

I27

Maywan Krach

From: Elaine Binger <souptonuts@binger.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 15, 2015 1:45 PM
To: Placer County Environmental Coordination Services
Subject: Squaw Valley developments

The beauty and open environment of Squaw Valley and the whole Tahoe North Shore area is a gift to all people. Therefore, I request of you to consider not allowing the building of high rises and amusement parks that will severely increase traffic and visitors to the area. We need to be responsible to future generations by continuing the purity of the land and the clarity of the water and air. Please do not approve the development of Squaw Valley!

I
I27-1
I

Elaine Binger
Soup To Nuts Catering
Home: 510.527.2176
Kitchen: 510.528.3332
Cell: 510.418.1992

I27

Elaine Binger
July 15, 2015

I27-1

The comment is directed towards the project approval process and does not address the content, analysis, or conclusions in the DEIR. Therefore, no further response is provided here. All comment letters submitted during the DEIR public review period will be reviewed and considered by the Placer County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors before a decision on the project is rendered.

July 17, 2015

Dear Placer County Board of Supervisors,

My name is Michael Blanchard. I am a resident of Mill Valley, CA and have been a regular visitor to north Lake Tahoe over much of the past 10 years. I ski Squaw Valley and Alpine Meadows regularly and make frequent summer trips to the area to enjoy the various outdoors activities that make Tahoe so great.

Over the course of the last few years, I have been enjoying introducing my daughters (ages three, three and six) to Tahoe with both winter and summer trips. My 6-year old has now skied Squaw enough to begin to learn some of the mountain and share the love for the area that I have.

I am writing to express my concern over specific deficiencies with the draft environmental impact report (DEIR) submitted by Squaw Valley Ski Holdings/Squaw Valley Real Estate/KSL to the board of supervisors. While I am concerned about the manner in which the DEIR addresses several areas of concern – noise/air/light pollution, water usage, disruption of view shed – I am going to focus on the one that means the most to me and my family: traffic. More specifically, I am referencing the “unavoidable” impacts referenced in sections 9-2 through 9-5 of the DEIR.

I have a young family and both my wife and I work. This makes our free time preciously limited and therefore invaluable. At this point in time, most of our Tahoe trips are limited to the major holiday weekends, which obviously expose us to the peak traffic times in the region. While I understand this is the nature of the beast to a certain extent, exacerbating an already horrendous traffic situation is a potential deal-breaker for young families in the region who frequent the area during peak holiday times.

The cost in dollars of a Tahoe get away for a family of five is already significant. However in order to measure the total cost of such an endeavor, one must add the opportunity cost of travel time, time lost exploring other attractions in the region as well as the various challenges of vacationing with a family of five. Is it all worth it? Of course, that’s why we do it. Sharing a place that I care deeply about with my family is an absolute priority for me. However, *adding* to this considerable cost with ‘unavoidable’ traffic impacts in an already over-congested area? Unacceptable for me, unacceptable for my family. If this is what the future holds, I will be forced to consider exploring one of the many other outdoor treasures that grace this part of the world (not the least of which are comparable ski resorts that are closer to the bay area, with cheaper lift tickets, and no multi-year developments underway).

I28-1

I would like to thank the Planning Department for addressing my concerns and would appreciate being sent (via email, below) all future notices relating to the project and/or the DEIR.

I 128-1
cont.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael Blanchard

231 Richardson Drive
Mill Valley, CA
94941

415-517-0370
mblanch@gmail.com

July 17, 2015

Dear Placer County Board of Supervisors,

My name is Michael Blanchard. I am a resident of Mill Valley, CA and have been a regular visitor to north Lake Tahoe over much of the past 10 years. I ski Squaw Valley and Alpine Meadows regularly and make frequent summer trips to the area to enjoy the various outdoors activities that make Tahoe so great.

Over the course of the last few years, I have been enjoying introducing my daughters (ages three, three and six) to Tahoe with both winter and summer trips. My 6-year old has now skied Squaw enough to begin to learn some of the mountain and share the love for the area that I have.

I am writing to express my concern over specific deficiencies with the draft environmental impact report (DEIR) submitted by Squaw Valley Ski Holdings/Squaw Valley Real Estate/KSL to the board of supervisors. While I am concerned about the manner in which the DEIR addresses several areas of concern – noise/air/light pollution, water usage, disruption of view shed – I am going to focus on the one that means the most to me and my family: traffic. More specifically, I am referencing the “unavoidable” impacts referenced in sections 9-2 through 9-5 of the DEIR.

