that a commitment to doing what is right and "putting your money where your mouth is".

5 I am also a fan of their choice of architecture. The "Old Tahoe" design will rejuvenate the West Shore. I am old enough to remember the Tahoe Tavern and the Homewood Resort and I relish the idea of bringing that look back to the lake. This development is not an architectural hodge-podge, but a comprehensive and well thought out plan.

Please allow this development to continue.

Best regards,

Tom Grebitus

From: Christine Manolakas [mailto:cmanolakas@pacific.edu]
Sent: Wednesday, February 27, 2008 8:20 AM
To: jnikkel@TRPA.org
Cc: Richard Brown
Subject: Tahoe Community Enhancement Program

Dear Board Members,

I write in support of the strategies and dedicated efforts by JMA Ventures for Homewood Mountain Resort on the West Shore, Lake Tahoe.

The local and regional communities have already benefited from the forest management, water conservation, and equipment up-grade that HMR has instituted.

I respectfully ask that the TRPA Governing Board recognize HMR's efforts by supporting them as an important part of the Community Enhancement Program on Tahoe's West Shore.

Sincerely,

Ted Grebitus
Member: Homewood Homeowner's Association Board
Third Generation Homewood Homeowner

Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
Homewood CEP
PO Box 5310
Stateline, NV 89449-5310

131

APR 15 2011

Thank you very much for your outstanding efforts in preserving our home here in Lake Tahoe. People want to live here because it is so pristine and we know that there is a certain need for conscious future development. We have been homeowners on the West Shore since 1973. I have lived here full time for 27 years. My family and I have skied at Homewood Ski Resort since 1973. We have held Season Passes for years and today we give many family members tickets to Homewood for Christmas gifts. We feel there is a need for restoration and enhancement be it environmental and economic.

1 The HMR project is a wonderful opportunity for local residents and visitors alike. Although I DO have concerns about size and scope of the proposed project. It appears that the HMR project is threatening the attainment of the TRPA THRESHOLDS. Specifically,

WILDLIFE THRESHOLD: After reviewing Chap 8 of the DEIR/S, Biological Resources, I noticed the reference to 1) the Bald Eagle has been observed by myself and my family while hiking on the Homewood Ski Area in the Summer. (page 8-20). 2) Osprey (page8-23) will be impacted by the building of the HMR project. The last sentence of the Osprey statement is erroneous. Two miles EAST is IN THE LAKE. 3) We feel that California Black Bear habitats will be encroached upon by the project. I have personally observed first year cubs coming out to play in the Spring where the South Base condominiums are to be built. This is a serious encroachment.(page 8-4,8.1.4)

WATER QUALITY:(page 15-24, 15.1.9) The HMR project is asking for a groundwater amendment . This will further denigrate the Water quality in the area. Fill is a very dangerous activity, especially in or near active Earthquake faults. Example is the Mission District of San Francisco during the Loma Prieta Earthquake in 1989. Buildings that were built on fill were condemned as a result of that event. See paragraph 3.5.16, on page 3-34. I am concerned about the amendment for code subsection 64.7.A(2) and (I).

SCENIC RESOURCES:(page 3-42) I am concerned about the height issue. I feel that it will take away from the Scenic resource and I believe TRPA goals will be negated by 77 feet of buildings going up the mountainside. The mid mountain lodge will be observed from the
public outdoor recreation areas and the Lake. Currently, the white plastic building is clearly a visual problem from Tahoma, and the Lake. (page 10-0).

AIR QUALITY: Air Quality will be jeopardized by the fact that HMR proposes to DOUBLE the size of Homewood, CA. As a full time resident who knows West Shore traffic, I feel that traffic congestion will be significant especially at holiday and Summer vacations. Pedestrian traffic: What is the HMR plan? I am very opposed to a TRAFFIC LIGHT.

RECREATION THRESHOLD: Where is the BEACH ACCESS? There will be a significant increase in the number of people looking to recreate at the lake in the Homewood area. With the current proposal, there could be 750 to 1000 people wanting to go to the Lake and beach on Fourth of July weekend! This kind of volume can ruin the experience for everyone.

Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
Homewood CEP
PO Box 5310
Stateline, NV 89449-5310

14 VEGETATION THRESHOLD: The number of trees being removed is in opposition to the Vegetation Threshold. (page 8-55) shows 33 trees of over 30 inch diameter being cut down. PLEASE address this issue! The Dump Truck loads on page 11-81,Table 11-24 appears to be in violation of this threshold. 15

VARIOUS CONCERNS:

16 Waste Water:(page 16-2,16.1.2) Can the current system accommodate double the amount of material after 2013 based on the TCPUD budget of $6.4 million in expansion. Who is going to pay for the expansion?

17 The DEIR/S states the South Base will not be LEED certified. This is a major concern for me! The entire project must be GREEN ACCORDING TO THE CEP.

18 In conclusion, we would like to see a project similar to Proposal 6 without the two Amendments and TOTAL NUMBER OF 184 UNITS.

The TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY is a land use planning and REGULATORY entity charged with collaborating with local, state, and federal partners in the Tahoe Basin to work toward the ACHIEVEMENT of environmental thresholds within the context of a regional plan and corresponding code of ordinances. We would like to see TRPA scale back the scope of this project to Proposal 6 without the two Amendments and a total number of 184 units. I would like to support TRPA with the CEP to achieve a successful implementation of a Homewood Project , which is integrated into the character of the existing community.

Thank you very much for your kind attention and cooperative response.

Sincerely,

Susan F. Smith

Sincerely,

Daniel J. Greenlee

DUPLICATE LETTER SIGNED BY THIS PERSON.

Ms Susan Smith
PO Box 578
Tahoma, CA 96142

132

Judy Nikkel

132

From: Ronald Gregg <ronaldgregg@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Monday, April 18, 2011 8:55 AM
To: Judy Nikkel
Subject: Homewood DEIS Comments

Judy Nikkel

Dear TRPA,

Please vote against the proposed Homewood ski area resort because: The project will worsen the traffic, this large project will have negative impact on an area treasured for its serenity and natural beauty, this project does not follow therules that all other property owners have to follow, the height of the project will establish a dangerous precedent, and the project does not fit the plan defined by the community.

Ronald Gregg
7050 timberwolf Dr
Tahoma, CA 96142

408-997-9336

TRPA Governing Board
February 23, 2011 Public Comment

Dear TRPA and Placer County,

My name is David Griswold, my wife and I are full-time West Shore residents. We have and still own our first house in Meeks Bay for 25 years and have lived in a second house here full-time for 12 years. As a local business owner I am writing to express our concern with the proposed Homewood Mountain Resort Development.

We simply feel that the project is TOO big! The West Shore has a distinct character and essence which was what drew us here 25 years ago- we do not want that to change. A development of this size and scale would PERMANTENTLY change the West Shore. As community members we support a redeveloped and revitalized Homewood that fits in with the local community. Unfortunately, the current proposal does the opposite. The size and scale is simply not compatible with the long-standing character of Homewood and the West Shore. How are 77ft. buildings and a parking garage compatible with a small local sleeper ski area? In addition to the size and scale of the project we are concerned with traffic. What will happen? Just recently on Presidents Day weekend Highway 89 was gridlocked from near Tahoma to Tahoe City. This is not safe nor is it fair to West Shore residents. Highway 89 cannot support this amount of increased traffic.

We hope you take our comments into consideration.

Sincerely,

David and Marjorie Griswold
8217 Meeks Bay Ave.
Meeks Bay, CA 96142

134

134

Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
P.O. Box 5310
128 Market Street
Stateline, NV 89448
Contact: David Landry, Project Manager
Phone: (775) 589-5214
Fax: (775) 588-4527
Email: homewooddeiscomments@trpa.org

April 19, 2011

County of Placer
Community Development Resource Agency
Environmental Coordination Services
3091 County Center Drive, Suite 190
Auburn, CA 95603
Contact: Maywan Krach, Community Development Technician
Phone: (530) 745-3132
Fax: (530) 745-3080
Email: cdraecs@placer.ca.gov

Re: Homewood Mountain Resort Ski Area Master Plan, CEP Project, Draft Environmental Impact Report/Statement

Dear TRPA and Placer County,

My name is David Griswold, my wife and I are full-time West Shore residents. We have owned our house in Meeks Bay for 25 years and lived here full-time for 12 years. As a local business owner I am writing to express our concern with the proposed Homewood Mountain Resort Development.

