3.2.2 State Responses

This page intentionally left blank.

S1

STATE OF CALIFORNIA—THE RESOURCES AGENCY EDMUND G. BROWN Jr., *Governor*

DEPARTMENT OF FORESTRY AND FIRE PROTECTION
13760 Lincoln Way
AUBURN, CA 95603
(530) 889-0111
Website: www.fire.ca.gov

RECEIVED
JUN 16 2015
PLANNING

June 6, 2015

TO: Alex Fisch
Placer County Community Development Agency
3091 County Center Drive Suite 190
Auburn, CA 95603

RE: Squaw Valley Village Specific Pan SCH# 2012102023

This project will require a Timberland Conversion and Timber Harvest Plan as per the following:

California Code of Regulations, per section 1103, and Public Resources Code 4581 requires a Timberland Conversion Permit and/or Timber Harvest Plan be filed with the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection if the project involves the removal of a crop of trees of commercial species (regardless of size of trees or if trees are commercially harvested).

The Timberland Conversion Permit shall address the following:

a. The decrease in timber base in the county as a result of the project.
b. The cover type, including commercial species, density, age, and size composition affected by the project.
c. The ground slopes and aspects of the area affected by the project.
d. The soil types affected by the project.
e. Any significant problems that may affect the conversion.

S1-1

Squaw Valley Fire Department is the structural fire protection provider for Olympic Valley (Squaw Valley). CAL FIRE has responsibility for SRA lands in the vicinity of Olympic Valley. CAL FIRE's current resource commitment is sufficient for this project.

S1-2

If you require further clarification, please contact Forester Jeff Dowling at (530) 587-8926.

Sincerely,

George Morris III
CAL FIRE
Unit Chief

Jeff Dowling
Truckee Area Forester

CONSERVATION IS WISE-KEEP CALIFORNIA GREEN AND GOLDEN

PLEASE REMEMBER TO CONSERVE ENERGY. FOR TIPS AND INFORMATION, VISIT "FLEX YOUR POWER" AT WWW.CA.GOV.

S1

CA Department of Forestry and Fire Protection, Truckee Division
Jeff Dowling, Unit Chief, Truckee Area Forester
June 6, 2015

S1-1 The comment states that the project will require a Timberland Conversion Permit and Timber Harvest Plan, and provides the criteria for these as well as the required contents of a Timberland Conversion Permit. This issue is addressed in the DEIR (see Impact 4-6 [Conflict with existing zoning/loss of forest land] on pages 4-31 through 4-32). As described therein,

> …the project applicant would secure a Timberland Conversion Permit (TCP) (or an exemption if applicable for 3 acres or less) and/or receive approval of a Timber Harvest Plan (THP) from CAL FIRE in accordance with the most current California Forest Practice Rules in effect at the time.

Additionally, Section 3.5.2, "Other Agencies Using the EIR and Consultation Requirements," of the DEIR, a Timber Harvest Plan and potentially a Timberland Conversion Permit are listed among the permits and approvals that may be required for project implementation.

S1-2 The comment states that CA Department of Forestry and Fire Protection's current resource commitment is sufficient for this project. This comment is noted. No further response is necessary.

S2

STATE OF CALIFORNIA—CALIFORNIA STATE TRANSPORTATION AGENCY EDMUND G. BROWN Jr., Governor

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
DISTRICT 3
703 B STREET
MARYSVILLE, CA 95901
PHONE (530) 741-4199
FAX (530) 741-5346
TTY 711

Flex your power!
Be energy efficient!

July 16, 2015

FMP # 032015PLA0103
03-PLA-89/PM 13.388
SCH# 2012102023

Mr. Alex Fisch
Placer County, Planning Services Division
3091 County Center Drive
Auburn, CA 95603

Village at Squaw Valley Specific Plan

Dear Mr. Alex Fisch:

Thank you for including the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) in the environmental review process for the Village at Squaw Valley Specific Plan Project. The Specific Plan proposes to amend the existing Squaw Valley General Plan and Land Use Ordinance (adopted in 1983) to comprehensively plan development of a recreation-based, all-season, resort community consisting of up to 750 fractional ownership resort residential and guest accommodation units. Other proposed land uses would include commercial, retail, and recreational uses similar to uses currently allowed as well as parking and other visitor amenities. The project would be developed over approximately 20-25 years with construction proposed to begin in 2016. The project is located in the 4,700-acre Squaw Valley (also known as Olympic Valley). These comments are based on the Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR). S2-1

Traffic Operations

This traffic analysis provides good information about traffic volumes at three peak times in this area. However, it should be noted, that not all peak hours have been evaluated. For example, congestion from Squaw Valley to Tahoe City was not analyzed for winter weekend impacts. Some discussion of this peak hour, along with discussion of any other peak hours that have not been analyzed for our review and comment, as well as, some discussion of the Tahoe City Fanny Bridge Revitalization project should also be provided. S2-2

The SIMTraffic analysis of the Squaw Valley Road intersection with SR 89, showed that queue lengths for some movements exceed the lengths of the turn lanes. This type of analysis appears to be necessary for the West River Street intersection as well, since the analysis for this intersection did not show the existing congestion that occurs for North Bound (NB) traffic on Sunday afternoons. The second through lane on this approach is too short to get drivers to use it effectively. The Town of Truckee has used cones to lengthen this lane, through the encroachment permit process, which can eliminate this congestion. A permanent lane-extension may be necessary, and may be appropriate as a condition of approval of this development. A roundabout should be considered as another alternative. S2-3

"Provide a safe, sustainable, integrated and efficient transportation system to enhance California's economy and livability"

Mr. Alex Fisch/County of Placer
July 16, 2015
Page 2

At the Squaw Valley intersection, the congestion is described, but no improvements are recommended to mitigate the increase in congestion. The signal timing for the NB left turn lane has already been extended by Caltrans' signal operations staff, but this may cause longer queues on the other legs. At a minimum, the south bound (SB) right turn lane delineation should be revised to increase the length of this lane and add a dashed edge line across the commercial driveway in this area, which would require a permit. To reduce queues and delay at peak times, and to reduce delays at all times, replacing the traffic signal with a roundabout should be considered. S2-3 cont.

On Page 9-13, the analysis of two-lane highway segments is discussed. For SR 89 and 28 in this area, the "Percent Time Spent Following" is not the best method, due to the relatively short segments. Estimating the average speeds is more appropriate, but it should be modified to compare speeds to the existing posted speed for each segment. A 15 mph reduction in speed, from the posted speed, should be avoided. It is understood that this is not specifically how this analysis is described in the Highway Capacity Manual (HCM), but it is more useful for an area with reduced speed limits. S2-4

In summary, the increase in traffic volumes in this area due to this development will increase congestion at peak times. It appears to be feasible to reduce these congestion effects at the Squaw Valley and West River Street intersection, so these locations should be improved as mitigation measures, or as conditions of approval. S2-5

Hydraulics

On Page 13-76 of the Specific Plan, Impact 13-7: Long-term management of runoff volumes, peak flows, and snow storage, and risks of potential degradation to water quality. In the second to last paragraph on this page, a summary discussion of the potential impacts of increasing the impervious area on peak runoff rates of discharge and on water quality is provided. The last sentence in this paragraph states, "This impact in the main Village area would be less than significant and the impact to the East Parcel [located closer to Pla-89] would be potentially significant." Subsequent text in this section indicates that the impervious area in the East Parcel will be increased by over 4 acres, while the main Village impervious area increases by only 0.25 acres. Yet most of the discussion regarding potential increases/decreases in the rate of runoff discharge is dedicated to changes proposed within the main Village area. No information is provided regarding the potential adverse impacts of development of the East Parcel was provided. Please provide the information for our review and comment. S2-6

On Page 13-77 of the Specific Plan, first paragraph, discusses how changes in the developed areas will ". . . result in a mix of slight increases and reductions in peak and total storm volumes generated in the main Village area for the 2-, 5-, 10- and 100-year events." The last two sentences in this paragraph state, "These changes to runoff peak flows and volumes indicates that the existing drainage pattern of the site [main Village area] would not be substantially altered and the proposed project would not contribute runoff which would exceed the capacity of the existing or planned stormwater drainage systems. Therefore, for the main village area, this impact would be less than significant." However, no mention is made regarding the anticipated discharge rate and flow changes from the East Parcel area. The anticipated discharge rate modifications within the main Village area are not quantified. Please

Provide a safe, sustainable, integrated and efficient transportation system to enhance California's economy and livability"

Mr. Alex Fisch/County of Placer
July 16, 2015
Page 3

provide data for the anticipated discharge rate and flow changes noted above for our review and comment. S2-6 cont.

A brief discussion of the impacts of development of the East Parcel on water quality for runoff from this area that flows into Squaw Creek is provided on page 13-79. No discussion is provided that indicates what the impacts will be on the anticipated increase in the rate of runoff discharge from this parcel, once developed, and how that increase in runoff discharge may affect flows in Squaw Creek, the State's highway right of way and the Squaw Creek Bridge downstream of the proposed development, even though the summary statement referenced in item 4 above indicated these impacts "would be potentially significant." Please provide information regarding the impacts and how these impacts will be mitigated. S2-7

Over the years the hydrologic/hydraulic impacts to the area resulting from ongoing development of the Squaw Valley Resort facilities since the late 1950s, have not always been considered. The impacts may or may not have been significant. It is now appropriate to perform a detailed hydrologic/hydraulic assessment of the entire Squaw Creek tributary watershed (both pre- and post-improvement) to determine whether the anticipated discharge rates for the watershed are within the design discharge rates at the Squaw Creek Bridge on Pla-89, as stated in paragraph 2 above for the 50-year, 100-year and 500-year return storm events. This is important to determine to insure these impacts of development will not have an adverse impact on the Squaw Creek Bridge or other highway drainage facilities within the State's highway right of way. Please provide this assessment for our review and comment. S2-8

The anticipated runoff discharge rates, volumes and distribution of flows within the Village at Squaw Creek resulting from the proposed improvements under this project must be quantified to determine the potential impacts on the discharges that cross beneath Pla-89 through the existing Squaw Creek Bridge and the other 3 highway drainage facilities (Pla-89 highway cross drainage facilities; an existing 18 inch corrugated steel pipe (CSP) located at PM 13.5, a 48 inch structural steel plate pipe (SSPP) located at PM 13.84, and a 24 inch CSP located at PM 14.1). Even minor increases to the rates of discharge through the existing CSP and SSPP drainage facilities could cause flows overwhelming these smaller facilities and could cause damage to the highway, increased flooding or potential hazardous conditions for the traveling public. Please quantify the discharge rates, volume and distribution of flows and please provide this information for our review. There should be no net increase in the anticipated rates of runoff discharge from the Village at Squaw Valley that reach the State's highway right of way. S2-9

Adverse impacts upon the East Parcel of this Specific Plan area are not addressed. Please provide additional documentation for Caltrans to determine the hydrological impacts upon the area and the State Highway System.