I have a young family and both my wife and I work. This makes our free time preciously limited and therefore invaluable. At this point in time, most of our Tahoe trips are limited to the major holiday weekends, which obviously expose us to the peak traffic times in the region. While I understand this is the nature of the beast to a certain extent, exacerbating an already horrendous traffic situation is a potential deal-breaker for young families in the region who frequent the area during peak holiday times.

The cost in dollars of a Tahoe get away for a family of five is already significant. However in order to measure the total cost of such an endeavor, one must add the opportunity cost of travel time, time lost exploring other attractions in the region as well as the various challenges of vacationing with a family of five. Is it all worth it? Of course, that’s why we do it. Sharing a place that I care deeply about with my family is an absolute priority for me. However, *adding* to this considerable cost with ‘unavoidable’ traffic impacts in an already over-congested area? Unacceptable for me, unacceptable for my family. If this is what the future holds, I will be forced to consider exploring one of the many other outdoor treasures that grace this part of the world (not the least of which are comparable ski resorts that are closer to the bay area, with cheaper lift tickets, and no multi-year developments underway).

I28-1

I would like to thank the Planning Department for addressing my concerns and would appreciate being sent (via email, below) all future notices relating to the project and/or the DEIR.

I 128-1
cont.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael Blanchard

231 Richardson Drive
Mill Valley, CA
94941

415-517-0370
mfblanch@gmail.com

I28

Michael Blanchard
July 17, 2015

I28-1

The project's traffic-related impacts, including those that were determined to be significant and unavoidable, are addressed in Chapter 9, "Transportation and Circulation," of the DEIR. The commenter's concern about these issues is noted. The Placer County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors will take the commenter's opinions into consideration when making decisions regarding the project. The County notes, however, that the comment infers that the applicant prepared the DEIR. While the applicant provided certain information that was peer reviewed and, when considered accurate and objective, used in the DEIR, the document was prepared by the County and reflects the County's independent judgement regarding the impacts of the project.

July 17, 2015

Maywan Krach, Community Development Technician
Placer County Community Development Resource Agency
3091 County Center Drive, Suite 190
Auburn, CA 95603
Sent by email to cdraecs@placer.ca.gov

Subject: Village at Squaw Valley Specific Plan Draft Environmental Impact Report

Dear Ms. Krach,

My name is Pete Blanchard. I am a current resident of Truckee, CA and have spent the majority of the last 10 years living in different parts of north Lake Tahoe including: Alpine Meadows, Homewood, Tahoe City and Truckee. Prior to living in Tahoe full time, I spent 8 years living and working in San Francisco, visiting Tahoe year round on a regular basis.

Professionally, I spent 8 years on Wall Street working as an institutional trader, three of those at Thomas Weisel Partners, a San Francisco-based investment bank. After my career in finance, I went on to get my masters in Sustainable Management from the Presidio Graduate School. With my background in finance and business degree, I began working with the Mountain Rider’s Alliance, a start-up dedicated to protecting the unique character of our mountain communities. I think my background provides me with a strong foundation and unique set of skills with which to address the Squaw Valley Village development plan and to provide educated and insightful feedback.

In summary, I have a deep understanding of the capital markets, including private equity and real estate (especially ski area) development principles, a graduate degree in sustainable business, a long history of visiting, living, working and playing in the region and above all, a passion for the natural environment, especially Lake Tahoe, which is my home.

I attended the Placer County Planning Commission meeting on 6/25 and rather than speak, I listened and paid close attention to the commentary, trying to draw common threads and gain a better understanding the public concerns regarding the draft environmental impact report (DEIR). The one concern that I heard several times that resonated with me was concerns over the loss of “culture” due to the proposed development. The speakers at the Planning Commission referring to the potential cultural degradation focused on the destruction of historically significant buildings used during the 1960 Olympic games, as well as potential disruption of significant Native American sites. These are addressed in the report under impact 7-1: demolition of historically significant buildings.

While I both respect and recognize the importance of preserving these important aspects of the cultural heritage of Olympic Valley, the cultural loss that rings true in my heart is something quite different. I was born and raised in New Jersey, making the weekly trek to southern Vermont where I learned to ski at Stratton Mountain.