1 We simply feel that the project is TOO big! The West Shore has a distinct character and essence which was what drew us here 25 years ago- we do not want that to change. A 2 development of this size and scale would PERMANTENTLY change the West Shore. As community members we support a redeveloped and revitalized Homewood that fits in with the local community. Unfortunately, the current proposal does the opposite.

3 The size and scale is simply not compatible with the long-standing character of Homewood and the West Shore. How are 77ft. buildings (see DEIS, p. 10-29) and a parking garage compatible with a small local sleeper ski area? In addition to the size and 4 scale of the project we are concerned with traffic. What will happen? Just recently this winter on Presidents Day weekend Highway 89 was gridlocked from near Tahoma to Tahoe City. This is not safe nor is it fair to West Shore residents. Highway 89 cannot support this amount of increased traffic. 5

We hope you take our comments into consideration.

Sincerely,

David Griswold
Marjorie Griswold

Dave and Marjorie Griswold
8217 Meeks Bay Ave.
Meeks Bay, CA 96142

homewood

JOHN GROH [johngroh@sbcglobal.net]

Sent: Wednesday, February 09, 2011 12:54 PM

To: Homewood DEIS Comments

135

o.k. you goes had meeting today nice the news paper prints one day to late so we see you on the 23 th.. but for now ,,..PLAN 1 IS 200 PLUS LIVING SPACES PLUS 70 UNIT HOTEL, WAY TO BIG.. I REALLY LIKE PLAN 4 WITH ONLY 16 LIVING SPACES,,,, BUT I CAN SEE PLAN 6 WITH 100 LIVING AND A 70 UNIT HOTEL.. AS A GOOD MIDDLE PLACE..JOHN GROH ,,WEST SHORE 1974--TELL HOW HAVE WORKED AND PLAYED AT HOMEWOOD SKI AREA/TAHOE SKI BOWL OVER ALL THOSE
YEARS. YOU
KNOW WE CAN ALWAYS GO TO ALPINE MEADOWS TO SKI..

Homewood project

al groner [westshore0@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, April 07, 2011 12:21 PM
To: Homewood DEIS Comments

136

Hello,

I am a full-time resident of the Homewood neighborhood (Tahoe Pines), and I have a few concerns about this project as it is currently presented.

I have been to several community meetings and I'd like to think I'm comprehending the Master Plan as it has been updated since its inception. I am in favor of improvements being made to the property(-ies), however I believe the development being proposed by JMA is way too big for Homewood (the town and its adjoining neighborhoods), as well as it is depending far too much on real estate investments (fractional ownerships, condos, etc.) that are going to double the current homeowner population of Homewood. Somewhat altruistic thinking given the current state of the real estate market in the Lake Tahoe and Truckee area, and the entire state of California. The amount of traffic generated by this influx of "homeowners" and their guests, renters, etc., will be very detrimental to the quality of life that is what makes Homewood so special. And from what I've been able to understand, the new resort will have limited or no parking for day-use, as the on-site parking will be for "Homeowners" and their guests. JMA's idea of using the Rideout Community Center and the 64 Acres sights as parking and transportation centers is questionable at best, as that would take away parking spaces for anybody that wants to utilize the facilities at Rideout. And visitors would not have use of 64 acres parking and access to the currently-being-built transit center because both venues would be filled with Homewood's guests. How does that benefit our community and the rest of us and our friends, visitors, etc., that aren't guests of Homewood?? Our community parking is being taken from us, the tax payers, and it would be given to a company that will be making money off of them. Regardless of how much the developers are claiming their desire is to reduce vehicular traffic (on the Westshore), taking away what little parking is available will force the public to either seek alternative parking in business lots, neighborhoods, and anywhere they can find it, or they will simply go away and (maybe) not come back because they had no where to park and enjoy their visit here. That only benefits JMA and their guests, at the tax paying public's expense.

I commend JMA for the environmental improvements and upgrades they've made to Homewood Mountain Resort, and I applaud their purchase of the West Shore Cafe property. I wish them good luck in polishing up the diamond-in-the-rough that we all know HMR is (and can be), however because of the above stated concerns, I cannot support this project as it is being offered. I know that they are shooting for the stars, figuring that if they (only) hit the moon that's still good, but I'd rather see it toned down, at least by half, before I can get behind it and give them my support. I therefore respectfully request that TRPA ask the folks at JMA to go back to the drawing board and start over. Give the community something that is much more compatible with Homewood, the town and its neighborhoods, than this resort development we are seeing now.