Based on the purpose of the proposed project as stated in the text of the Hydrology and Water Quality section of the EIR (Chapter 13), water quality aspects of the development have been well addressed. However, all runoff discharged from the Village at Squaw Valley must meet water quality standards as established by the Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board prior to being discharged to any creek or drainage pathway that enters the State's highway right of way. S2-10

Provide a safe, sustainable, integrated and efficient transportation system to enhance California's economy and livability"

Mr. Alex Fisch/County of Placer
July 16, 2015
Page 4

No actual design plans or hydrologic/hydraulic calculations or analysis were provided with IGR-CEQA documents for review. Concurrence with the documents provided with this current EIR submittal does not constitute concurrence with any future plans for development. Please provide copies of all proposed plans and drainage plans, hydrologic/hydraulic calculations and analysis that pertain to the development of the Village at Squaw Creek to the State (Caltrans District 3 Marysville - Attention Hydraulics Branch) for review and comment. **S2-11 cont.**

Encroachment Permit

Please be advised that any work or traffic control that would encroach onto the State right of way (ROW) requires an encroachment permit issued by Caltrans. To apply, a completed encroachment permit application, environmental documentation, and five sets of plans indicating State ROW must be submitted to the address below: **S2-12**

Office of Permits
Caltrans - District 3
703 B Street
Marysville, CA 95901

Traffic-related mitigation measures should be incorporated into the construction plans prior to the encroachment permit process. Please visit the following URL for more information: http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/traffops/developserv/permits/. **S2-13**

Please provide our office with copies of any further actions regarding this project. We would appreciate the opportunity to review and comment on any changes related to this development.

If you have any questions regarding these comments or require additional information, please contact Kevin Yount, Intergovernmental Review Coordinator for Placer County at (530) 741-4286 or by email at kevin.yount@dot.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

Susan Zanchi

SUSAN ZANCHI, Chief
Office of Transportation Planning – North

c: Scott Morgan, State Clearinghouse

Provide a safe, sustainable, integrated and efficient transportation system to enhance California's economy and livability"

S2

California Department of Transportation, District 3
Susan Zanchi, Chief, Office of Transportation Planning-North
July 16, 2015

S2-1 The comment is an introductory statement and summarizes elements of the project description, but does not address the content, analysis, or conclusions in the DEIR. Therefore, a response is not provided here. It is noted that the identification of "up to 750 fractional ownership resort residential and guest accommodation units" in the comment is incorrect. As identified in Table 3-1 (page 3-10) and elsewhere in the DEIR, the Village at Squaw Valley Specific Plan (VSVSP) provides for up to 850 residential units, not 750.

S2-2 The DEIR contains a comprehensive analysis of project impacts to SR 89 between Squaw Valley Road and Tahoe City for two winter weekend peak hours. The selection of the Winter Saturday AM and Sunday PM peak hours was based on correspondence with California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) staff. Refer to response to comment O8d-3 for a discussion confirming that the analysis periods studied in the DEIR were the most appropriate periods for study. See the portion of the traffic Master Response addressing the Fanny Bridge Revitalization project.

S2-3 A scoping meeting was held with Caltrans staff on February 14, 2012. During that meeting, it was confirmed that micro-simulation was not necessary at intersections on SR 89, but that the imbalanced lane utilization at SR 89/Squaw Valley Road and SR 89/West River Street intersections should be considered. This was confirmed in an email sent on February 15, 2012 by Fehr & Peers to the Caltrans staff present at the scoping meeting. Despite not requiring simulation analysis, the SR 89/Squaw Valley Road intersection was nevertheless analyzed using SimTraffic because of the need to provide accurate queue length estimates in turn lanes. Because this was not necessary at the SR 89/West River Street intersection because the project would add primarily through traffic only (whereas it added considerable levels of turning traffic at SR 89/Squaw Valley Road), it was analyzed using Synchro, as directed by Caltrans at the scoping meeting. Page 14 of DEIR Appendix G shows the lane utilization factor applied in Synchro for the northbound travel direction during the Winter Sunday PM peak hour condition.

It is recognized that Caltrans' new Intersection Control Evaluation policy requires a detailed operational methodology to determine the most appropriate form of traffic control, which could range from stop-control, a traffic signal, or a roundabout. Because a roundabout was not proposed as part of the proposed project, it was not analyzed for this intersection. It is possible that Caltrans may require such an analysis if/when the project applicant applies for an encroachment permit to lengthen the northbound left-turn lane as specified in Mitigation Measure 9-4. Caltrans, as the agency responsible for operations and maintenance of this intersection, may find that construction of a roundabout is an equally effective solution when compared to additional turn lane lengthening. However, a roundabout could have adverse operational impacts including longer winter Sunday PM peak hour northbound queues (due to right-of-way priority given to motorists entering the roundabout from Squaw Valley Road), could have adverse impacts on the properties on the east side of the intersection, and result in greater challenges to bicyclists and pedestrians wishing to cross SR 89 to access to the Class I multi-use trail located on the east side of SR 89 at Squaw Valley Road. As the costs of a roundabout would significantly exceed the costs of extending the turn lane, only a portion of the costs for a roundabout could be justifiably allocated to the project applicant to mitigate project impacts.

The comment also recommends the lengthening of the southbound right-turn lane at the SR 89/Squaw Valley Road intersection back to the commercial driveway on SR 89. This turn lane, which is 250 feet in length (storage for 10 vehicles), is blocked by adjacent queued vehicles during the Winter Saturday AM peak hour according to Table 9-22. The proposed project would cause a 10 percent increase in the southbound right-turn volume during the Winter Saturday AM peak hour. Overall delay on the southbound approach would increase from 10 to 17 seconds per vehicle (see pages 10 and 59 of DEIR Appendix G). The traffic simulation did not show queued vehicles filling up the entire lane. Rather, the 95th percentile queues shown in Table 9-22 for this turn lane represented vehicles that could not access the turn lane due to through lane queuing. The lengthening of the right-turn lane is not required as mitigation for any adverse environmental impacts. Operations on the southbound approach remain at an acceptable LOS B under existing plus project conditions.

S2-4 The commenter suggests that a 15 mph reduction in speed from the posted speed limit should be avoided, and that speed should be used to assess roadway performance instead of "percent time spent following" given the short segment distances. The speed limits described on page 9-3 of the DEIR were compared against the average speeds shown in Table 9-23 for existing and existing plus project conditions. All study segments currently have peak hour speeds that are within 15 mph of the posted speed limit with the exception of SR 89 between West River Street and Deerfield Drive, in which speeds are 17.6 mph below the posted 45 mph speed limit during the Winter Sunday PM peak hour and 14.5 mph below the speed limit during the Summer Friday PM peak hour. It is worth noting that the project would cause the Summer Friday PM peak hour speeds to further decrease to 16.8 mph below the posted speed limit. And this segment was identified as having a significant impact for this peak hour based on the v/c ratio increase. Thus, the use of average speed would have resulted in the same impact conclusions as are already in the DEIR.

S2-5 Project-specific impacts were identified at the SR 89/Squaw Valley Road intersection. Mitigations for these impacts include both signal timing modifications (which were deemed feasible and appropriate by Caltrans staff during consultations, see page 9-62 of DEIR) and turn lane lengthening. Since significant impacts were not identified at the SR 89/West River Street intersection, no mitigation measures are necessary to address the specific impacts of the proposed project.

S2-6 The comment questions why in the discussion of Impact 13-7, "Long-term management of runoff volumes, peak flows, and snow storage, and risks of potential degradation to water quality," there is more information provided for the main Village area compared to the East Parcel, especially when proposed development of main Village area would result in an estimated net increase of 0.25 acre of impervious surface and the East Parcel would result in an estimated increase of 4.24 acres of impervious surface. Given the complexity of stormwater management issues in the main Village area relative to the East Parcel, it is reasonable that more information would be developed by project engineers for this area and be available in the EIR. In the main Village area an existing stormwater management system must be replaced in phases as project development proceeds, while keeping remaining elements of the existing system operational. The stormwater management system must both address stormwater generated in the main Village area and accommodate a separate system serving the ski area to the south. In addition, the portion of Squaw Creek immediately downstream from the main Village area is particularly sensitive to potential water quality effects. Whereas the East Parcel consists of new development that includes a stormwater system designed specifically for that development that need not address the issues described above for the main Village area. The storm drainage system proposed for the East Parcel is shown in Exhibit 13-28 in the DEIR. The system follows standard engineering requirements, incorporates low impact development elements, and must meet County codes and other established performance standards. The drainage studies prepared by MacKay &

Somps and cited in Chapter 13 of the DEIR (MacKay & Somps 2012, 2014c, and 2014e) conclude that the systems in both the East Parcel and main Village area meet applicable performance criteria for flows and water quality. The "anticipated discharge rate modifications within the main Village area" are quantified as shown by runoff and peak flow data provided in Table 13-14 on page 13-79 of the DEIR.

