

141

To: Placer County Community Development Resource Agency, Environmental Coordination Services ; Attention: Maywan Krach

Date: July 1, 2015

I would like to address a number of the consequences of the proposed Village at Squaw Valley as stated in the Specific Plan and the DEIR. My first point is that the proposed development could affect the economy of Squaw Valley. In Section 1.4, "a social or economic change related to a physical change may be considered in determining whether the physical change is significant." I would argue that the entire development is making a huge physical and social change to the current village in all aspects such as parking, sense of personal space, crowds of people, views, skiing/hiking enjoyment. These physical and social changes could decrease the economic viability of Squaw Valley.

141-1

I believe that a number of factors will impact the number of visitors, especially skiers and snowboarders. One factor is climate change, the effects of which are spelled out in Chapter 16." Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger in 2005, proclaims that California is vulnerable to the impacts of climate change." (Executive Order S-3-05) One effect, as stated by DWR, is that the "the sierra snowpack will experience a 25-40% reduction from its historic average by 2050." (16.1.2). Table 9.1 shows that the number of skier visits to Squaw Valley Ski Resort has dramatically decreased from 713,393 to 389,395. Thus a decrease in the number of visitors to Squaw Valley will certainly impact the economic vitality of the valley.

141-2

Stated in Impact 4.5, (Section 4, Land Use and Forest Resources) the Economic Impact and Urban Decay Analysis (EIDA) has suggested that the project would not add to an oversupply of land uses within the North Tahoe area. Demand for housing in the Tahoe market area is expected to outpace the increase in supply. However this figure does not necessarily relate to Squaw Valley specifically. Squaw Valley historically has not had full capacity in bedrooms. My argument is that with a decrease in number of skiers, winter visitors will not seek out Squaw Valley, but chose to stay in less expensive lodging in Truckee and Tahoe City. (Also more activities are available in Truckee and Tahoe City.) Skiers, who do not live in Squaw Valley, may also turn to Utah and Colorado where the snowpack is more predictable. Visitors from other countries may choose not to ski at Squaw with years of low snow pack. Again a decrease in the number of visitors will affect the economic vitality of Squaw.

141-3

Although the use of the MAC might attract more visitors, the developer (Section 9.3.2) states that visitors probably will not come to just use the MAC. The MAC visitors are "expected to be skiers already staying on site or extending the length of a day skier visit." (To be noted also that Plumpjack, the Resort at Squaw Creek, and the Squaw Valley Estates also plan to expand number of rooms available for visitors.) One last point is that if construction does take 25 years, visitors may be turned off by cranes, trucks, and general construction noise and inconvenience. If the developer created fewer rooms, the

141-4

number of years for construction would decrease. Thus the economic viability of adding 1493 bedrooms in 850 units in Squaw Valley, especially in the winter, may be questionable. A specter could be raised of an over-built village with many empty rooms.

I41-4  
cont.

SVRE states as an objective to to be a world-class resort ...to be on a par with peer world class North American ski destinations and be economically sustainable." (2.13, Section 2, Executive Summary) The ski terrain of Squaw Valley and Alpine Meadows can in no way compete against Vail and Whistler, which are world-class ski areas. Much of the vaulted skiing at Squaw Valley is for experts on K-T, Headwall, Granite Chief and the Palisades. Shirley Canyon, Mountain Run, Big Blue runs are for intermediate skiers. Unless one is an expert skier/snowboarder, Squaw Valley is limiting especially compared to the expanse of slopes at Vail and Whistler. SVRE should look to creating a smaller truly unique Alpine ski area, a special niche, with fewer hotels and condos. Obviously a smaller ski area has much less environmental impact over-all such as related to noise, views, light, water consumption, and general energy consumption.

I41-5

Section 8, Visual Resources, has shown well the impact of the proposed buildings on the views. Exhibit 8-11 clearly shows the 90,000' foot print and 108' height MAC dominating the view. As stated in 8-1, the impact of the proposed buildings (especially the size of the MAC) to occasional visitors is less than significant because they have no expectations what the view was previously. However the greatly altered view as one enters Squaw Valley would be "significant to permanent residents of the Valley." I would add that not only for the Squaw Valley residents is the altered view significant, but also to the 1400 Squaw Valley property owners (who pay Placer County taxes) and hundreds of locals who have skied Squaw Valley for many years. Condo owners, such as those in Olympic Village Inn, will be hugely impacted by the buildings shown in Exhibit 8-19. They clearly lose views of the mountain. The screening of the buildings by trees, Exhibits 8-11 and 8-12, do mitigate the impact of the views. If the 7-8 story buildings, which may be built in the new Village, were 4 stories high, planted trees could help soften the visual impact.