I29-1

From the first time is clicked into my bindings at age three, I knew I had found one of my life's passions. My newfound passion for skiing went far beyond the physical act of sliding down a hill on two planks. The mountains, their natural beauty, the challenges they presented; these are a few examples of the deep connection I felt when I was fully present in my mountain community. I also, at this early age, began to identify with people who shared my passion and connection with the mountains. One group in particular was the locals. My instructors, the servers in the restaurants, the people in the season pass office; I began to detect a bond that we shared, an energy that these folks possessed that I wanted to be close to, to be part of.

Skiing in California was something that was so foreign to me, so exotic; I only saw it in movies. One such movie was Hot Dog: The Movie, famously filmed on site at Squaw Valley. One of the main reasons for me choosing to move to San Francisco after college in 1999 was to explore the Sierra Nevada.

Before this letter is dismissed as another party guy stuck in a lost era let me elaborate. The premise of the movie, the hard-charging skiing, partying, life lived on your terms and on razor thin margins, this is exactly what draws so many people like myself to the great ski towns of the US. As with any town anywhere in the world, with time comes change and Squaw Valley is no different. But as the Valley has encountered change, it has maintained its core identity, that as a Mecca for serious skiers and people who like to enjoy life. Is this Squaw's core money-making business segment? Absolutely not. Most of these people (present company included) find a way to get someone else to pay for their pass, usually bring their own beer and food to the hill and if they don't rarely pay full price for those services on the mountain. However, this group that I am now proud to call myself part of is *critical* to the culture of Olympic Valley; that work hard, play hard ethos that is increasingly lost in today's super-charged economic machine of a society.

Having spent several years living in the Bay Area, living a very similar 'weekend warrior' existence to that which I was raised in, I recognized this group immediately. They were the same passionate people I connected with in Vermont when I was a kid. The locals, the dirt bags. They lived day-to-day making a fraction of what the wealthy out of state visitors did, and yet they were happier. This is exactly what I saw at Squaw and the greater north Lake Tahoe region; and the single biggest reason I moved to the basin full time in the fall of 2006.

Having been raised as a visitor to a ski town, then having experienced again as an adult living in northern California, and then moving to Tahoe full time, I feel that my perspective is somewhat unique. While living in San Francisco, my friends and I did whatever we could to spend as much time in Tahoe as possible. We were drawn to the culture and vibe of Squaw Valley. We looked at the locals, as I did as a kid in Vermont, and wondered "what are they doing right that I'm not?" We just wanted to be around it.

The scale and scope of this development severely threatens the viability of this group of locals' existence in and around Olympic Valley. We don't come for water slides, time shares, paid parking and luxury hotels. In fact, we disdain these modern

I29-1
cont.

“marvels” and are rather drawn to the beauty of nature, the challenge of the Sierra Nevada and the camaraderie that develops between those that truly appreciate this place for what it is. Sadly, as has been the case in several other major US ski areas, the development goes in and the locals are pushed out. What the developers don’t realize (and if they do, they absolutely don’t care) is that as those locals are pushed out, much of the culture that is indigenous to that region is pushed out as well. And with those people and their culture goes the draw for so many visitors who share that a similar passion for the mountains and the natural beauty and challenges they present.

Will this development bring more people to the Tahoe basin? Absolutely. But it will be people who are looking for indoor amusement parks, luxury hotels and high-priced amenities. People who tolerate hellacious traffic, rampant disregard for the natural environment and have a fraction of the knowledge and more importantly *respect* for nature. Look at the growing problems of traffic, trash left on beaches and other problems associated with major holiday weekends in north lake. This is only going to get worse, as the DEIR clearly states.

But my number one concern and focus of this letter is the irreparable damage to the culture of both Olympic Valley and the greater Tahoe City/Truckee corridor. Once the buildings go up and the ‘new’ crowd fills in, the old crowd will be mostly gone and not looking back. And gone with them will be the customs, practices and *culture* that make this place so special. The visitors who value this culture, the people who appreciate what north lake is, will move elsewhere to find the same experience. The make up of the community, both residents and visitors will shift from one that is characterized by the quest for an authentic mountain experience and a true appreciation for the natural beauty of the region and the various *outdoor* opportunities it furnishes, to one that is determined by disposable income, man-made attractions and activities, and a general lack of understanding and respect for the natural characteristics of the land.

I would like to thank the Planning Department for their consideration and would like to be updated (via email) any updates regarding the EIR or the plan itself.