S2-7 The potentially significant impact conclusion for the East Parcel provided in the discussion of Impact 13-7 relates exclusively to potential adverse water quality effects from snow storage and snowmelt runoff. This is described on page 13-80 of the DEIR and supported by the content of Mitigation Measure 13-7 that addresses this impact. The East Parcel is incorporated into the overall less than significant impact conclusions related to stormwater runoff volumes, peak flows, and water quality. Also see response to comment S2-6. It should also be noted that the SR 89/Squaw Creek Bridge referenced in the comment is approximately a 0.5 mile downstream from the East Parcel, minimizing the potential for effects on this facility even if the East Parcel were to contribute a significant amount to flows in Squaw Creek. Nevertheless, see response to comment S2-8 for further discussion of this issue.

S2-8 The comment suggests a detailed study of hydrologic/hydraulic conditions in the Squaw Creek watershed to assess whether the proposed project would result in a change in flows in Squaw Creek that could adversely affect the SR 89/Squaw Creek bridge and other State highway facilities. The comment provides no evidence that the facilities in question are currently being damaged by Squaw Creek flows, or are in imminent danger of being damaged from an increase in flows. The potential for impacts related to flooding is evaluated in Impacts 13-7 and 13-8. As shown in Table 13-14 on page 13-79 of the DEIR, runoff from development in the main Village area, during the 2-year, 5-year, 10-year, and 100-year storm events would result in either decreases, or minor increases in peak flows. The increases are only during the 100-year event, and would be approximately 2.6 percent leaving the Village area and less than 1 percent downstream at the meadow area. This indicates the relative decrease in project generated effects on flows as distance downstream increases. The SR 89/Squaw Creek Bridge is more than 1.5 miles downstream from the main Village area, providing significant distance for relative project generated flow increases to be further reduced. See responses to comments S2-6 and S2-7 regarding runoff from East Parcel. The comment does not provide sufficient evidence to support that the requested hydrologic/hydraulic impact analysis is necessary at this time.

S2-9 See response to comment S2-8. The comment provides no evidence that the facilities in question are currently being damaged by Squaw Creek flows, or are in imminent danger of being damaged from an increase in flows. Therefore, the comment provides no basis for holding development to the "no net increase in the anticipated rates of runoff" criteria suggested in the last sentence.

S2-10 The commenter is correct that runoff discharges must meet applicable water quality standards established by the Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). The various water quality regulations administered by the Lahontan RWQCB are described in Section 13.2.2 of the DEIR (beginning on page 13-32).

S2-11 The applicant will coordinate with Caltrans regarding all activities under Caltrans jurisdiction and that require Caltrans authorization. Any design plans or similar materials required as part of submittals to achieve Caltrans authorizations will be provided.

S2-12 A Caltrans encroachment permit is identified in Section 3.5.2 of the DEIR (page 3-40) as one of the permits or approvals that may be required for project implementation. The project applicant will coordinate as needed with Caltrans regarding any necessary authorizations.

S2-13 The URL provided in the comment provides information on the Caltrans encroachment permit process. If a Caltrans encroachment permit is required for any project activities, the applicant will coordinate with Caltrans regarding the permit and submit any materials necessary. Mitigation Measure 9-8 in the DEIR requires preparation and implementation of a Construction Traffic Mitigation Plan. If Caltrans requires additional measures associated with activities on lands under the jurisdiction of Caltrans that require an encroachment permit, the applicant must coordinate with Caltrans regarding the implementation of these measures.

S3

State of California Transportation Agency

Memorandum

late 7/1/15

Date: July 3, 2015

RECEIVED
JUL 06 2015
STATE CLEARING HOUSE

To: State Clearinghouse
1400 Tenth Street, Room 121
Sacramento, CA 95814

From: **DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL**
Truckee Area

File No.: 222.15648.15648

Subject: VILLAGE AT SQUAW VALLEY SPECIFIC PLAN, SCH #2012102023

The Truckee Area of the California Highway Patrol (CHP) recently received the "Notice of Completion" environmental document for the proposed Village at Squaw Valley Specific Plan, State Clearinghouse #2012102023. After review, we have concerns with this project.

The Truckee and North Tahoe communities (including Squaw Valley, an unincorporated portion of Placer County) has experienced an incredible amount of growth within the last few years, as well as fluctuating population increases. This particular project will increase tourism, congestion, and indirectly increase the frequency of special events. The North Tahoe area has limited roadway infrastructure for State Route (SR) 89 and SR 28. The Tahoe Basin is a-protected environment making increases to the state highway system challenging. The CHP Truckee Area is comprised of 24 field officers and a communications center which services four distinctly different offices. These impacts and an increase to congestion increase emergency response times for first responders including CHP Truckee Area personnel. S3-1

The Truckee Area has one of the highest year-round influxes of tourism in the entire nation. In 2014, the North Tahoe area (not to include Truckee) had over four million visitors; more than ever recorded. In addition to being the recreation center of northern California, the Truckee Area provides safety and service to the main traffic artery between California and the rest of the United States. The CHP takes pride in assisting 38,000 vehicles per day (transporting 113 million dollars in assets) reach their destination along Interstate (I) 80. S3-2

The North Tahoe/Truckee area is the host to more large scale events than any other area in the region. Much of these large scale events are directly involved with the Squaw Valley community. Many of these events begin or culminate in Squaw Valley. In the winter, there are numerous snow-related events conducted at one of the eight world class ski resorts. Truckee and the Tahoe Basin have more ski resorts than anywhere else in the country. In the summer months, there is an average of three large events affecting traffic each and every week. Truckee recently S3-3

Safety, Service, and Security *An Internationally Accredited Agency*
CHP 51 (Rev. 06/2013) OPI 076

State Clearinghouse
Page 2
July 3, 2015

hosted the USA Cycling Championships, Amgen Tour of California, Ironman Lake Tahoe, two Tough Mudder events, and the Spartan Race, as well as many other bicycle races, triathlons and running events. The Ironman alone requires a yearlong planning process. These special events absorb a tremendous amount of state resources, as well as simultaneously affecting the Squaw Valley area.

In 2014, Truckee experienced a multitude of special events, year round road construction, and snow conditions which required both internal and external staffing from other CHP Areas. The geography, location, and elevation of the Truckee area provide some of the most treacherous roadway conditions in the entire country. Due to these treacherous conditions on I-80, the Department of Transportation has stationed more equipment and personnel assigned to the Truckee region than in any other portion of the state.

Due to these unique nuances of the Truckee area, it is important to provide context to the North Tahoe and Truckee communities, as well as this development within the Squaw Valley community. Please do not hesitate to contact me with any question or concerns directly at (530) 582-7570.

S3-3 cont.

Sincerely,

R. STONEBRAKER, Captain
Commander

cc: Valley Division
Special Projects Section

S3

Department of CA Highway Patrol, Truckee Area
R. Stonebraker, Captain
July 3, 2015

S3-1 The comment is primarily a summary of existing conditions in the project area and an expression of concern of traffic congestion. Contributions to traffic congestion anticipated from the proposed project are addressed in the DEIR in Chapter 9, "Transportation and Circulation." The comment does not address the content, analysis, or conclusions in the DEIR. Regarding congestion and emergency vehicle access, see the portion of the traffic Master Response addressing this topic.

S3-2 The comment is primarily a summary of existing conditions in the project area. The comment does not address the content, analysis, or conclusions in the DEIR. The comment takes note of some of the services provided by the California Highway Patrol.

S3-3 The comment is primarily a summary of existing conditions in the project area. The comment does not address the content, analysis, or conclusions in the DEIR. There are no additional special-events included as part of the VSVSP. Although the illustrative plan shown in Exhibit 3-5 of the DEIR includes venues for smaller scale entertainment and events, such as courtyards, plazas, and the snow beach, the project is not designed to host, attract, or support any particular event, nor is plan implementation associated with the desire to add any new events. The traffic analysis in Chapter 9 of the DEIR addresses the regional context of the project area, with the traffic model assessing peak days (e.g., peak ski days and peak summer holiday/event days) and the associated influx of visitors to the region and incorporating traffic generated by existing regional development, as well as projected future development in the cumulative impact analysis provided in Chapter 18 of the DEIR.

S4

CALIFORNIA
Water Boards

EDMUND G. BROWN JR.
GOVERNOR

MATTHEW RODRIQUEZ
SECRETARY FOR
ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board

July 17, 2015

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

COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT FOR THE VILLAGE AT SQUAW VALLEY SPECIFIC PLAN (SCH# 2012102023), PLACER COUNTY

The California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Lahontan Region (Water Board) staff received a copy of the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the above-referenced project on May 18, 2015. The Village at Squaw Valley Specific Plan (VSVSP) DEIR is intended to identify planned improvements of various types associated with commercial, residential, resort, and recreational amenities, and propose mitigation measures for all potential environmental impacts. Implementation and completion of the VSVSP will occur over an estimated 25 years, with initial construction proposed to begin in spring of 2016. The VSVSP will be located approximately nine miles south of the Town of Truckee and seven miles northwest of Tahoe City and Lake Tahoe, outside of the Tahoe Basin in the Squaw Creek sub-area of the Truckee River Hydrologic Area (Department of Water Resources No. 635.20). Water Board staff has reviewed the DEIR and our comments follow. S4-1

SPECIFIC COMMENTS

Chapter 6 Biological Resources

Page 6-25, Section 6.1.7., Waters of the United States
The DEIR states that "… preliminary wetland delineation and constraint map for portions of the project site did not cover the entirety of the project site and assessments will need to be completed for the unsurveyed locations prior to construction…"

Comment: The failure to complete the preliminary wetlands delineations and the constraints maps for the entire project site prevents even a preliminary analysis and disclosure of potential environmental impacts associated with wetlands, 100-year floodplains, and riparian areas. Appropriate mitigation measures for potential impacts to such habitats and waste discharge prohibition areas also cannot be identified and evaluated. Additionally, the DEIR does not identify where wetland delineations or other constraint assessments have been completed, preventing the reviewer from developing S4-2

KIMBERLY COX, CHAIR | PATTY Z. KOUYOUMDJIAN, EXECUTIVE OFFICER

2501 Lake Tahoe Blvd., So. Lake Tahoe, CA 96150 | 14440 Civic Dr., Ste. 200, Victorville, CA 92392
e-mail Lahontan@waterboards.ca.gov | website www.waterboards.ca.gov/lahontan

RECYCLED PAPER

- 2 -

an understanding of how much of the project site has been evaluated and how much has not. Therefore, Water Board staff considers the evaluations and assessments made in Chapter 6 with respect to the wetlands delineation and constraints mapping to be incomplete and must be remedied prior to adopting the EIR. S4-2 cont.