I41-6

Over-all, the proposed buildings give an urban feel to this mountain village. The term "pedestrian friendly pathways" tries to soften the effect of corridors between multi-storied buildings. Table 3.3 and Exhibit 3-16 (Section 3, Project Description) show "open space network" including a 150-200 foot-wide conservation corridor along the creek. Interpretive stations will be built along the creek. These open spaces and walkways are an added attraction for visitors, but hardly take away the large visual impact of the proposed hotels and condos. One more point, in this programmatic proposal one cannot be assured that the architecture, as shown in the Specific Plan and the visuals in Chapter 8, will be how the Village will really look.

I41-7

The developers do not seem to take into account that Squaw Valley is a box canyon with limited space to expand. Compared to resorts such as Vail, Sun Valley, Jackson Hole, Whistler, Squaw Valley does not have the room to expand without filling up the end of the valley. The very large MAC does not fit into the environs of Squaw Valley. The MAC is simply too big a building. The environmental impact on such a small valley is

I41-8

huge. Again the developer's proposal, as stated in the Specific Plan, will greatly alter the natural beauty of Squaw with its surrounding mountains and granite peaks. I 141-8  
cont.

Among the benefits touted by the developer (Section 3) are improved hiking and biking trails in Squaw Valley. Flush toilets would be added to the park. However as true bikers and hikers know, there are ample trails around North Tahoe to enjoy. The SVRE plans for a very large development with significant environmental impacts related to views, water, noise, lights, traffic are a large price to pay for a few improved hiking and biking trails. Especially significant to hikers is the environmental impact of the fractional homes and resident roads at the bottom of Shirley Canyon. Much is given up forever in these 8.8 acres in Shirley Canyon (Lot 19) for the enjoyment of a few home-owners. I 141-9

The impact of increased traffic cannot be mitigated as stated in the DEIR (Section 9) especially on big ski days. However currently the proposal has no plan, except for cones which are already used and traffic information on one's phone, to mitigate the traffic jams on Highway 89 and also into Alpine Meadows. Potentially skiers from the Bay Area and Sacramento on holidays and week-ends will be turned off by traffic jams. An argument consistently used by SVRE is with increased number of rooms, people will stay rather than leave the valley. Since currently not all beds are filled in the valley, how can SVSH prove that statement? Consequently if the number of skiers decreases because of traffic (as well as climate change), are all the proposed 1470 rooms needed in the valley? I 141-10

Above I have commented on some of the analyses of the DEIR. Over-all the SVRE proposed village for Squaw Valley has too many significant and unavoidable impacts to overcome to truly benefit future visitors as well as for those who have enjoyed Squaw for many years. We therefore ask the Placer County Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors to reject the proposed project because of its significant and unavoidable impacts, and require the applicant to submit an alternative with fewer bedrooms, lower heights and revised project features I 141-11

.....  
 Written by Sally Brew, PhD. I have taught at San Jose State for 20 years, worked at Lockheed for 10 years, and NASA for 4 years. My working years have made me aware of dealing with facts, not suppositions. I first came to Squaw Valley in 1956. Since then I have come to Squaw regularly with my husband, Dave, and four daughters to enjoy its natural beauty, as well as opportunities for hiking and skiing. I have been a property owner in Squaw Valley, off and on, since 1964. Obviously much has changed as the resort has developed over the years.

Thank you for the opportunity to address the above issues. I look forward to receiving any future information about the SVRE Squaw Valley village development.