Respectfully Submitted,



Pete Blanchard
11463 Silver Fir Drive
Truckee, CA
96161

Peteblanchard31@gmail.com
415-254-4503

I29-1
cont

I29

Pete Blanchard
July 17, 2015

I29-1

The comment provides an opinion regarding the merits or qualities of the proposed project and does not address the content, analysis, or conclusions in the DEIR. The Placer County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors will take the commenter's opinions into consideration when making decisions regarding the project.

I30

Maywan Krach

From: Judy Bloch <theblochs@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 14, 2015 8:04 PM
To: Placer County Environmental Coordination Services
Subject: dEIR for KSL SV proposal

July 14, 2015

Re: dEIR for KSL proposal for Squaw Valley ATT: Maywan Krach

Dear Ms. Krach:

Identifying ourselves: We, Spencer and Judy Bloch, have owned a dwelling at the head of Squaw Valley for 44 years, before the birth of our children. Original owners of a Squaw Peak Condo, after the birth of our 3rd child, we traded up to a larger, Squaw Tram Condo when they were built.

Why we are writing: 1) For ourselves, our children and their spouses, and now even our school age grandchildren, SV has been a place cherished by all 3 generations for its unsurpassed tranquility, beauty, and restful ambience during non-winter months, and beauty, comfort and full satisfaction of the extant winter activities--in all seasons an absolutely remarkable and unparalleled refuge of solitude and fun from all manner of the proverbial "slings and arrows" that complicate daily living.

I30-1

a) What does that have to do with critically assessing errors or omissions in the dEIR?

i) In letters responding to NOPs in August and November of 2012, we emphasized that this unique ambience is what draws homeowners and visitors alike in all seasons—of whom we have known many in 44

I30-2

years of paying property and transient occupancy taxes. Despite having been “modestly revised several times” (2.2.1) since January 2014, the dEIR’s enumeration of 23 “significant and unavoidable negative environmental impacts” (Section 2.2) persuasively attests to the inadequacy of revisions, essentially by highlighting the basic problem of this proposal. That is to completely change the longstanding ethos, respect for and quality of life into the opposite, in KSL’s words, by creating a “world class vibrant village” with “high energy offerings”. Yet those 23 impacts bespeak the overriding magnitude, if not impossibility, of reconciling these two models. It is because of the size and orientation of the proposal that we began this letter with our overview of SV as it relates to the dEIR. For we feel it is vital to always keep the big picture in mind, so as not to lose sight of the woods for the trees when requested to focus on a myriad of details. A representative of KSL may have underscored this point best at a presentation to the SV Property Owners Association on January 18, 2014. He candidly observed that if their project is successful, the only potential advantage to current homeowners is increase in their property values. That would hardly seem sufficient justification for changing the whole character and nature of Squaw Valley, so that the developer can make a financial killing and then get out of town. (Parenthetically, at the outset, is it possible that incompatibility between the SVGPLUO and Specific Plan regarding jurisdiction, and Placer County Policy 1.G.1, that expansion of existing and development of new areas will be supported “where environmental impacts can be adequately mitigated”, represents grounds for rejecting this dEIR outright?

I30-2
cont.

I30-3

ii) KSL has addressed visual impacts, e.g., on scenic vistas (2.2.1) and degradation of the visual character and quality (2.2.1). But perhaps by focusing on the subjective aspect of this type of impact (8.1), the dEIR did not give sufficient attention to the integration of the individual elements and their coalescence into their ultimate effects. Doing so would clarify how completely opposite are these two models, and how KSL’s “concessions” regarding population density and height of buildings have been more token offerings than substantive reductions. Their intention of mimicking and competing with other destination resorts (located in significantly larger areas) remains unmodified. In fairness to KSL, we should perhaps be charitable with such observations, or ones like that quoted in the dEIR regarding visual impacts, namely that only homeowners would be negatively affected. Stipulations that the ambience not be significantly altered (SVGP 1983/4), have not been sufficiently heeded with respect to density of population and reduced height and scale of buildings. Yet these would seem the only ways to reconcile their wishes with those who are already here; and at least some, if not most of the 23 unavoidable negative environmental impacts (Section 2.2) would become avoidable and more readily reconciled. But to this point KSL still seems incessantly preoccupied with trying to jam a large, square peg into a smaller round hole.