Page 6-40, Section 6.3.4., Impact Analysis

Impact 6-1: Removal or degradation of sensitive habitats (jurisdictional wetlands, wet meadows, and riparian vegetation).
Mitigation Measure 6-1a: Conduct delineation of waters of the United States, obtain authorization for fill and required permits, and compensate for regulated and unregulated wetlands.

Comment: Mitigation measures are typically proposed and implemented in order to reduce the level of significance of a given unavoidable impact. Delineating wetlands and other waters of the United States and/or waters of the state, and obtaining a Clean Water Act Section 401 Water Quality Certification (WQC) do not constitute mitigation. Such activities in and of themselves, do not affect the significance of or mitigate for proposed impacts. Therefore, decision-makers cannot rely upon them when evaluating the level of significance of the proposed project's impacts associated with removing and/or degrading jurisdictional wetlands, wet meadows, and riparian vegetation. Actual mitigation measures, such as restoring degraded or previously destroyed wetlands or other sensitive habitats, must be identified within the EIR in order for reviewers to be able to evaluate the proposed project's impacts. S4-3

The Water Board follows a policy of avoiding, minimizing, and then mitigating (e.g., restoration) unavoidable impacts to wetland, riparian, and other sensitive aquatic habitats. Water Board staff recommends that the VSVSP proponent thoroughly evaluate all project alternatives in order to demonstrate that it has followed a project development approach that is compatible with the Water Board's policy. The Water Board's policy is implemented through regulatory measures, including but not limited to, waste discharge prohibitions specified in the Water Quality Control Plan for the Lahontan Region (Basin Plan). The DEIR should include information demonstrating how proposed impacts to sensitive aquatic habitats and surrounding habitat (e.g., 100-year floodplain) satisfy the prohibition exemption criteria specified by the Basin Plan. When mitigation is necessary, the Water Board prefers in-kind, onsite mitigation whenever possible. If not possible onsite, the Water Board will then consider in-kind, offsite mitigation. "In-kind" means that the mitigation site will have similar functions and values to that of the disturbed site prior to disturbance in terms of physical, chemical and biological parameters. S4-4

The analyses of the plan for development must demonstrate a net increase of sensitive habitat acreage and/or function and values will occur when the project impacts and mitigation lands are evaluated together. The Water Board frequently may require land-area mitigation ratios greater than 1:1 for disturbed to created or restored wetlands and floodplains. The applicant has not demonstrated that such lands are available for

- 3 -

mitigation, either on or off the project site, with which to mitigate potentially significant impacts to wetlands and other sensitive aquatic habitats. S4-4 cont.

Any activities that could or will result in a waste discharge will be regulated as necessary by the Water Board to ensure compliance with all provisions of the *Water Quality Control Plan for the Lahontan Region* (Basin Plan). The Basin Plan was recently amended in 2014 and is available on the Water Board's website. The DEIR does not note that some types of proposed waste discharges are prohibited in the Squaw Creek and Truckee River Hydrologic Unit and these are described fully in Chapter 4 as amended, and this is a very serious deficiency. In some cases, exemptions may be allowed and the Water Board will need to consider the alternatives analyzed and whether the conditions required in the Basin Plan will be met. The Water Board, when considering any discretionary exemption approvals or denials, must rely on the CEQA document, or make additional CEQA findings. Currently, the DEIR is deficient, as it contains no analysis regarding compliance with Basin Plan prohibitions and exemption criteria; and therefore, may not support approval of all Project elements by the Water Board. S4-5

Mitigation Measure 6-1b: Obtain and comply with a lake and streambed alteration agreement; compensate for unavoidable loss of stream and riparian habitat.

Comment: As discussed under Impact 6-1, above, these are actions that the VSVSP proponent will be required to take in order to receive approval for implementation activities associated with this action; regulatory requirements are not considered mitigation. S4-6

Mitigation Measure 6-1c: Implement Mitigation Measure 13-4 and monitor and respond to groundwater effects.

Comment: Groundwater monitoring and unidentified response measures do not constitute mitigation. The following also does not constitute mitigation: "Mitigation Measure 13-4: Verify performance of groundwater pumping system." S4-7

Mitigation Measure 6-1d (and 13-1): Implement water quality protection measures.

Comment: The DEIR states that these mitigation measures will provide for proper design, installation and abandonment of sewer lines and protection of water quality during implementation. However, no details or explanation regarding how potentially significant effects to water quality associated with constructing a replacement sewer line across Squaw Creek and the Truckee River will be avoided, minimized, or mitigated are discussed in the DEIR. The EIR must provide information supporting its statement, above. S4-8

Mitigation Measure 13-1: Implement water and sewer infrastructure water quality protection measures. S4-9

- 4 -

Comment: This mitigation measure, like the one above, does not account for water quality protection associated with construction. S4-9 cont.

Page 6-77, Impact 6-12: Construction phase dewatering impacts to fish and aquatic resources.
Mitigation Measure 6-12: Prepare and implement fish rescue plan.

Comment: The SVSVP Project will require construction work within active channels, which will potentially cause impacts to fish and other aquatic organisms including benthic macroinvertebrates. The DEIR states that most work will occur during low flow and may not need as much diversion. It is unclear how aquatic communities will be protected or restored following potentially significant harm. S4-10

The Squaw Creek Total Maximum Daily Load regulation (see Basin Plan) identified impaired biota in Squaw Creek as a consequence of human activities. Any activities contributing to additional impairment or delaying recovery must be considered as potentially significant effects. The DEIR is deficient for failing to include information and analysis supporting a conclusion of non-significant effects. Work conducted within active channels will need a WQC, and exemption(s) to Basin Plan prohibition(s), in addition to California Department of Fish and Wildlife stream bed alteration agreement and U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Clean Water Act section 404 permit.

Page 6-78, Impact 6-13 (also Impacts 13-4 and 13-5): Potential long-term impacts to fish and aquatic resources related to increased groundwater extraction, changes in groundwater elevations and flow directions, resulting changes to surface water flow, streambed drying, and off-site channel stability.
Mitigation Measure 6-13: Implement Mitigation Measures 13-4 and 6-1c.
Mitigation Measure 13-4: Verify performance of groundwater pumping system.
Comment: The DEIR states that groundwater extraction can lower groundwater elevations and flow and reduce subsurface flows that could lead to adverse consequences for water quality and stream flora and fauna; "although flow changes may occur…minor in specific to context of hydrology…little effect on WQ." Water Board staff disagrees with the current DEIR assessment. Improper management of groundwater extraction could dewater Squaw Creek, adversely affecting riparian vegetation resulting in increased creek erosion, increased creek temperatures, decreased aquatic and terrestrial wildlife habitat. It is unclear how the stated mitigation measures will prevent or reduce these impacts to levels that are not potentially significant. S4-11

Chapter 13 Hydrology and Water Quality

Page 13-45, Section 13.3.3 Issues or Potential Impacts Not Discussed Further

The DEIR states the following: S4-12

- 5 -

As stated in the Initial Study prepared for the project (included as Appendix A), some potential hydrology and water quality issues will not be addressed in the DEIR. The proposed project would not place any structures, including housing, within a 100-year flood hazard area. The project is not within a watershed that could experience flooding from levee or dam failure. The project is not located near any large water body that could result in inundation by seiche or tsunami. Therefore, these impacts are not evaluated further in this DEIR. Impacts from landslides and mudflows are evaluated in Chapter 12, "Soils, Geology, and Seismicity."

Comment: Water Board staff is aware of two private dams on the South Fork of Squaw Creek, within the ski resort areas, and potentially a third dam near Squaw Valley Ski Resort's Red Dog ski lift. One dam sits just above the base lodge area and a higher, larger dam and water impoundment used for snow-making, Gold Coast Pond, sits higher in the watershed upstream of the Project. The capacity of these dams to withstand flooding, and the risk of failures that would put lives and property at risk is unknown and not evaluated or disclosed in the DEIR due to the above-cited assessment. The potential for both dams to fail and release flood waters, sediment, and debris during a significant runoff event must however be considered, based on the scientific evidence, and the anecdotal evidence of runoff events such as the January 1997 flood event that affected the entire Truckee River watershed, including Squaw Creek and its tributaries. S4-12 cont.

The potential risk should not be underestimated or limited to "100-year flood" events based on the available probability data from the 20th century or before; recent published scientific data and models from the U.S. Geological Survey provides substantial evidence of the potential for devastating flooding and damage from "atmospheric rivers" of moisture that reoccur with regularity on a scale of one to several centuries, bringing floods potentially much, much larger than experienced in the last century. The DEIR is deficient for failing to analyze the potentially significant threats to life and property associated with the existing dams, their hydrological and structural capacities, and the potential for dam failures and flooding due to significant flood events, such as the January 1997 flood event. Such flood events also have the potential to adversely affect water quality over a significant time period due to the discharge of building materials and waste from damaged infrastructure.

Page 13-45, Section 13.3.4 Impact Analysis
Impact 13-1: Well and sewer line construction and abandonment risks to groundwater and surface water quality.
As stated in the DEIR (page 13-46), "Shall be in conformance with Section 71 of the Placer County Department of Public Works General Specifications." "Because existing codes and regulations…require measures to protect water quality…there is a low risk that water quality would be adversely affected or that any water quality standards would be violated by these activities." S4-13
Mitigation Measure 13-1: Implement water and sewer infrastructure water quality protection measures.

- 6 -

Implement mitigation measures as required by Placer County actions with County oversight.