Sent by: Sally (Alice) Brew  
 629 Benvenue Ave.  
 Los Altos, Ca. 94024  
 sdbrew1@ mindspring.com

---

**I41**Sally (Alice) Brew  
July 1, 2015

---

- I41-1 The project's potential socioeconomic impacts are addressed in Chapter 4, "Land Use and Forest Resources," of the DEIR (see Impact 4-5 on pages 4-29 through 4-31).
- I41-2 Impacts of climate change on the project are addressed in Chapter 16, "Greenhouse Gases and Climate Change," of the DEIR (see Impact 16-3 on pages 16-20 through 16-21). As discussed therein, climate change is projected to result in a variety of effects that would influence conditions in the Specific Plan area including increased temperatures, leading to increased risk of wildfire, flooding, and avalanches. A reduction in the sierra snowpack as it relates to the number of visitors to Squaw Valley and the economic vitality of the valley is a business issue and not an environmental impact in the context of CEQA. As stated in the State CEQA Guidelines (Section 15131), the economic or social effects of a project shall not be treated as significant effects on the environment. Further, the project applicant is seeking to make the Village at Squaw Valley a more attractive summer destination by adding amenities that are not reliant on snowfall (e.g., the MAC).
- The comment also refers to Table 9-1 in Chapter 9, "Transportation and Circulation," of the DEIR as evidence that the number of skier visits has dramatically decreased due to the effects of climate change. While it is true that this table shows an overall reduction in skier visits from the 2010-2011 season to the 2013-2014 season, it also shows an increase in skier visits from the 2011-2012 season to the 2012-2013 season. As described in the introductory text on page 9-4 of the DEIR, "Visitor levels in the study area during the winter season are dependent on weather and snow conditions." As such, skier visits increase and decrease depending on the amount and quality of snow in any given ski season, among other factors. Visitor levels in the study area are also dependent on other factors such as the timing of fresh snow fall (i.e., weekend vs. weekday) whether holidays fall on or near weekends. Further, Table 9-1 presents four years of travel data, which makes it difficult to generalize as to the reasons for the year-to-year fluctuations in skier visits in the context of longer time scale trends, such as climate change. Ultimately, Table 9-1 is meant to provide some context as to why the 2011-2012 ski season was selected as the most appropriate winter season data set for establishing the existing setting.
- I41-3 See response to comments I41- and I41-2. Also, see the Master Response regarding occupancy assumptions.
- I41-4 See the Master Response regarding the 25-year construction period. Also, see the Master Response regarding occupancy assumptions.
- I41-5 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.
- Alternatives to the proposed project, including a Reduced Density Alternative that would reduce some but not all of the project's impacts, are described and evaluated in Chapter 17, "Alternatives," of the DEIR. See also the Master Response regarding the Reduced Density Alternative.
- I41-6 See the Master Response regarding the visual impact analysis for definition of viewer groups.

- I41-7            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.
- As described in the DEIR (on pages 8-53 through 8-54), the project would be developed using the Development Standards and Design Guidelines, which include architectural design, exterior treatments and colors, and landscaping (see Appendix B of the Specific Plan). Further, Mitigation Measure 8-2b in the DEIR requires the project applicant to obtain Design Review approval from the Placer County Design/Site Review Committee (D/SRC) prior to submittal of Improvement Plans or Building Permits. Mitigation Measure 8-2b requires review and approval by the County to such project components as: colors, materials, and textures of all structures; landscaping; signs; exterior lighting; and entry features. The Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP), included as Chapter 4 of this FEIR, identifies the specific funding, timing, and monitoring requirements for implementation of all mitigation measures identified in the DEIR. All of the mitigation measures would be monitored through the County's implementation of the MMRP. As indicated in the text of each mitigation measure, compliance with each would be verified by County staff prior to issuance of required approvals and permits.
- I41-8            See the Master Response regarding the MAC.
- I41-9            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. See also responses to comment letter F2 regarding trails.
- I41-10           See the Master Response regarding traffic and response to comment O8d-14 regarding effectiveness of traffic mitigation measures, and the Master Response regarding occupancy assumptions.
- I41-11           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. See also the Master Response regarding significant and unavoidable impacts.

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](mailto:cdraecs@placer.ca.gov)

June 14, 2015

Dear Ms. Krach,

We are homeowners on John Scott Trail in Alpine Meadows, owning two properties (1743 John Scott Trail and 1751 John Scott Trail) for more than 15 years. We have reviewed the Draft EIR (DEIR) for the Village at Squaw Valley Specific Plan (PSPA 20110385, State Clearing House No. 2012102023) (VSVSP). Our comments follow.