I30-4

2) Turning now from the overview to specific elements of the dEIR, we will focus only on a couple, realizing how many more could be commented upon. The issues involving visual/scenic damage and cumulative degradation of the environment were addressed in what we have covered above (1). We will focus most briefly on only a couple of others.

I30-5

3) Ref: Lots 16/17/18/19

a) re: legality.

i) Is it within stipulations of the SVPLUO to trade lots and to trade uses of these lots, HC for CP and FR as proposed? I 130-5
cont.

ii) Is it in compliance with the SVGPLUO to allow lots 17 & 18 to encroach upon and carve into the steep hillside at an area of entry into the east side of the Shirley Canyon wilderness directly adjacent to/north of those lots? I 130-6

b) re: safety.

i) I don't think that the dEIR has paid sufficient attention to the significant risks to residents and the Creek if great quantities of propane are stored on Lot 19. The humans risk significant physical danger from explosions and the Creek risks contamination by toxic materials. I 130-7

3) The current conception of the MAC (Mountain Adventure Camp) appears to replicate indoors many of the 22 recreational activities identified and recommended out-of-doors in the SVGP (p. 30). I'm not sure the dEIR has given sufficient attention to the justification for that huge, controversial, view blocking and distracting structure in the center of an outdoor world of wonders. Also, is it truly in compliance with the letter and intent of the SVGP, or with County Policy (1.G.1), whichever has precedence? I 130-8

Lastly, the magnitude of this sea changing project and KSL's response to the views of the community (characterized more by pleasant lip-service than significant actions), plus the length for its build-out and fact that the dEIR relates the latter to market forces, as well as KSL's lack of vested interest in staying the course, all incline us to urge you not to grant KSL any entitlements, and most especially ones that would in any way reduce the influence of the homeowners regarding decisions that are important to their welfare. As sociable as KSL may have been to work with, and no matter how much money they have spent in trying to win over SV, we owe them nothing and we hope you'll never forget that as you analyze this dEIR. I 130-9

We certainly do thank you for your attention to and consideration of our comments.

Sincerely,

Spencer and Judy Bloch

Squaw Tram Condominiums #6, Olympic Valley, CA 96146. Tel: (530) 583-6046.

54 Reed Ranch Rd, Tiburon, CA 9492-2083. Tel: (415) 388-2696.

I30

Spencer & Judy Bloch
July 14, 2015

- I30-1 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.
- I30-2 See the Master Response regarding significant and unavoidable impacts. No specific issues related to the content, analysis, or conclusions in the DEIR are raised in this comment. No further response is provided here.
- I30-3 See the Master Response regarding significant and unavoidable impacts, including a discussion of Placer County General Plan Policy 1.G.1.
- I30-4 See the Master Response regarding the visual impact analysis. No specific issues related to the content, analysis, or conclusions in the DEIR are raised in this comment. No further response is provided here.
- I30-5 The comment provides a summary of comments provided above and below. See responses to those comments.
- Regarding Lots 16, 17, 18, and 19, the comment asks if it is within the stipulations of the SVPLUO to trade lots and to trade uses of these lots (for example, HC for CP and FR). This is allowed with an amendment to the SVGPLUO, as described in Section 3.5.1, "Planning Entitlements and Approvals from Placer County," on page 3-39 of the DEIR. As described therein, one of the planning entitlements the project applicant is requesting from Placer County is an amendment of the SVGPLUO to incorporate the Specific Plan and a rezone of the plan area to include the Specific Plan zoning designations. As stated on page 3-39 of the DEIR,
- For the most part, the rezones are provided to better align the existing and proposed land uses with the appropriate zoning. For example, most of the Squaw Creek corridor is currently zoned Village Commercial and would be rezoned to Village – Conservation Preservation under the proposed project. Other rezones are necessary for the relocation of certain land uses. For example, Mountain Maintenance would be moved to Lot 19, which would therefore be rezoned to Village – Heavy Commercial (see Exhibits 3-4 and 3-5). Additional information regarding the location of proposed zoning districts, and uses permitted within each district, is available in the proposed VSVSP.
- I30-6 Regarding Lots 17 and 18, the comment asks if it is in compliance with the SVGPLUO to allow these lots to encroach upon and carve into the steep hillside at an area of entry into the east side of the Shirley Canyon wilderness. Lots 17 and 18 are located in the Village Neighborhood, in the northwestern corner of the project site. This area is partially disturbed and a portion is currently forested. Under the SVGPLUO, these lots are primarily zoned Village Commercial and High Density Residential with a smaller portion zoned Forest Recreation; they would be rezoned to include the newly created SPL-VSVSP zoning and would be designated Village Commercial-Neighborhood under the VSVSP. Under the existing SVGPLUO, both the Village Commercial and High Density Residential land use designations permit for development of land uses and densities that are consistent with the proposed Village Commercial-Neighborhood land use designation. Moreover, while a small portion of Lot 18 is currently designated Forest Recreation and would be rezoned to include the Village Commercial-Neighborhood land use designation, the plan area creates, on the whole, 4.28