Thank you for your time and consideration,

Name Witheld

137

Judy Nikkel

137

From: David Gruber <dgruber@ggprop.com>
Sent: Tuesday, April 19, 2011 12:59 PM
To: Judy Nikkel
Subject: Homewood DEIS Comments

Judy Nikkel

Dear TRPA,

1 I continue my appeal to the TRPA for help to preserve Lake Tahoe from the continued assault of large and intrusive projects that abuse the development process and the vitality of the region. The basin is unable to handle the present load of civilization and frustrating the condition further will only hasten its demise. When is enough, enough?

Mr. David Gruber
119 17th Ave
San Francisco, CA 94121

Homewood DEIS Comments

138

Ann Dee Hafner [maidanndi@maidanndi.com]
Sent: Tuesday, April 19, 2011 10:26 AM
To: Homewood DEIS Comments

Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
Boulder Bay CEP
PO Box 5310
Stateline, NV 89449-5310
US

Dear TRPA,

The proposed project at Homewood is not favored in my view. While the investors and realtors love the sterility (and income) that come from these projects they are without soul and permanently ruin the natural beauty and unique feeling that exists. Traffic on this small scenic (beautiful!) two lane road is already (at times) quite congested. This will turn this road into a bumper-to-bumper night mare with auto fumes stinking up the place. Building codes will have to be changed to allow such a development which in turn will make it fair game for any other developer that currently have to deal with certain restrictions, restrictions that are vital to preserve this area. The entire thing is a bad idea and being a home owner, tax paying citizen for over a decade in SLT, I strongly oppose this project. Thank you for listening and caring.

Ann Dee Hafner
1450 Pebble Beach Dr
S.Lake Tahoe, CA 96150

Judy Nikkel

139

From: Marcia Hagen <marciahagen@comcast.net>
ent: Tuesday, April 19, 2011 6:58 PM
To: Judy Nikkel
Subject: Homewood DEIS Comments

Judy Nikkel

Dear TRPA,

I am a long-time cabin owner in Tahoe Pines. This year we will rebuild our 60+ year-old cabin to serve another generation of Hagens. It is important to us that any development serve the locals as well as visitors and not unduly impact traffic, the woodsy character of the Pines and the clarity of the lake.

I trust the League to Save Lake Tahoe to protect the local environment including the Lake.

Marcia Hagen
59 Forrest Terrace
Fairfax, CA 94930

140

Office Outlook Web Access | Type here to search | This Folder | Address Book | Options | Log Off

Mail
Calendar
Contacts

Deleted Items
Drafts
Inbox (228)
Junk E-Mail
Sent Items

Click to view all folders

Manage Folders...

Reply | Reply to All | Forward | Move | Delete | Close

FW: Homewood Mountain Resort Master Plan

David Landry

140

Sent: Wednesday, February 16, 2011 11:52 AM
To: Homewood DEIS Comments

From: Ric Hagge [mailto:rhagge@cox.net]
Sent: Wednesday, February 16, 2011 11:49 AM
To: David Landry
Cc: cdraecs@placer.ca.gov
Subject: Homewood Mountain Resort Master Plan

David Landry, Maywan Krach
February 16, 2011

Dear Mssrs Landry and Krach;

I consider the Homewood Mountain Resort Master Plan to be a TRAVESTY!! That's the best way I can describe what is happening to Homewood, CA. How those of authority can allow a few rich "money hungry" developers/investors to ruin the sanctity and serenity of the gem of the Tahoe West Shore is incomprehensible to me, my wife and our multi-generation neighbors.

I am 3rd generation of residents of 5330 Sacramento Ave. My late grandfather, Carl D. Hagge built the cabin the year I was born(1945). My wife and I waited in anticipation but patiently for our turn to spend our summer months in that cabin. Now thanks to these greedy outsiders, at least 65 years of this jewel called The West Shore, the Best Shore will be taken from all of us property owners in Homewood.

SACRILEGE!

Howard R. Hagge Jr.
Trustee and Durable Power of Attorney
5330 Sacramento Avenue
Homewood, CA

P.S. I will let the concerns of traffic congestion and crime potential speak for themselves, to say nothing about denigration to the Lake itself.
No more "Keep Tahoe Blue", now "Keep Tahoe Green" for the few perpetrating this venture.

Connected to Microsoft Exchange