Summary:

We are very concerned about a number of irreparable environmental impacts, which according to the findings presented in the EIR will result from the proposed VSVSP. While the development plan does suggest specific mitigation efforts to lessen the direct environmental impact caused by the construction and on-going operation of the proposed development, the habitat destruction and the large increase to the permanent and tourist population will result in "significant and unavoidable impact", as defined by the EIR. We have detailed our concerns with regard to the specific environmental resources below:

I  
I42-1  
I

Population, Employment, and Housing (Chapter 5):

The proposed project would result in a significant increase in local population, with an emphasis on seasonal resort workers, resort visitors, and construction workers (up to 136 according to the EIR). Transient populations, lacking a vested interest in the long term effects they impose on the Squaw Valley environment, will have an outsized negative effect. If allowed, this population will result in an unavoidable increase in street and pedestrian traffic, water usage, waste production and treatment requirements, air quality, and noise pollution.

I  
I42-2  
I

The project is expected to generate an additional 574 new FTE employees annually. The project would need to provide housing for 386 employees (287 new employees plus 99 replacement housing facilities) to meet the Placer County policy. Under the current illustrative plan, employee housing units (in different bedroom and dormitory configurations) would be constructed on the East Parcel to house a maximum of 300 employees. This would be less than the required number of beds to meet *Placer County General Plan* policies for new employee housing. Since the VSVSP is not in accordance with the *Placer County General Plan*, the plan for achieving compliance has not been defined by this DEIR, and the ultimate environmental impact cannot be assessed.

I  
I42-3  
I

Biological Resources (Chapter 6):

Impact 6-9 Tree Removal – The project proposes removing trees to make room for new construction and mitigating the impact to the environment by replanting trees in an alternate location on an inch-for-inch basis. The DEIR finds this mitigation effort to be acceptable; however, it would take decades if not a century for newly planted trees to truly replace the large mature trees that would be removed by the

I  
I42-4  
I

proposed project. In addition, creation of a denser forest in one area cannot offset the negative impact to animal populations of reducing the overall forest acreage.

I42-4  
cont.

Approximately 26 acres of the project site are identified as mixed conifer forest and occur throughout the project site. Canopy cover varies from dense to a more open canopy. The DEIR says that this conifer forest will be 47% covered by the VSVSP. This is irreparable destruction of critical wildlife habitat.

With regard to the stream or riparian habitat, the DEIR says:

“In summary, construction and creek restoration activities associated with implementing the Specific Plan could result in loss or degradation of stream or riparian habitat protected under Section 1602 of the Fish and Game Code, and Placer County policies. Specific Plan construction would also result in the fill or disturbance to wetlands and waters of the United States under the jurisdiction of the CWA. Removal or disturbance of these sensitive habitats (although temporary in some cases) would result in loss of natural communities important to ecosystem functioning in the Sierra Nevada. Construction of the bike trail along Squaw Creek would conflict with General Plan policies if the County determines there is a feasible alternative or that impacts would not be minimized. Degradation or loss of sensitive habitats and waters of the United States under the Specific Plan and the identified conflict with General Plan policies intended to protect these resources would be a significant impact.”

I42-5

The DEIR is unclear on how this significant impact would be mitigated.

6.1.8 Critical Habitat:

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 Squaw Creek from the upper watershed into the Village Core area. The unit intersects lots 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, and 33. It ends at the western edge of the golf-course, just past lots 26 and 10. The USFWS has not released a proposed recovery plan for the Sierra Nevada yellow-legged frog.

I42-6

The management plan for the Loyalton-Truckee Deer Herd (CDFG 1982, 2010b) shows that Olympic Valley is included in the Verdi Sub-Unit of the Loyalton-Truckee Deer Herd summer and migratory range. While not designated as an important fawning area, the meadows associated with Squaw Creek could be used by some migrating or resident deer for fawning. The 1982 Loyalton-Truckee Deer Herd Management Plan is 30 years old, and deer migratory and fawning patterns have been shown to have shifted somewhat since the Plan’s completion due to development in the general region, increased traffic on SR 267 and SR 89, and the expansion of I-80. Additionally, over the last 15 years, migratory habitat loss and fragmentation has increased throughout the herds’ range because of residential development. Given the age of the Loyalton-Truckee Deer Herd Management Plan (Deer Herd Plan) and the increased development in the area, it is essential that a new Deer Herd Plan be prepared before VSVSP can be approved.

I42-7

The DEIR does not describe the impact on the habitat of black bears that are native to the area. 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 put many people at risk of dangerous encounters with the bear population.

I42-8

Visual Resources (Chapter 8):

The proposed development will permanently obstruct or alter scenic views that local residents and visitors currently enjoy. This is a significant and unavoidable negative impact that cannot be mitigated.

