

EXHIBIT A

Village at Squaw Valley Specific Plan Draft EIR and Final EIR Errata Sheet (Revised 8-5-16)

This errata sheet provides corrections to errors and/or omissions discovered in the Village at Squaw Valley Specific Plan Draft and Final EIR, which were identified subsequent to the document's publication and public review. These revisions do not change the conclusions of the EIR and do not contain "significant new information" requiring recirculation of the Draft EIR (see Master Response "Recirculation" in Chapter 3, page 109 of the Final EIR for more information regarding recirculation). The revisions are presented in the order in which they appear in the Draft and Final EIR and are identified by page number in respective chapters. These revisions are shown as excerpts from the EIR, with strikethrough (~~strikethrough~~) text to indicate deletions and underlined (underlined) text to indicate additions.

Document/Chapter/Section	Page(s)	Correction
Final EIR Chapter 2, Section 2.1.1	2-5	<p>The following text is struck from Section 2.1.1</p> <p>Also in Section 3.4.3, "Public Services and Utilities," the description under Propane/Liquefied Natural Gas proposed to locate all of the new propane tanks that would be required for this project on Lot 19, where propane tanks that serve the existing Village development are currently located. This has been modified to split the location of the new propane tanks between two locations. Approximately half of the new capacity would remain on Lot 19 at the west side of the Village, while the remainder of the new propane storage capacity would be located on Lot 28. Lot 19 would have fewer storage tanks and associated facilities as a result of these modifications.</p> <p>The tanks on Lot 28 would be buried and placed behind the entry monumentation that is planned for the Village at the intersection of Squaw Valley Road and Far East Road. The vaporizer station, propane bulkhead, and backup generator would be located on the surface and screened by landscaping and rock walls. A truck access way would be built on the site, allowing trucks to enter from Far East Road and exit on to Squaw Valley Road.</p>
Final EIR Chapter 2, Section 2.1.2	2-6 through 2-10	<p>The following text is struck from Section 2.1.2:</p> <p>LAND USE AND FOREST RESOURCES The project modifications that have been proposed</p>

	<p>by the applicant since the DEIR was released do not change the proposed maximum density or types of land uses that were analyzed in the proposed action for the DEIR. The proposed changes to the Placer County General Plan, Placer County Zoning Ordinances, and the SVGPLUO remain the same as those that were proposed in the VSVSP. The analysis of impacts of those changes in the DEIR remains unchanged, concluding that the impact would be less than significant.</p> <p>The project modifications that have been made include the location of new propane storage facilities on Lot 28 in addition to the existing propane tanks on Lot 19. Lot 19, the Mountain Maintenance Yard, is already zoned for heavy commercial uses (V-HC) such as the propane storage tanks and maintenance facilities. Lot 28 is proposed by the project to be zoned for forest recreation (V-FR), an open space designation. As proposed in the April 2015 Specific Plan, propane storage facilities would not be an allowed use on Lot 28. However, the zoning designation for Lot 28 has been modified to include an overlay zone such that propane storage would be a permissible use on Lot 28 if the VSVSP is approved. Propane storage would not be an allowed use on other lots within the VSVSP proposed to be zoned forest recreation.</p> <p>None of these changes would alter the DEIR's conclusions regarding impacts associated with division of an established community, conflict with land use plans or policies adopted for avoiding or mitigating and environmental effect, development of incompatible uses, alteration of planned uses, or economic or social changes leading to environmental changes, all of which were found to be less than significant.</p> <p>The analysis of forest resources that would be affected by the project has also remained essentially unchanged. Removal of consideration of the Five Lakes Connector trail as part of the Proposed Parks and Recreation Improvements may reduce forest impacts by the small number of trees that would have been removed as part of constructing that trail. The conclusion in the DEIR that impacts to forest resources would be less than significant remains unchanged.</p> <p>BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES</p>
--	---