Comment: The specific mitigation measures that address the reduction of impacts from sewer infrastructure implementation need to be provided and described to support a determination that effects are not significant. S4-13 cont.

Page 13-53, Impact 13-4: Long-term land cover changes and increased groundwater production effects on groundwater patterns, recharge, and aquifer storage in the Olympic Valley Groundwater Basin.

Comments - Potential Effects of Sub-Grade Parking: Regarding aquifer storage or groundwater obstruction, recharge and storage capacity, or groundwater table intersection, it appears from the information provided (page 13-53) that there is a potential for groundwater to be intercepted when the groundwater is at its shallowest recorded depth of 14.2 feet below ground surface if the excavation for sub-grade parking is deeper than 14.2 feet. Is the DEIR making a blanket assumption that the groundwater level will never be at or higher than this shallow depth again over the course of the projected 25-year project build-out and ongoing operation? What will the consequences be if ground water levels rise higher than anticipated, either seasonally or during flooding or unusually wet periods? The potential for such conditions are anticipated to increase with global atmospheric warming. S4-14

Water Board staff would like to be assured that any changes in the planned excavation depths or dimensions of the sub-grade parking areas will be adequately assessed in regard to potential impacts to groundwater obstruction, lowering of water tables, recharge elimination or other effects on groundwater in the project area or areas that would be affected by the project. Evaluation of potential modifications to the planned excavation depth, or other modifications are needed in the DEIR to fully evaluate the potential for significant impacts associated with groundwater interactions. The DEIR is deficient in its analysis because it says no effects will occur; however, monitoring and mitigation measures are needed to verify current assumptions and conclusions, or to adapt to unforeseen conditions created, in part or entirely, by the Project.

Chapter 18 Cumulative Impacts

Comment: Construction or operational land use activities as proposed by this DEIR must include appropriate implementation measures to eliminate or minimize the degradation of water quality. Impacts to water quality and water resources due to excessive water supply groundwater withdrawals in the service area may be considered as potentially significant cumulative effects unaddressed by the DEIR. Local, state, or federal regulations associated with DEIR related project activities neither avoid nor reduce impacts. The DEIR describes generally the regulations to be complied with, with deficiencies as noted herein. Development and implementation of appropriate mitigation measures, which is the responsibility of the project proponent, should be described fully in the DEIR, or a statement of overriding considerations must be provided. S4-15

- 7 -

OTHER COMMENTS:

Comments on the Mountain Adventure Camp: The DEIR does not evaluate or analyze potential impacts resulting from the operations of the Mountain Adventure Camp associated with the discharge of wastewater from exchanging pool water, cleaning operations, filter rinsing, bacterial contamination, or treatments with strong oxidizing and toxic materials such as chlorine (with associated risks from handling same). Water Board staff recommends that wastewater from the operations only be conveyed to the sewer system. Will the sewer system capacity adequately allow for increased flows from the operation of the Mountain Adventure Camp? S4-16

If you have any questions regarding our comments, please contact Dale Payne at (530) 542-5464, or me at (530) 542-5430.

Alan Miller, P.E.
Chief, North Basin Regulatory Unit

Cc: State Clearinghouse/Office of Planning and Research

S4 Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board
Alan Miller, Chief, North Basin Regulatory Unit
July 17, 2015

S4-1 The comment is an introductory statement and does not address the content, analysis, or conclusions in the DEIR. Therefore, a response is not provided here.

S4-2 The comment states that the "failure to complete the preliminary wetlands delineations…prevents even a preliminary analysis and disclosure of potential environmental impacts associated with wetlands, 100-year floodplains, and riparian areas." Preliminary wetland delineations were prepared for all but a small portion of the project footprint, limited to certain offsite utility corridors and potential trails, as discussed on page 6-25 of the DEIR. These delineations have yet to be verified. While a preliminary wetland delineation is a necessary first step in permitting the fill of wetlands, a verified delineation is not needed to identify potential wetland resources and impacts to these resources in an EIR, particularly at the programmatic planning level. Moreover, as explained below, the EIR includes information from other sources, including reconnaissance-level surveys and aerial imagery.

Six wetland constraint and wetland delineation reports that surveyed a total of 133.5 acres of the project site and vicinity were cited on page 6-1 of the DEIR and referenced to create the waters of the U.S. maps within the project area. The total project site analyzed within the DEIR for sensitive habitats consists of 120.25 acres (DEIR Table 6-1, page 6-9). While the surveyed area covers more acreage than the project site and the majority of the project site was surveyed for waters of the U.S., there still remained a small acreage within the project site that was not included in the Salix Consulting reports. Identification of land cover in these areas, which the VSVSP proposes to use for utilities or project implementation, was augmented by aerial imagery and reconnaissance level information. Trail areas, as stated in the DEIR, do not have specific locations and were analyzed broadly in Impact 6-10 (DEIR pages 6-74 to 6-75). The DEIR includes Mitigation Measure 6-10 (Implement previous applicable mitigation measures during trail development) to address potentially significant impacts related to trail construction (DEIR page 6-75).

Thus, the DEIR did not defer analysis of impacts; instead, it conducted various surveys and employed other tools to identify potential resources and examined the type and extent of impact that could occur throughout the project area, included groundbreaking activities such as trails and utility installation. This is a programmatic EIR that addressed impacts specifically in known areas and more broadly in unknown areas (such as the future unknown trails and utilities) as required by CEQA. See response to comment 09-59 that further describes mitigation measures and impact analysis in a programmatic document such as this one.

Also, see responses to comments 08b-3 through 08b-10, 08b-13, and 08b-34.

S4-3 The comment states that delineating wetlands and obtaining a Clean Water Act Section 401 Water Quality Certification do not constitute mitigation. The comment appears to address the title of Mitigation Measure 6-1a, but does not acknowledge the content of the mitigation measure. The measure includes requirements to verify and/or further delineate all wetland resources; to consult with U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, California Department of Fish and Wildlife, U.S. Department of Fish and Wildlife Service, and the Lahontan RWQCB on a variety of specified conditions; to replace any filled wetlands/waters of the U.S. on a "no net loss" basis including a minimum 1:1 ratio (but could be higher if needed to achieve no net loss); to prioritize that mitigation occurs on site; to monitor replacement habitat for success and

remediate any issues; and to obtain the applicable permit(s) prior to affecting wetlands (page 6-46 to 6-48). This is a robust mitigation program with performance standards that ensures wetlands resources that are affected will be fully mitigated. This type of mitigation is appropriate and adequate for a CEQA analysis.

CEQA defines mitigation as avoiding an impact; minimizing effects to a degree; rectifying an impact through rehabilitation, restoration, etc.; reducing the impact over time by preservation and maintenance actions; or compensating for an impact by replacing or providing substitute resources (CEQA Guidelines Section 15370). Mitigation Measure 6-1a, as proposed in the DEIR, meets this definition.

In particular, Mitigation Measure 6-1a states: "The project applicant shall replace on a 'no net loss' basis (minimum 1:1 ratio) (in accordance with USACE and/or the Lahontan RWQCB) the acreage and function of all wetlands and other waters…that would be removed, lost or degraded as a result of project implementation or operations. Wetland habitat shall be replaced at acreage and location agreeable to USACE and the Lahontan RWQCB and as determined during the Section 401 and Section 404 permitting processes. Any temporarily disturbed riparian habitats, water bodies, and wetlands shall be restored to pre-project conditions." The DEIR did not identify mitigation acres in the mitigation measures because wetland delineations had not been verified at the time of the DEIR release. Mitigation ratios for sensitive habitats will be determined, if necessary, by USACE, CDFW, the Lahontan RWQCB (the commenter), and the County as per Mitigation Measures 6-1a and 6-1b once delineations are verified and permits applications are received.

See response to comment 09-59 that further describes mitigation measures and impact analysis in a programmatic document such as this one. With respect to the comment that the identified mitigation measures are insufficient, see responses to comments 08b-3 through 08b-10, 08b-13, and 08b-34.

S4-4 The comment explains Water Board policy and staff recommendations related to mitigation of impacts to wetland, riparian, and other sensitive aquatic habitats. However, the project-specific mitigation measures are compliant with Water Board policies. See response to comment S4-3. Moreover, the Water Board can withhold issuance of a permit related to wetlands fill if the project does not comply. The project-specific mitigation for sensitive habitats, including waters of the U.S. (Mitigation Measures 6-1a, 6-1b, and 6-1c), require avoidance and minimization measures, planning measures, and specific compensation levels (i.e., no net loss) and show that this type of compensation would mitigate for the significant impact. The proposed mitigation follows the Water Board's policy as outlined by the comment.

With regard to the Basin Plan prohibition exemption criteria, see response to comment S4-5.

The comment states that the Water Board prefers in-kind, onsite mitigation whenever possible. The project is consistent with this preference. The project plan is to restore and mitigate for project impacts on-site as much as possible. This goal is stated on page 6-47 of the DEIR under Mitigation Measure 6-1a ("The project plans to construct all or a portion of replacement wetlands onsite") and on page 6-48 of the DEIR under Mitigation Measure 6-1b ("This project plans to construct all or a portion of replacement riparian habitat onsite").

Regarding no net loss of habitat within the Tahoe-Truckee region, see response to comment 08b-35, which adds text to the mitigation measures to require that offsite mitigation, if necessary, occur within the Tahoe-Truckee region. This will ensure that habitat benefits to the bioregion and dependent species are not lost within the Tahoe-Truckee region, the Lahontan RWQCB area, and the greater Sierra Nevada.

S4-5 The comment expresses concern that the DEIR does not addressing waste discharge prohibitions within the Truckee River Hydrologic Unit, as provided in the 2014 *Water Quality Control Plan for the Lahontan Region* (Basin Plan); however, the comment does not specifically identify any discharges of concern related to the project.