As summarized in the DEIR:

Impact 18-14: Substantial adverse cumulative effect on a scenic vista.

There are no additional feasible mitigation measures available to reduce this cumulative impact to a less-than-significant level.

Impact 18-15: Substantial contribution to the cumulative degradation of the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings.

There are no additional feasible mitigation measures available to reduce the cumulative impact related to construction activities to a less-than-significant level.

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.

There are no additional feasible mitigation measures available to reduce the cumulative impact related to construction activities to a less-than-significant level.

Impact 18-18: Contribute to cumulative light and glare or skyglow effects in the region.

There are no additional feasible mitigation measures available to reduce this cumulative impact to a less-than-significant level.

I42-9

Transportation & Circulation (Chapter 9):

The proposed development will result in an increase in traffic and roadway congestion, most notably on Squaw Valley Road and SR89. While the project plan does suggest some mitigation efforts, including monitoring average traffic speeds and conducting traffic control, I feel these measures will fall short of preserving existing transportation and circulation conditions. According to the DEIR "Because there are no available mechanisms to provide an acceptable LOS on the SR 28 and SR 89 segments in question, this impact would be significant and unavoidable." This unavoidable negative impact is just one of many red flags that deserve serious consideration by the Placer County Community Development Resource Agency.

I42-10

Noise (Chapter 11):

According to the DEIR, despite substantial efforts to mitigate construction noise, "... construction activities would continue to produce disruptive daytime noise over an extended period. Thus, this impact would remain significant and unavoidable." Given the very long-term nature of the proposed project, local residents would likely be subjected to the noise of on-going construction for a significant portion of their residency in Squaw Valley. Escaping the noise associated with many of California's major cities is a primary factor for many residents who call Squaw Valley home. A construction project of this size over an expected 25 year period essentially destroys the peaceful environment which was a key reason most residents purchased their Squaw homes, and it does so for the remaining life of many residents.

I42-11

In addition, a project of this size and duration will likely reduce the market value of the existing homes in Squaw Valley as potential new buyers will not want to buy in Squaw given the long-term construction disturbance.

I 142-12

Hydrology & Water Quality (Chapter 13):

To satisfy water demands for the proposed project, new groundwater wells and sewer systems/lines will need to be constructed, and some existing wells and sewer infrastructure may need to be destroyed or decommissioned. If a well or sewer component is not correctly constructed or if the proper procedures are not followed during destruction/decommission, there is a significant chance for contaminants to enter the groundwater. The project will also increase the total volume of water needed by the Squaw Valley community/resort. This could lead to a shortage of water for local wildlife, as well as for the purpose of fighting forest fires. Utilizing more groundwater in this sensitive area, particularly during a serious California drought, has consequences which have not been adequately studied in the DEIR.

I 142-13

For example, the DEIR indicates that "Potential loss of nesting yellow warbler habitat due to operational groundwater impacts would be significant." But no solid mitigation plan is presented.

I 142-14

Additional Concerns:

Forest Fire Risk: Construction activities which can produce extreme heat and airborne embers/sparks, pose an increased risk of forest fires. Considering the current extreme California drought conditions, which environmental experts expect to persist given trends in climate change, we should be highly conscious of allowing any activities that could lead to an increased risk of starting forest fires. A few of the construction activities that pose extreme risk include the use of welding torches, as well as concrete, tile, and masonry saws.

I 142-15

Conclusion:

Based on the findings presented in the DEIR, I believe that this project would result in significant and unavoidable environmental impacts (i.e., significant effects that cannot be feasibly mitigated to less-than-significant levels). In accordance with PRC Section 21002; CCR Section 15093, this requires a "statement of overriding considerations", for which we do not believe sufficient evidence exists.

I 142-16

Thank you for your consideration of our comments. Please feel free to contact us at any time.