	<p>The proposed modifications to the project may slightly reduce the potential impacts to biological resources by moving the bike trail away from Squaw Creek on the East Parcel, and by removing the Five Lakes Connector trail from consideration as part of the Proposed Parks and Recreation Improvements due to potential risks to Sierra Nevada yellow-legged frog habitat. Overall, this would be a slight improvement related to biological resources, and the effects described in the DEIR would remain essentially unchanged. Also, see the Master Response regarding water supply for a discussion of the effects of groundwater pumping on biological resources and creek restoration benefits.</p> <p>The proposed changes to the propane storage site locations would not significantly change the conclusions in the DEIR for biological resources. Locating additional storage on Lot 19 was analyzed for potential impacts from leaks or spills due to its proximity to Squaw Creek in the Hazards section of the DEIR, and it was determined that sufficient regulatory control was in place to reduce the risk of such an event to be less than significant. Similarly, Lot 28 is proximate to Squaw Creek, and the same conclusions can be made.</p> <p>Appendix E1 of the DEIR shows the habitat impact assumptions that were made for each lot in the VSVSP. The assumption for Lot 19, where all the propane storage tanks were to be located for the proposed project, was that habitat would be 100 percent removed. With the proposed modifications, approximately half of the propane storage capacity would be transferred to Lot 28. In the DEIR, Lot 28 was already assumed to be 100 percent affected by the project. It is a gravel surface at the present time, and the applicant intends to use Lot 28 for entry monumentation and arrival information. The lot would also be graded. The addition of a buried propane storage tank, a vaporizer station, a back-up generator and an access way for propane trucks, would not change project effects related to habitat disturbance.</p> <p>VISUAL RESOURCES</p> <p>The DEIR identifies a number of significant, potentially significant, and significant and unavoidable impacts to visual resources. Mitigation Measure 8-2 in the DEIR requires the project applicant to obtain Design Review approval from the</p>
--	--

	<p>Placer County Design/Site Review Committee prior to submittal of Improvement Plans or Building Permits. In addition, all project phases must be compatible with the Plan Area Development Standards prescribed in Appendix B of the VSVSP. Since release of the DEIR, the project applicant has worked with Placer County's Squaw Valley Design Review Committee to improve the design features of the project so as to better meet the objectives of the Specific Plan, and to improve consistency with the vision and objectives of the SVGPLUO.</p> <p>Most of the modifications to the project that have been proposed by the applicant are a result of the recommendations of the Design Review Committee. The reduced building heights, broader passageways, and increased setbacks of structures are all intended to help reduce the overall visual impacts to residents and visitors. This, together with compliance with the Placer County Development Standards and Design Guidelines, would serve to further reduce the potential visual impacts of the project. However, the significant impacts associated with adverse effects on views from view blockage of the lower slopes of the background mountains, while slightly reduced, would continue to be significant to those who frequently visit or live in the valley; the changes in the viewshed would remain substantial because view blockage would occur, even if less than with the project evaluated in the DEIR, and because the long-term trend of development of the valley would continue.</p> <p>The reduced heights and wider passageways in the proposed modifications would also reduce the shadowing effects of structures in the project area, which is already a less-than-significant impact.</p> <p>The project modifications to the East Parcel include landscaping on the north and west sides to screen night lighting from adjacent residential parcels. This will bring the project into compliance with Mitigation Measure 8-5a as recommended in the DEIR. With this mitigation measure, lighting or glare generated by the project would have a less-than-significant impact on the day and nighttime views of the East Parcel.</p> <p>The modifications to the project also include the anticipated placement of propane storage facilities on Lot 28. The propane tanks themselves will be below</p>
--	---

~~ground, and associated facilities that are above ground will be screened by landscaping vegetation and rock walls consistent with Placer County Development Standards and Design Guidelines. Additional scenic screening may be recommended at the project approval stage to accommodate site-specific needs for these two sites. Because of the proposed screening, this modification would not alter the overall significance of impacts to visual resources associated with the project.~~

TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION

The proposed modifications to the Specific Plan would not change the maximum number of new residential units or bedrooms or square footage of restaurant, retail, and other uses. Therefore, traffic generation as described in the DEIR would not change. The project modifications include minor changes to the pedestrian and vehicular circulation pattern in the Village Core. The plaza areas and courtyard of buildings 1-A and 1-B have been redesigned and expanded, and the plaza width and building separation at buildings 3 and 4 have been increased. Pedestrian passageways have also been widened. The bike trail that passes through the East parcel has been moved within the parcel, but capacity and access to the bike trail has not changed. Vehicular circulation at the shipping and receiving structure on the East Parcel has also been improved, creating a drive-through passage rather than a back-in and out pattern. These changes would make modest improvements to the circulation patterns in the project area, but the impacts and mitigation needs described for the project in the DEIR remain essentially unchanged. ~~Access ways for propane trucks to Lot 28 as part of the modifications related to the propane storage facility would not significantly affect transportation or circulation patterns in the project area.~~ Finally, new crosswalk facilities on Squaw Valley Road outside of the Specific Plan area would improve pedestrian circulation patterns and enhance public safety in these areas.

HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

The project modifications would reduce the footprint of impervious surfaces on the East Parcel, thereby slightly increasing groundwater recharge, and slightly reducing potential water quality impacts to Squaw Creek with reduced surface runoff. The footprint of the parking garage is smaller, the bike trail that was

		<p>on the Squaw Creek side of the development on the East Parcel has been moved to the Squaw Valley Road side, and Lot 44 has been designated as open space. These changes are minor in the scope of the overall project, however.</p> <p>The project modifications include adding a new site for a propane storage facility on Lot 28. This will add impervious surfaces to the site, but reduce the amount of additional development originally proposed for Lot 19 in the Specific Plan. The total amount of impervious surfaces that may affect groundwater recharge and surface runoff will be generally offset with the new modifications, and the changes are minor in the scope of the overall project. The proposed modifications would not alter the effects identified for hydrology and water quality in the DEIR.</p> <p>HAZARDOUS MATERIALS AND HAZARDS The project modifications would not change the potential for hazardous materials to be found in the project area or the potential for exposure to hazards. The modifications made to the propane distribution system will be subject to the pipeline safety regulations of the California Public Utility System. The proposed modification to transport and delivery of propane to two site locations rather than one is also subject to regulatory oversight by the state and federal government. No additional hazardous impacts are anticipated from this change to the proposed project. Lot 28, which has been proposed as a possible propane storage site is similar in characteristics, including proximity to Squaw Creek, to Lot 19, which was originally proposed as the only propane storage location. The effects and mitigation measures related to hazardous materials and hazards would remain essentially unchanged with the proposed modifications from those described in the DEIR.</p>
<p>Final EIR Chapter 2, Section 2.3.2 and Chapter 4, Section 4.1.1 Mitigation Measure 6-1c: Implement Mitigation Measure 13-4 and monitor and respond to groundwater effects</p>	<p>2-18 and 4-7</p>	<p>The following text is added to Mitigation Measure 6-1c:</p> <p>“If monitoring and surveys indicate that riparian and/or wet meadow vegetation is being lost and/or degraded at levels that could impair the viability and value of the wet meadow and/or riparian habitat, and that change is correlated with lowered groundwater levels as indicated by monitoring wells and pumping data, one or more of the following steps shall be undertaken to ensure that there is no net loss of</p>

		<p>acreage and/or value of wet meadow habitat:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Work with the SVPD to reduce potable water demand at a level commensurate to the increased irrigation demand during the dry season.</u>
<p>Final EIR Chapter 2, Section 2.3.2 and Chapter 4, Section 4.1.1 Mitigation Measure 6-1c: Implement Mitigation Measure 13-4 and monitor and respond to groundwater effects</p>	<p>2-18 and 4-7</p>	<p>The following footnotes are added to Mitigation Measure 6-1c:</p> <p>¹ <u>Responsibility for funding, monitoring and carrying out this mitigation measure is the sole responsibility of the Project and imposes no burden of any kind on the Squaw Valley Public Service District. At its option and at its sole discretion, the District may choose to work directly with the Project proponent to adjust the pumping regime or make other adjustments to well field operations.</u></p> <p>² <u>The Squaw Valley Public Service District currently operates programs to fund and construct efficiency improvements to its water system and end users. This project may provide additional funding to augment existing programs to enhance water system efficiency and end user efficiency.</u></p>
<p>Final EIR Chapter 2, Section 2.3.14 Chapter 3, Section 3.2.3C Responses to Comments</p>	<p>2-70 and 2- 71, and 3.2.3-73 and 3.2.3-74</p>	<p>The text of response L5-6 is modified as follows. Because the text in the Final EIR included underline and strike through modifications, the modifications specific to this change are shown in <u>thick underline</u> and double strikethrough.</p> <p>The comment relates to a statement in Section 14.1, “Existing Setting,” of Chapter 14, “Public Services and Utilities,” of the DEIR. To more accurately describe <u>existing conditions related to the remaining capacity of the TRI, and to reflect input from T-TSA,</u> the last paragraph of Section 14.1.2, “Wastewater,” is revised as follows:</p> <p>The 17-mile TRI sewer line transports wastewater flows to the wastewater treatment facility located east of Truckee in the Martis Valley, which is also operated by T-TSA. The capacity of the treatment facility is 9.6 MGD on a seven day dry weather average flow basis and the capacity at the upstream end of the TRI is 6.0 MGD. Both the treatment plant and TRI are operating at approximately 80 percent of capacity. Based on this information, in 2012, the remaining available capacities at the treatment plant and in the TRI are were estimated to be 1.92 MGD and 1.20 MGD, respectively (MacKay & Soms 2012b). Therefore, the treatment plant is operating at approximately 80 percent of capacity. The capacity of</p>