As a preliminary matter, the County notes that the NOP for the project was initially sent to the commenter in 2012, to which the Regional Board (the commenter) replied. Information in that comment, pertaining to waste prohibitions, informed the analysis of the DEIR. A revised NOP was issued in 2014, but the Regional Board did not comment and did not notify the County that the Basin Plan was being revised. The analysis of impacts properly relied on the Basin Plan in effect at the time the analysis started, in 2012. Nonetheless, additional response related to the 2014 Basin Plan is provided below.

The 2014 Basin Plan includes a number of waste discharge prohibitions in the Truckee River Hydrologic Unit, which includes Squaw Creek, including discharge of wastes from boats, treated and untreated sewage, and solid or liquid wastes including soil, silt, and clay (the same as the 2006 Basin Plan). Most other prohibitions address discharges related to wastewater and septic tanks. The proposed project does not include wastewater or septic systems (it would discharge wastewater to the sewer system that conveys flows to TTSA). Regarding discharge of material relevant to the project (soil, silt, clay), this issue is addressed in Chapter 13 (see surface water quality discussion on pages 13-25 through 13-29 and 13-32 through 13-26 for existing conditions discussions and pages 13-45 through 13-52 for impact and mitigation discussions). This analysis addresses the relevant basin plan prohibitions.

S4-6 The comment states that regulatory requirements are not considered mitigation and specifically references a portion of Mitigation Measure 6-1b. The County disagrees with the notion that compliance with the requirements of an agency regulating an environmental issue would not result in mitigation if those requirements serve to reduce the impacts of a project. With respect to insufficient mitigation measures, see responses to comments 08b-3 through 08b-10, 08b-13, 08b-34, and S4-3. The requirement to obtain and comply with a lake and streambed alteration agreement in Mitigation Measure 6-1b is only a small portion of the measure. The mitigation for wetlands and waters of the U.S. and other sensitive habitats (Mitigation Measures 6-1a, 6-1b, and 6-1c) requires avoidance measures, planning measures, and specific compensation levels (i.e., no net loss) and shows that this type of compensation would mitigate for the significant impact. The construction activities that might damage or degrade habitat would be conducted in accordance with the streambed alteration agreement that will include implementing reasonable measures to protect fish and wildlife resources (including streambank habitat). Temporary construction impacts should be minimized as a result. This measure requires compensation for permanent loss at an approved CDFW wetland mitigation bank or through the development and implementation of a Compensatory Stream and Riparian Mitigation and Monitoring Plan (CSRMMP) and a County-approved MMIP aimed at creating and restoring in-kind habitat within the plan area or in the surrounding area.

See response to comment 09-59 that further describes mitigation measures and impact analysis in a programmatic document such as this one. Also, see response to comment S4-3.

S4-7 The comment states that the requirement in Mitigation Measure 6-1c to implement Mitigation Measure 13-4 does not constitute mitigation. As discussed on pages 13-52 through 13-63 and 18-33 through 18-45 of the DEIR, the 2014 Water Supply Assessment (WSA) demonstrates that groundwater withdrawals to serve the proposed project and cumulative development would not substantially deplete groundwater supplies if the well field is operated as analyzed in the WSA. Additional analysis concludes that groundwater pumping consistent with the WSA assumptions would not adversely affect water quality (see

DEIR pages 13-65 through 13-74). These findings were reaffirmed by the 2015 WSA update and associated analyses (see the Master Response regarding water supply). If the pumping regime differs from the 2014 WSA assumptions, then Mitigation Measure 13-4 requires a number of steps to ensure that the use of groundwater for the proposed project is managed in a manner that maintains adequate water supply and protects water quality (see pages 13-64 and 13-65 of the DEIR). These steps include meeting identified standards, including average saturated thickness of 65 percent of more for three consecutive months or more than four times total for the entire study period, and demonstration that drawdown in wells near the upper meadow no cause substantially more drying in refugia pools than shown in the DEIR. Because Mitigation Measure 13-4 does include specific standards to be met, the mitigation measure is adequate. See response to comment S4-3 regarding requirements for mitigation measures.

S4-8 The comment states that Mitigation Measures 6-1d and 13-1, as stated in the DEIR, would provide for proper design, installation, and abandonment of sewer lines and protection of water quality during implementation. Then, the comment states that the DEIR does not provide details or explanation regarding how potentially significant effects to water quality associated with constructing a replacement sewer line across Squaw Creek and the Truckee River would be avoided, minimized, or mitigated. Mitigation Measure 6-1d, as referenced by the comment, does include measures to be implemented during construction, as follows (see page 6-50):

- The project applicant shall implement the mitigation measures as required under Mitigation Measure 13-2a to protect water quality during construction and over the project life.
- The project applicant shall implement the mitigation measures as required under Mitigation Measure 13-2b to address potential discovery of contaminated soils and protection of groundwater quality during construction.

Mitigation Measure 13-2a, referenced by Mitigation Measure 6-1d, includes numerous provisions that provide water quality protection (DEIR pages 13-49 to 13-50). Mitigation Measure 13-2b, also referenced by Mitigation Measure 6-1d, states, in part:

> <u>Prepare a Construction Dewatering and Discharge Plan</u>
>
> A dewatering and discharge plan shall be developed and submitted to the Lahontan RWQCB for approval prior to initiating any excavation activities. The plan will be implemented during project construction to address protection of groundwater resources and surface water quality in the event that groundwater is intercepted during project activities. The dewatering and discharge plan shall provide methods to protect groundwater during excavations from potential contaminant releases during equipment use and refueling, such as specific spill control and clean up and response measures in the vicinity of excavations.

Mitigation Measure 13-1 would help ensure that "new wells, well destruction, and sewer line abandonment would be conducted under the review and approval of Placer County" (DEIR page 13-47). Mitigation Measures 13-2a and 13-2b, however, are specific to project construction, and require the implementation of construction water quality protection measures, including for sewer lines. As stated on page 13-51 of the DEIR, implementation of Mitigation Measures 13-2a and 13-2b would:

> …ensure that construction phase, site-specific risks to water quality that might result from improper implementation of water quality protection measures, discovery and disturbance of contaminated soil or water, and ground disturbance in the vicinity of

the existing Far East bridge sewer line crossing would be fully addressed and avoided.

To ensure that cross-referencing of all relevant mitigation is clear, and in response to this comment, the text of Mitigation Measure 13-1 is revised as follows:

Mitigation Measure 13-1: Implement water and sewer infrastructure water quality protection measures.

The project applicant shall implement the following actions, including standard mitigation measures as required by the County, to protect water quality during the design, installation, and destruction/abandonment of wells and sewer lines:

- Prior to providing final authorization for drilling of a well (e.g., initiating an applicant directed test well, providing access to property for a well drilled by another entity, final agreement to fund a well drilled by another entity), the project applicant shall confirm that required fees are paid and a drilling permit is obtained from Environmental Health Services for each well and that the location of the well meets applicable DWR criteria for distances from utility infrastructure (e.g., stormwater, sewer, and petroleum pipelines and petroleum storage tanks).

- Prior to approval of a Final Subdivision Map, the applicant shall provide to Placer County Environmental Health Services final design drawings indicating that separation between any planned or existing wells in the map area and any planned or existing stormwater, sewer, and petroleum pipelines and petroleum storage tanks is sufficient to meet applicable DWR separation requirements.

- Prior to approval of a Final Small-Lot Subdivision Map, complete or provide for the proper destruction under permit and inspection, of existing wells and abandonment of sewer lines located within the project site.

- Prior to approval of an Improvement Plan that includes the need for well destruction or sewer line abandonment, well destruction and/or sewer line abandonment shall be shown on the Improvement Plans; the actions shall be included in the engineers' estimate of costs for subdivision improvements; and the Improvement Plan will include a Plan Note indicating proper destruction, under permit and inspection, of the existing wells and abandonment of sewer lines located within the Improvement Plan area.

<u>The project applicant shall also implement relevant provisions of Mitigation Measures 13-2a and 13-2b.</u>

S4-9 See response to comment S4-8.

S4-10 The comment states that the DEIR is deficient for failing to include information and analysis supporting a conclusion of "non-significant" effects. The relevant discussion in Impact 6-12 concerns impacts to fish and aquatic resources and concludes the impact would be potentially significant (although no sensitive species would be affected). The comment infers the DEIR came to the conclusion that this impact would be less than significant. The DEIR includes a requirement for a fish rescue plan, to be prepared in conjunction with CDFW, to provide for capture and relocation of fish. The comment does not explain why this is deficient. It is noted that the predominant impacts to Squaw Creek that result in the need to fish capture are from plans to restore the creek to more natural conditions, a benefit of the project (although it will also offset impacts). As to other requirements associated with modification of the creek bed, the DEIR acknowledges the permitting requirement of the

Regional Board, USACE, CDFW, and USFWS. See Mitigation Measure 6-1a and 6-1b on pages 6-46 through 6-49 of the DEIR.

S4-11 The comment states that the Water Board staff disagrees with the DEIR's conclusion that groundwater extraction will only lead to minor flow changes having little impact on water quality. See response to comment S4-7 and the Master Response on water supply.

S4-12 The comment refers to three dams and the "potentially significant threats to life and property associated with the existing dams, their hydrological and structural capacities, and the potential for dam failures and flooding due to significant flood events."

This comment focuses on the extent to which potential hazards that are part of the existing environment may affect the proposed project, rather than on the project's impact on the environment. The California Supreme Court recently addressed the extent to which an EIR must consider such effects. In *California Building Industry Assn. v. Bay Area Air Quality Management Dist.* (2015) 62 Cal.4th 369 (*CBIA v. BAAQMD*), the Court held that "CEQA generally does not require an analysis of how existing environmental conditions will impact a project's future users or residents." (62 Cal.4th at p. 386.) The Court drew a distinction "between requirements that consider the *environment's* effects on a project and those that contemplate *the project's* impacts on the existing environment. The former . . . are invalid. The latter, however, are valid and entirely consistent with CEQA's concerns about environmental protection, public health and deliberation." (*Id*. at p. 388, emphasis in original.) Thus, it is appropriate for an EIR to "evaluat[e] a project's potentially significant exacerbating effects on existing environmental hazards." (*Ibid*.)