- acres more Forest Recreation zoning than currently exists. See also the Master Response regarding the SVGPLUO.
- I30-7 See the Master Response regarding the mountain maintenance facility.
- I30-8 See the Master Response regarding the MAC and the Master Response regarding significant and unavoidable impacts, which includes a discussion of Placer County General Plan Policy 1.G.1.
- I30-9 The comment is directed towards the project approval process and does not address the content, analysis, or conclusions in the DEIR. Therefore, no further response is provided here. All comment letters submitted during the DEIR public review period will be reviewed and considered by the Placer County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors before a decision on the project is rendered.

I31

Maywan Krach

From: Emily Boronkay <eboronkay@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2015 3:14 PM
To: Placer County Environmental Coordination Services
Subject: KSL Capital Partners development of Squaw Valley

Dear Placer County officials,

I am writing to express my concern over the environmental impact of the proposed development. I moved to this area from San Diego for the quiet, reduced traffic, air-quality, water quality, and a way of life that has long disappeared in San Diego.

I31-1

In my short year here, living on Squaw Valley Road, I have experienced traffic that creates horrible black dust. Fortunately that is mostly on weekends and holidays. The proposed development would increase traffic, reduce air quality, put the life of Lake Tahoe itself at risk with run off from traffic and sewage and increased trash and everything else that comes with this sort of project.

The silica dust that it will put in the air will put at risk the health of people who live along Squaw Valley Road. Let us not forget that Squaw Valley Academy boarding school students and staff will be put at risk by all the effects of increased traffic.

I31-2

KSL Capital Partners wants to put in a 10 story building with a footprint the size of a large Walmart with an indoor waterpark, amusement park, 1500 bedrooms. They want to widen the entire road up into Squaw to four lanes. The construction itself will disrupt life up here in a way that is antithetical to Tahoe life.

I31-3

We also don't have the aquifer in Squaw to support this. Water is already an issue up here. Have you seen the Truckee River up here with grass growing in it?

I31-4

On Sunday, July 5, my 20 minute trip out of Squaw to get to church took 45 minutes, at 9:30 am! Friends trying to go to Truckee later in the day reported it taking over an hour just to get to I 80. Can we really afford to increase traffic beyond what we already sometimes have?

I31-5

I apologize if this is a little rambling. I only just learned about this project this week and I'm still a little in shock that I may have uprooted my entire life to come somewhere where I'm going to have to watch it be destroyed in the way that I saw San Diego eaten away until I could no longer stand to live there.

I31-6

Please do not approve this project.

May Love and Blessings fill your life,

Emily Boronkay
Director of the Academic Support Program Squaw Valley Academy
235 Squaw Valley Road
Olympic Valley, Ca 96146