		<p><u>the TRI is limited by existing bottlenecks, and T-TSA is currently studying the possibility of upsizing and replacing sections of the TRI.</u></p> <p>As indicated in response to comment L5-2, Impact 14-2 in the DEIR correctly characterizes the current condition of the TRI and discloses that there may not be sufficient capacity during peak flow periods to serve the project in addition to existing flows. Therefore, this text modification does not change the analysis or conclusions reached in the DEIR.</p>
<p>Final EIR Chapter 2, Section 2.3.14 Chapter 3, Section 3.2.3C Responses to Comments</p>	<p>2-70 and 3.2.3-74</p>	<p>The text of response L5-7 is modified as follows. Because the text in the Final EIR included underline and strike through modifications, the modifications specific to this change are shown in <u>thick underline</u> and double strikethrough.</p> <p>The first paragraph under “Impact 14-2: Increased demand for wastewater collection, conveyance, and treatment” on page 14-36 of Chapter 14, “Public Services and Utilities,” of the DEIR is revised as follows to reflect the information provided in the comment:</p> <p>The SVPSD owns and operates the wastewater collection system that serves Squaw Valley. The project would connect to existing SVPSD transmission lines. T-TSA would provide wastewater treatment at its existing water reclamation plant, located in Nevada County along the Truckee River, east of the Town of Truckee. The plant, which has a capacity of 9.6 MGD, provides primary and secondary treatment, phosphorus removal, biological nitrogen removal, disinfection, and effluent filtration (T-TSA 2012). The project could generate 0.350 MGD of ADWF and 0.852 of PWWF at buildout (MacKay & Soms 2014d). In 2012, the remaining capacity at the treatment plant is was estimated to be 1.92 MGD. Therefore, the treatment plant has sufficient capacity to serve the project at buildout, even at peak wet weather flows. As of 2012, the treatment plant was operating at 80 percent of capacity (7.68/9.60 MGD) (MacKay & Soms 2012b). <u>The WRP currently has sufficient capacity to serve a development as large as the proposed project. However, capacity allocations for customers and projects in T-TSA’s service areas are made in accordance with T-TSA’s rules and regulations in the order that applications are received. As specific elements of the project are proposed, they would be required to obtain a Will Serve letter from SVPSD T-TSA and a SVPSD T-TSA</u></p>