The *CBIA v. BAAQMD* decision does not *prohibit* the lead agency from including in an EIR an analysis of the environment's impact on a proposed project. Rather, the decision focuses on the extent to which CEQA *requires* such analysis. Thus, an EIR may include an analysis of the environment's impact on a project, even if CEQA does not expressly require such analysis. The description of the location of the ponds provided in the comment is not highly specific; therefore, information provided herein addresses several ponds that are located within the Squaw Valley Resort, including the dam described as sitting "just above the base lodge area and a higher, larger dam and water impoundment used for snow-making, Gold Coast Pond[.]"

Impoundments:

Gold Coast Pond and Cornice Pond are both in-stream impoundments rather than dams. Gold Coast Pond was constructed in the early 1990s and the Cornice Pond is thought to have been constructed in 1958 or 1959 in preparation for the 1960 Winter Olympics. The Gold Coast impoundment is located approximately 3.2 miles above the main Village area near the Gold Coast chair lift and the top of the Funitel. The Cornice impoundment is located approximately 2.5 miles from the main Village area. Squaw Valley staff is of the understanding that the structures creating these impoundments do not qualify as a "dam" and have not been regulated by the California Division of Safety of Dams. The referenced impoundments are also not identified in any flood hazard maps. Due to their relatively small size (see descriptions below) and distance from the nearest development, neither pond is expected to provide a risk of catastrophic inundation to residents of the proposed project if one of the impoundment structures were to fail.

As in-stream impoundments, Gold Coast Pond and Cornice Pond are designed to pass through stream flows when the impoundments are full/overflowing. Both structures survived the "flood of 1997," referenced by the comment, without damage or breach. Hydrologic engineering analysis would be necessary to establish specific maximum loadings from flood flows; however, given that the impoundments remained intact under 100+ year flood

conditions in 1997, and based on recent engineering work for the Gold Coast Pond (described below), they appear to show little risk of failure even during extreme flow events.

Gold Coast Pond:

The Gold Coast impoundment was raised and reconstructed in 2012 pursuant to plans approved by the Placer County Department of Public Works, Placer County Planning, Lahontan RWQCB, US Army Corps of Engineers, and the California Department of Fish and Wildlife, among other agencies. The impoundment underwent extensive design and engineering to meet modern regulatory and design standards for structural integrity.

The Gold Coast impoundment contains approximately 24 acre feet of useful volume. The pond is primarily supplied by groundwater wells; therefore, the volume of stored water is typically controlled by mountain operations staff. The Gold Coast pond is located at the headwaters of the South Fork of Squaw Creek and natural runoff is a small contributor to the water volume entering the impoundment.

Cornice Pond:

The Cornice Pond impoundment was likely constructed in 1958 or 1959 by the State or the Olympic Committee before the 1960 Olympic Winter games. The pond is located in the South Fork of Squaw Creek. Pursuant to a permit from the Lahontan RWQCB, Squaw Valley removed approximately 2,600 yards of sediment from the pond in 2015, which is equivalent to the approximate pond-volume (i.e., 1.6 acre feet). Squaw Valley staff is aware of no original or as-built design drawings, or engineering analysis, regarding the integrity of this structure. However, during the recent sediment removal operations, no leaks or evidence of cracking or structural deformity were noted. The water supply is provided entirely by natural runoff; there is no recharge by well water.

Sediment Basins:

Squaw Valley contains numerous sediment basins, designed to protect water quality. One such basin is the Searchlight Pond, located at the end of an un-named seasonal drainage beneath KT-22. This is the pond that is referred to in the comment as being located between Red Dog and the old Searchlight Pond. The sediment basin has a small (unknown) volume. The pond is usually dry, except when runoff is present. It is connected through large culverts to the Olympic Channel and Squaw Creek. The source of water for Searchlight Pond is natural runoff, not well water. The sole purpose of this sediment basin is to provide a small impoundment where entrained sediment in runoff can settle. The sediment is removed from the basin during dry conditions by Squaw Valley Resort on a regular basis pursuant to permits with the Lahontan RWQCB.

The Searchlight pond has been engineered, studied, re-engineered, and modified numerous times during the past several decades, including:

- Placer County and Lahontan RWQCB review and permitting of culvert design and adequacy for the original installation; connection to Squaw Creek (1980's)
- Review based upon damage to the embankment from the 1997 floods by Lahontan RWQCB and Placer County
- Design, engineering, and reconstruction, pursuant to the "1998 work plan," a comprehensive hydrologic analysis and engineering program undertaken to repair damage and upgrade resort facilities to withstand flooding, following 1997 flood event. This program was supervised and approved by Placer County Department of Public Works (DPW) and Lahontan RWQCB.

- Review and management by the Lahontan RWQCB, including evaluation of hydrologic criteria pursuant to the Facility Assessment, Facility Assessment Addendum, Critical Water Quality Improvement Plan, and Water Quality Improvement Plan (2000-2010)

- Review of the culverts for additional surcharge adequacy, upon installation of stormwater filtration technology nearby Squaw Valley Lower Vehicle shop, 2000-2006 pursuant to Lahontan RWQCB BMP requirements

Extensive drawings and correspondence relating to the Gold Coast Pond, Cornice Pond, and Searchlight Pond, are available as matters of public record in the files of Placer County and the Lahontan RWQCB.

The proposed project would not alter the existing size, design or use of the above referenced ponds. Because the ponds are not used as part of the flood control system for the ski resort, impound only small amounts of water, are, in the case of the Gold Coast and Cornice ponds, located far from the proposed project site, and are structurally sound, they do not pose or exacerbate a flood risk to future users of the proposed project.

S4-13 The comment states that the specific mitigation measures addressing reduction of impacts from sewer infrastructure implementation need to be provided. See response to comment S4-8.

S4-14 The comment asserts that potential climate change effects would result in higher groundwater levels than stated in the DEIR and also asserts that groundwater levels could be higher during unusually wet periods. The analysis included in this discussion concerns whether parking garages would displace groundwater storage that is important for the Olympic Valley Groundwater Basin (OVGB). The analysis concludes that the parking garages would displace a maximum of 2.8 acre feet of groundwater, which is between 0.061 and 0.078 percent of total groundwater storage, estimated at 3,600 to 4,600 acre feet (see DEIR page 13-53). While there is no evidence that groundwater levels would be higher than previously measured, if unusually wet conditions occurred and *did* result in higher groundwater levels, then it stands to reason that the overall OVGB would store, in those conditions, a greater amount of groundwater, above the 3,600 to 4,600 acre feet cited in the DEIR. In other words, if conditions were wet enough to raise the most shallow groundwater levels, it would be because the basin filled up even more than suggested by recorded measurements, creating a “fuller” bath tub. If this were to occur, then subsurface parking garages would, indeed, displace more storage, but because substantially more water would be in the basin and above the 14.2 feet below ground surface level, it still would not affect groundwater availability. The project would displace more groundwater, but never to the point where it would reduce storage below the 3,600 to 4,600 acre feet cited in the DEIR. This speculative condition would not alter the conclusions in the DEIR with respect to recharge and storage. No mitigation measures are warranted.

S4-15 The comment references Chapter 18, “Cumulative Impacts,” of the DEIR but does not provide sufficient explanation for what might be inadequate about Chapter 18. Contrary to the inference of the comment, the analysis of groundwater use is a cumulative analysis. The WSA evaluates the impacts on groundwater of the project and cumulative conditions expected over the next 25 years, in normal, single year, and multiple year drought conditions. This exceeds the requirements of CEQA Guidelines Section 15155 and California Water Code Sections 10910 to 10915, which require consideration of cumulative development expected over a 20-year period. Mitigation Measure 13-4 fully addresses any potential impacts from groundwater use associated with the project’s contribution to cumulative increases in groundwater use. As stated in the introduction to the cumulative analysis chapter (page 18-7), the analysis of cumulative impacts determines if additional mitigation, beyond what is required for the project alone, would be needed to address the project impact in a

cumulative context. The commenter does not explain why this analysis is insufficient, and why the mitigation applicable to the project would not address the project's contribution to cumulative impacts. No further response is warranted.

S4-16 The comment states that the DEIR does not evaluate certain impacts resulting from the operation of MAC. See the Master Response regarding the MAC. As described therein, wastewater, including water used for the MAC swimming pools, would be discharged to the SVPSD sewer system and treated at the Tahoe-Truckee Sanitation Agency (TTSA) wastewater treatment plant in Truckee. The calculations included in the water and sewer demands included the MAC's wet amenities (e.g., pools). The on-site sewer system will include a storage tank that will control the rate of discharge to the sewer system from the wet amenities, in order to ensure that the sewer system can accommodate those flows (MacKay & Somps 2014:6). As discussed on page 14-36 of the DEIR, the TTSA treatment plant has capacity to accept VSVSP wastewater, including wastewater from operation of the MAC.

S5

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
Governor's Office of Planning and Research
State Clearinghouse and Planning Unit

Edmund G. Brown Jr.
Governor

Ken Alex
Director

Memorandum

Date: July 9, 2015
To: All Reviewing Agencies
From: Scott Morgan, Director
Re: SCH # **2012102023**
Village at Squaw Valley Specific Plan

The State Clearinghouse forwarded the above-mentioned project to your agency for review on **May 18, 2015** with incorrect review dates. Please make note of the following information for your files:

Review period ends: **July 17, 2015 – 60 Day Review**

We apologize for any inconvenience this may have caused. All other project information remains the same.