Grateful & Loved follower of Jesus Christ

I31Emily Boronkay
July 17, 2015

- I31-1 The comment provides a summary of detailed comments provided below. See responses to the detailed comments below.
- I31-2 The comment asserts that the project would result in silica dust that could affect the health of people who live along Squaw Valley Road. Without greater clarification, it is assumed this is in reference to the dust that results from the application of sand onto the roadway surface during snow and ice conditions. Some sand can contain silica, depending on the source of the sand. There is no simple method for determining whether more roadside dust would be generated due to increased traffic volumes on Squaw Valley Road as a result of the VSVSP. Generally, an increase in the number of vehicles traveling along the road would result in more frequent re-entrainment of dust into the air; but, greater traffic volumes could also result in slower traffic speeds, which could result in less dust being emitted into the air.
- See also response to comment I282-4 and Section 10, "Air Quality," of the DEIR for a discussion of the project's potential effects on air quality and impacts to sensitive receptors, including the effects of increased traffic.
- I31-3 The comment provides an opinion regarding the merits or qualities of the proposed project and does not address the content, analysis, or conclusions in the DEIR. The Placer County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors will take the commenter's opinions into consideration when making decisions regarding the project.
- The statement regarding widening Squaw Valley Road to four lanes is incorrect. As noted on pages 3-15 and 3-16 of the DEIR,
- Beginning at its intersection with Far East Road, Squaw Valley Road would be striped with two 12-foot travel lanes, a 12-foot two-way left-turn lane, and 10-foot shoulders on both sides (plus 3-foot curb and gutter sections). The two-way left-turn lane would be utilized as a left turn lane at Village East Road and would provide an acceleration lane for westbound turn movements from Village East Road onto Squaw Valley Road. Squaw Valley Road would then continue southward from the intersection with Chamonix Place, going into the Village resort core as a two-lane road.
- I31-4 See the Master Response regarding water supply for a discussion of proposed groundwater extraction. The effects of increased groundwater production on groundwater patterns, recharge, and aquifer storage in the Olympic Valley Groundwater Basin, as well as changes to interactions between groundwater and surface water are also addressed in Chapter 13, "Hydrology and Water Quality," of the DEIR.
- I31-5 The comment relates to existing and potential traffic congestion in the project area. The potential impact of vehicle traffic generated by the project on roads is analyzed in Chapter 9, "Transportation and Circulation," in the DEIR.
- I31-6 The comment is a conclusory statement and does not address the content, analysis, or conclusions in the DEIR. Therefore, a response is not provided here.

132

Maywan Krach

From: Lauren Bosche <laurenbosche@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 23, 2015 3:17 PM
To: Placer County Environmental Coordination Services
Subject: Comment Letter

June 23, 2015

Placer County Community Development Resource Agency
Attention: Maywan Krach
3091 County Center Drive, Suite 190
Auburn, CA 95603

COMMENT LETTER FROM:

Lauren Bosche laurenbosche@gmail.com

Dear Placer County Community Development Resource Agency,

I would like to stand up for Squaw Valley and the Tahoe Sierra and ask that you please deny the KSL Capital Partners development proposal. Regarding KSL's Squaw Valley proposal even a quick read of the draft EIR makes it clear that the proposed development would transform Squaw Valley into a noisy, urbanized place. In the terminology of the draft EIR, the proposed development would have "significant" and "unavoidable" impacts on Squaw Valley – and beyond. For example:

132-1

- *Traffic:* According to the document, development would add to area traffic and "exacerbate unacceptable operations" on Squaw Valley Road, on Highway 89 in Tahoe City, in Truckee, and in between.
- *Views:* To Squaw's iconic mountain scenery, the project would make a "substantial contribution to the cumulative degradation of the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings" with a "significant and unavoidable impact on scenic vistas."
- *Noise:* The project would generate noise louder than "applicable Placer County noise standards", especially for the 25 years it would be under construction – even at night.

132-2

I disagree strongly with KSL's development plan. Thank you very much for denying it.

Best Regards,

Lauren Bosche

laurenbosche@gmail.com

I32Lauren Bosche
June 23, 2015

- I32-1 The comment is directed towards the project approval process and does not address the content, analysis, or conclusions in the DEIR. Therefore, no further response is provided here. All comment letters submitted during the DEIR public review period will be reviewed and considered by the Placer County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors before a decision on the project is rendered.
- I32-2 The comment provides a summary of the DEIR's significant and unavoidable impacts that are of concern to the commenter, specifically traffic, views, and noise. These issues are addressed in the DEIR and in Master Responses in this FEIR. No specific issues related to the content, analysis, or conclusions in the DEIR are raised in this comment. No further response is provided here.

July 17, 2015

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

Sent by email to: cdraecs@placer.ca.gov

Dear Ms. Krach,

As full time residents of Alpine Meadows we have serious concerns about the proposed Village at Squaw Valley Specific Plan (PSPA 20110385, State Clearing House No. 2012102023) (VSVSP). We have lived in Squaw Valley, Alpine Meadows or at the Lake for 29 years. We built a home in Alpine Meadows, work in Tahoe City and Truckee and our children attend school in Tahoe City. These valleys, mountains, and the Tahoe Basin are our home. We have seen many changes to the area in the past 29 years and strongly feel that the area is reaching its carrying capacity and cannot undergo any further environmental and social impacts that will forever change the experience of living in and visiting Squaw Valley, Alpine Meadows and the Lake Tahoe basin.