		representative’s signature shall be provided on the Improvement Plans.
Final EIR Chapter 2, Section 2.3.18	2-85	<p>To clarify the impact conclusion, the following text is added to the last paragraph of the analysis for impact 18-20:</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 18-20: Implement Mitigation Measures 9-2a through 9-2d. Implementation of Mitigation Measures 9-2a through 9-2d, which include conducting traffic management along Squaw Valley Road, would reduce this cumulative impact to a less-than-significant level because operations would be restored to acceptable levels. The traffic management procedures recommended for the Squaw Valley Road/Wayne Road and Squaw Valley Road/Squaw Creek Road intersections were analyzed to determine how the LOS would change. With the use of traffic management personnel, they would each operate similar to a two-phased signalized intersection. Based on the cumulative plus project traffic volumes and anticipated right-of-way allocations, these intersections would operate at LOS C or better with traffic management <u>except that the intersection of Squaw Valley Road/Village East Road, which would primarily operate at LOS C or better, would be subject to intermittent degradations during peak operations where temporary slippage to LOS F would occur. However, Specific Plan Policy CP-1 permits LOS F during limited peak periods if falling within the criteria outlined in this policy. This intersection falls within the parameters of policy CP-1. Therefore this impact would be less than significant.</u></p>
Final EIR Chapter 3, Section 3.1.1, Table 3-1: Comparison of 2014 WSA and 2015 WSA Update: Historic Demand	3-7	The increases <u>differences</u> in total water demand between the 2014 and 2015 WSAs is the result of higher <u>lower</u> SVPSD, and <u>SVMWC use</u> , and <u>increased</u> snowmaking water use in 2012 through 2014 as compared to average use between 2000 and 2012.
Final EIR Chapter 3, Section 3.1.14, Master Response: Mountain Maintenance Facility	3-84	PROPANE STORAGE As evaluated in the DEIR, all of the propane needed to serve development in the main Village area would be stored in five 30,000-gallon storage tanks at a “tank farm” in the mountain maintenance facility, and would be distributed through the plan area via underground pipelines. However, as described in Section 2.1, “Project Modifications,” of this FEIR, the applicant has revised the proposal for storage of propane such that two or three of the proposed tanks would potentially be located on an alternative site

		<p>south of Squaw Valley Road on Lot 28 (see Exhibit 3-1). The tanks would be buried, and would meet all applicable local, State, and federal safety standards. Adherence to existing regulations is anticipated to reduce safety risks to an acceptable level on any of these sites. As discussed on page 15-8 in Chapter 15, "Hazardous Materials and Hazards," of the DEIR, the propane distribution system would be regulated under Title 49 of the CFR adopted by the California Public Utilities Commission under General Order 112-E. The California Public Utilities Commission's Utilities Safety Branch administers the propane safety program, scheduling each jurisdictional system for a safety audit at least once every 5 years to assure compliance with the federal pipeline safety regulations. The proposal to decentralize propane storage would avoid concentrating residual safety hazards in one area of the site.</p>
Final EIR Chapter 3, Section 3.1.14, Master Response: Mountain Maintenance Facility	3-85	Exhibit 3-1 depicting the Lot 28 Propane Site Conceptual Plan is struck as this use is no longer part of the project description.
Final EIR Chapter 3, Section 3.2.5C.2, Response to Comments	3.2.5- 207	<p>The following text is struck from response I-54-10:</p> <p>See the Master Response regarding the mountain maintenance facility. In addition, since publication of the DEIR, the applicant has proposed a modified propane storage scenario. See Section 2.1 of this FEIR for description and analysis of this modified scenario.</p>
Final EIR Chapter 3, Section 3.2.5L.2, Response to Comments	3.2.5- 758	<p>The following text is struck from response I-240-2:</p> <p>CEQA requires analysis of the potential for the project to result in the release of potentially hazardous materials into the environment. See the Master Response regarding the mountain maintenance facility for a discussion of safety concerns because of proposed uses of Lot 19 and Section 2.1 of this FEIR for the revised proposal for propane storage. The Master Response regarding the Reduced Density Alternative provides discussion of the feasibility of implementing this alternative.</p>
Final EIR Chapter 3, Section 3.2.5M.2, Response to Comments	3.2.5- 762	<p>The following text is struck from response I-241-7:</p> <p>Regarding the proposed location, financing, and timeframe for construction of a new fire station, see responses to comments O9-13 and O9-278 and responses to comment letter LL1.</p>

		<p>See the Master Response regarding the mountain maintenance facility. Also, since publication of the DEIR, the applicant has suggested several project modifications, many in response to public input. One of these changes is moving a portion of the propane storage capacity out of the mountain maintenance facility. Please see Section 2.1 of this FEIR for further information on this project modification.</p>
<p>Final EIR Chapter 3, Section 3.2.7, Response to Late Comments</p>	<p>3.2.7-6</p>	<p>The following text is struck from response LL1-2:</p> <p>The code requirements for design of the proposed propane tanks are noted. See Section 2.1, "Project Modifications," of this FEIR for information on how the proposal for propane storage has been modified since release of the DEIR. None of these modifications would be inconsistent with these comments or the analysis in the DEIR.</p>