S5-1

cc: Alex Fisch
Placer County, Planning Services Division
3091 County Center Drive
Auburn, CA 95603

1400 TENTH STREET P.O. BOX 3044 SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95812-3044
TEL (916) 445-0613 FAX (916) 323-3018 www.opr.ca.gov

Appendix C

Notice of Completion & Environmental Document Transmittal

Mail to: State Clearinghouse, P.O. Box 3044, Sacramento, CA 95812-3044 (916) 445-0613
For Hand Delivery/Street Address: 1400 Tenth Street, Sacramento, CA 95814

SCH # 2012102023

Project Title: Village at Squaw Valley Specific Plan
Lead Agency: Placer County, Planning Services Division — Contact Person: Alex Fisch, Senior Planner
Mailing Address: 3091 County Center Drive — Phone: 530-745-3081
City: Auburn — Zip: 95603 — County: Placer

Project Location: County: Placer — City/Nearest Community: Squaw Valley, Olympic Valley
Cross Streets: Squaw Valley Road — Zip Code: 96146
Longitude/Latitude (degrees, minutes and seconds): 39 ° 11 ' 50 " N / 120 ° 14 ' 07 " W Total Acres: 94
Assessor's Parcel No.: Multiple — Section: 32 NW Twp.: 16N Range: 16E Base: CA21
Within 2 Miles: State Hwy #: 89 — Waterways: Squaw Creek, Truckee River
Airports: -- — Railways: -- — Schools: Squaw Valley Academy

RECEIVED MAY 18 2015 STATE CLEARING HOUSE

Document Type:
CEQA: ☐ NOP ☐ Early Cons ☐ Neg Dec ☐ Mit Neg Dec ☒ Draft EIR ☐ Supplement/Subsequent EIR (Prior SCH No.) ☐ Other:
NEPA: ☐ NOI ☐ EA ☐ Draft EIS ☐ FONSI
Other: ☐ Joint Document ☐ Final Document ☐ Other:

Local Action Type:
☐ General Plan Update ☒ General Plan Amendment ☐ General Plan Element ☒ Community Plan
☒ Specific Plan ☐ Master Plan ☐ Planned Unit Development ☒ Site Plan
☒ Rezone ☐ Prezone ☐ Use Permit ☒ Land Division (Subdivision, etc.)
☐ Annexation ☐ Redevelopment ☐ Coastal Permit ☐ Other:

Development Type:
☒ Residential: Units 850 Acres ~40
☐ Office: Sq.ft. Acres Employees
☒ Commercial: Sq.ft. 206.2 K Acres ~5 to 8 Employees 574 fte
☐ Industrial: Sq.ft. Acres Employees
☐ Educational:
☒ Recreational: Swimming/aquatics facility, ice skating rink etc.
☒ Water Facilities: Type Wells MGD TBD
☐ Transportation: Type
☐ Mining: Mineral
☐ Power: Type MW
☐ Waste Treatment: Type MGD
☐ Hazardous Waste: Type
☒ Other: Preserve, Forest Recreation, Roads, Parking, etc.

Project Issues Discussed in Document:
☒ Aesthetic/Visual ☐ Agricultural Land ☒ Air Quality ☒ Archeological/Historical ☒ Biological Resources ☐ Coastal Zone ☒ Drainage/Absorption ☒ Economic/Jobs
☐ Fiscal ☒ Flood Plain/Flooding ☒ Forest Land/Fire Hazard ☒ Geologic/Seismic ☐ Minerals ☒ Noise ☒ Population/Housing Balance ☒ Public Services/Facilities
☒ Recreation/Parks ☒ Schools/Universities ☐ Septic Systems ☒ Sewer Capacity ☒ Soil Erosion/Compaction/Grading ☒ Solid Waste ☒ Toxic/Hazardous ☒ Traffic/Circulation
☒ Vegetation ☒ Water Quality ☒ Water Supply/Groundwater ☒ Wetland/Riparian ☒ Growth Inducement ☒ Land Use ☒ Cumulative Effects ☐ Other:

Present Land Use/Zoning/General Plan Designation:
High Density Residential, Heavy Commercial, Village Commercial, Forest Recreation, Conservation Preserve, Entrance Commer

Project Description: *(please use a separate page if necessary)*
The Specific Plan proposes to amend the existing Squaw Valley General Plan and Land Use Ordinance (adopted in 1983) to comprehensively plan development of a recreation-based, all-season, resort community consisting of up to 1,493 bedrooms associated with hotel and resort residential uses (condo hotel, timeshare, and fractional units). Other proposed land uses would include employee housing (for up to 300 employees), commercial (up to 206,211 square feet), a Village Core, restoration of Squaw Creek, forest recreation, conservation preserve, a Mountain Adventure Camp, and a transit center and parking facilities. The project will also involve extension of some infrastructure. The project would be developed over approximately 25 years with some construction proposed to begin no earlier than spring 2016.

State Clearinghouse Contact: SM (916) 445-0613
State Review Began: 5 - 18 - 2015
SCH COMPLIANCE 7 - 1 - 2015
100 Day Review

Please note State Clearinghouse Number (SCH#) on all Comments

SCH#: 2012102023
Please forward late comments directly to the Lead Agency

Project Sent to the following State Agencies

X Resources
___ Boating & Waterways
___ Coastal Comm
___ Colorado Rvr Bd
X Conservation
X CDFW # 2
___ Delta Protection Comm
X Cal Fire
___ Historic Preservation
X Parks & Rec
___ Central Valley Flood Prot.
___ Bay Cons & Dev Comm.
X DWR
X OES
___ Resources, Recycling and Recovery

CalSTA
X Aeronautics
X CHP
X Caltrans # 3
___ Trans Planning

Other

State/Consumer Svcs
___ General Services

Cal EPA
X ARB: ALL Other Projects
___ ARB: Transportation Projects
___ ARB: Major Industrial/Energy
___ SWRCB: Div. of Drinking Water
___ SWRCB: Div. Financial Assist.
___ SWRCB: Wtr Quality
___ SWRCB: Wtr Rights
X Reg. WQCB # 6S
___ Toxic Sub Ctrl-CTC

Yth/Adlt Corrections
___ Corrections

Independent Comm
___ Energy Commission
X NAHC
___ Public Utilities Comm
X State Lands Comm
X Tahoe Rgl Plan Agency

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Governor's Office of Planning and Research

State Clearinghouse and Planning Unit

Edmund G. Brown Jr.
Governor

Ken Alex
Director

July 2, 2015

Alex Fisch
Placer County, Planning Services Division
3091 County Center Drive
Auburn, CA 95603

Subject: Village at Squaw Valley Specific Plan
SCH#: 2012102023

Dear Alex Fisch:

The State Clearinghouse submitted the above named Draft EIR to selected state agencies for review. The review period closed on July 1, 2015, and no state agencies submitted comments by that date. This letter acknowledges that you have complied with the State Clearinghouse review requirements for draft environmental documents, pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act. S5-2

Please call the State Clearinghouse at (916) 445-0613 if you have any questions regarding the environmental review process. If you have a question about the above-named project, please refer to the ten-digit State Clearinghouse number when contacting this office.

Sincerely,

Scott Morgan
Director, State Clearinghouse

1400 TENTH STREET P.O. BOX 3044 SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95812-3044
TEL (916) 445-0613 FAX (916) 323-3018 www.opr.ca.gov

Document Details Report
State Clearinghouse Data Base

SCH# 2012102023
Project Title Village at Squaw Valley Specific Plan
Lead Agency Placer County

Type EIR Draft EIR

Description The Specific Plan proposes to amend the existing Squaw Valley General Plan and Land Use Ordinance (adopted in 1983) to comprehensively plan development of a recreation-based, all-season, resort community consisting of up to 750 fractional ownership resort residential and guest accommodation units. Other proposed land uses would include commercial, retail, and recreational uses similar to uses currently allowed as well as parking and other visitor amenities. The project would be developed over approximately 20-25 years with construction proposed to begin in 2016.

Lead Agency Contact

Name Alex Fisch
Agency Placer County, Planning Services Division
Phone (530) 745-3081 **Fax**
email
Address 3091 County Center Drive
City Auburn **State** CA **Zip** 95603

Project Location

County Placer
City Olympic Valley
Region
Lat / Long 39° 11' 50" N / 120° 14' 07" W
Cross Streets Squaw Valley Road
Parcel No. Multiple
Township 16N **Range** 16E **Section** 32NW **Base** CA21

Proximity to:

Highways Hwy 89
Airports
Railways
Waterways Squaw Creek, Truckee River
Schools Squaw Valley Academy
Land Use Low Density & High Density Residential, Heavy Commercial, Village Commercial, Forest Recreation, Conservation Preserve

Project Issues Schools/Universities; Archaeologic-Historic; Biological Resources; Drainage/Absorption; Economics/Jobs; Flood Plain/Flooding; Geologic/Seismic; Forest Land/Fire Hazard; Minerals; Noise; Population/Housing Balance; Public Services; Recreation/Parks; Septic System; Sewer Capacity; Soil Erosion/Compaction/Grading; Solid Waste; Toxic/Hazardous; Traffic/Circulation; Vegetation; Water Quality; Water Supply; Wetland/Riparian; Growth Inducing; Landuse; Cumulative Effects; Aesthetic/Visual; Air Quality

Reviewing Agencies Resources Agency; Department of Conservation; Department of Fish and Wildlife, Region 2; Cal Fire; Department of Parks and Recreation; Department of Water Resources; Office of Emergency Services, California; California Highway Patrol; Caltrans, District 3 N; Air Resources Board; Regional Water Quality Control Bd., Region 6 (So Lake Tahoe); Native American Heritage Commission; State Lands Commission; Tahoe Regional Planning Agency

Date Received 05/18/2015 **Start of Review** 05/18/2015 **End of Review** 07/01/2015

S5

CA Governor's Office of Planning and Research, State Clearinghouse and Planning Unit
Scott Morgan, Director
July 9, 2015

S5-1 The comment provides the correct beginning and ending dates of the public review period for the DEIR, which are May 18, 2015 through July 17, 2015.

S5-2 The comment states that the State Clearinghouse submitted the DEIR to selected state agencies for review, that the review period closed on July 1, 2015, and that no state agencies submitted comments by that date. The County contacted the State Clearinghouse to correct the ending date of the public review period, which was July 17, 2015. By that date, several state agencies did provide comment letters, which are reproduced herein. See responses to comment letters S1, S2, S3, and S4.

The County appreciates the acknowledgement of compliance with the State Clearinghouse requirements for DEIRs, pursuant to CEQA.