133-1

The 23 Significant Environmental Impacts that cannot be mitigated, according to Placer County’s Draft EIR, are staggering. The County can NOT allow such extensive social and environmental impacts to occur. The sheer number of significant environmental impacts would without question cause irreparable damage to Squaw Valley and Alpine Meadows and the greater Lake Tahoe area.

The EIR fails to address the cumulative impacts of the proposed Alpine Sierra development in Alpine Meadows (the Draft EIR is under preparation by the County), when those impacts are added to the impacts of the Squaw Village proposal. Additionally, there is the recently announced White Wolf housing and resort development in Alpine (38 houses, small resort, more chairlifts), and the recently announced KSL gondola connecting Squaw and Alpine. The cumulative impacts of all these projects increase and exacerbate the following:

133-2

- The scale of the proposed buildings in Squaw Valley is beyond anything else in the North Tahoe area. Buildings of this stature will irrevocably change the character of Squaw Valley. We will see the buildings and not the mountains.

133-3
- **light pollution** We have experienced light pollution from Squaw Valley since we moved to Alpine in 1996, which has never been addressed by the County. The DEIR does not address the night sky pollution but in a cursory manner. Night sky, the ability to view our galaxy, is a particularly valuable component of the Tahoe environment. The night sky has been degraded over the past 50 years by increments of development. The Squaw project would have major and lasting impacts not only to Squaw residents and visitors, but to all of Alpine Meadows and other nearby communities. The analyses of offsite impacts has not been addressed, omitting the analysis of a potentially significant impact to the social and cultural environment. This development will erase any chance to ever sleep out on the deck and watch the stars under a dark sky.

133-4
- **water quality** degradation and further regulatory noncompliance in the Truckee River, Bear Creek and Squaw Creek

133-5
- **water supply** for Alpine Meadows and Squaw Valley

133-6
- **roads** with the increase in volume of visitors does this mean highway 89 will be slated to become a 4 lane highway? This will gravely impact the people living in the Truckee River corridor, as well as all of us that live here.

133-7
- **Impact on Granite Chief Wilderness**—light pollution, noise, visual impact

133-8
- **loss of Critical Habitats**-- As described in the DEIR, the Five Lakes Subunit (Subunit 2D) is a critical habitat for the Sierra Nevada yellow-legged frog, which the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) listed as an endangered species in April 2014. The Five Lakes Subunit (Subunit 2D) intersects the project site as it follows

133-9

Squaw Creek from the upper watershed into the Village Core area. The development clearly impacts Critical Habitat, a natural resource that must be protected.

I33-9
cont.

The management plan for the Loyalton-Truckee Deer Herd (CDFG 1982, 2010b) documents the Olympic Valley as part of the Loyalton-Truckee Deer Herd summer and migratory range. The 1982 Loyalton-Truckee Deer Herd Management Plan is 30 years old, and deer migratory and fawning patterns have shifted over time. Climate change is putting additional stresses on these mammals. Migratory habitat losses and fragmentation have increased throughout the herds' range because of residential development. Given the age of the Loyalton-Truckee Deer Herd Management Plan (Deer Herd Plan), the increased development in the area, and the current knowledge of climate change impacts to wildlife habitats and wildlife needs, the potential impacts of the proposed project are not adequately evaluated.

I33-10

The DEIR does not adequately address the impacts to black bear habitat. There are many bears living in this general area and the development over a 25 year period would not only irreparably damage their habitat, but would also cause additional risks of human-bear encounters.

I33-11

• **Visual impacts**

- Impact 18-14: Substantial adverse cumulative effect on a scenic vista.
- Impact 18-15: Substantial contribution to the cumulative degradation of the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings.
- Impact 18-16: Substantial cumulative contribution to damage to scenic resources, including but not limited to trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a scenic highway.
- Impact 18-18: Contribute to cumulative light and glare or skyglow effects in the region.

I33-12

- **25 years of construction**

I 133-12
cont.

Why do people come to Tahoe? Why will they return if it is just like every other ski/resort town with gridlock traffic and city amenities? What are we doing to Squaw Valley and the great natural resources of the Tahoe Basin. We want our guests to get out and explore and experience the things we all moved here for... hiking in the Sierras, exploring canyons, swimming in rivers and lakes and skiing.

I 133-13

Thank you for your consideration of these comments. Please feel free to contact either if desired.

Sincerely,

Ingrid and David Bourke
1941 Cub Lane
Alpine Meadows, CA 96146
530.583.1842