Sincerely,  
Judy Bruner and Mike Bruner

Mailing Address:  
14072 Okanogan Drive  
Saratoga, CA 95070  
Judy's Work Phone: 408-801-1516  
Judy's Cell Phone: 408-772-7599  
Email: [judy.bruner@sandisk.com](mailto:judy.bruner@sandisk.com)

Alpine Meadows Property:  
1743 and 1751 John Scott Trail  
Alpine Meadows, CA

142

Judy & Mike Bruner  
June 14, 2015

- 142-1 The comment provides a summary of detailed comments provided below. See responses to the detailed comments below.
- 142-2 The secondary effects of population growth resulting from the project are addressed throughout the DEIR. For example, for increased street and pedestrian traffic see Chapter 9, "Transportation and Circulation," for increased water usage and increased waste production and treatment see Chapter 14, "Public Services and Utilities," for air quality see Chapter 10, "Air Quality," and for noise pollution see Chapter 11, "Noise."
- 142-3 As described in the DEIR (Impact 5-3 on pages 5-12 through 5-13), the project includes the construction of fewer employee housing units than the required number of beds to meet *Placer County General Plan* policies for new employee housing. Therefore, this impact was determined to be potentially significant. Mitigation Measure 5-3 requires the project applicant to develop a detailed "VSVSP Employee/Workforce Housing Plan" for Placer County review and approval prior to recordation of each Small Lot Final Map or approval of a building permit for any new-employee generating project that does not require a Small Lot Final Map, whichever occurs first. As stated therein, to comply with *Placer County General Plan* requirements, the project could employ other methods to meet the County employee housing standards, possibly including provision of off-site employee housing (including outside of Olympic Valley), dedication of land for needed units, and/or payment of an in-lieu fee to the County (which could be used to support development of employee housing, to provide rent subsidies to assist in making existing housing affordable, or other purposes). Implementation of this mitigation measure would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level because it would ensure that sufficient employee/workforce housing (i.e., sufficient to meet County requirements) is provided on-site and/or off-site for at least half of the expected new FTE employees generated, consistent with Placer County General Plan Housing Element Policy C-2. Also, see response to comment 012b-14 regarding this issue.
- 142-4 Mitigation Measure 6-9 in the DEIR is consistent with the County Tree Ordinance. The conditions of the ordinance, as expressed in Mitigation Measure 6-9 for tree replacement, are implemented throughout the County. Mitigation Measure 6-9 does not provide a mitigation approach exclusive to the VSVSP.
- The "inch-for-inch" replacement basis identified by the commenter would result in a net gain in the number of trees, offsetting over time the temporary loss of larger diameter trees. As stated on page 6-71 of the DEIR:
- For each diameter inch of tree removed, replacement shall be on an inch-for-inch basis. For example, if 100 diameter inches are proposed to be removed, the replacement trees would equal 100 diameter inches (aggregate).
- As an example scenario of how this requirement would be implemented, assume that the 100 diameter inches of tree removed consist of four 25 inch dbh trees. The project applicant, in coordination with the County, has multiple options on how to provide replacement trees. Although unrealistic, the replacement trees could consist of four 25-inch diameter trees placed in a new location. This would result in no net gain or loss in 25-inch diameter trees and is unlikely to result in a net change in forest acreage. It is more realistic to expect that the compensatory tree planting would consist of multiple smaller trees totaling a dbh of 100 inches; for example, 33 trees each at 3 inches dbh. At planting, there would be a net increase in the number of trees, but a reduction in the number of large diameter trees

(i.e., trees of 25 dbh). However, over time, as the planted trees grow, they would approach, and eventually meet and exceed the 25 inch dbh measurement of the removed trees. Although this may take several decades, the eventual net increase in the number of large diameter trees compared to the number originally removed trees provides compensation for the temporary loss of large diameter trees.

In addition, for the scenario described above, for 25 new trees to survive and thrive, they would likely need to be planted over an area larger than occupied by the original four trees that were removed. Therefore, the compensation for loss of larger trees via the planting of multiple smaller trees, in most instances, will result in a net gain in the acreage of forested habitat. Exceptions could result if the original trees that were removed were spread over a large area and the planting of the compensatory trees could be accommodated in a location of similar size.

Animal populations, particularly those associated with trees and forested habitats, typically occur over a large area. Although removal of trees in one area may adversely affect individuals of a particular species utilizing that location, unless the amount of tree/habitat removal is large, seldom would the overall regional population of the species be adversely affected. This is particularly true in situations such as the proposed project, where trees/habitat to be removed are in close proximity to existing development and therefore provide limited habitat value relative to forest acreage occurring far from existing development. In addition, implementation of a tree replacement program, as described above, would typically result in a net gain in overall forest acreage, further addressing the concern expressed in the comment.

Impacts to special-status animal species that require large trees for survival and reproduction such as spotted owls and northern goshawks from large tree removal is addressed in the DEIR under Impact 6-3 (see pages 6-54 and 6-55).

- 142-5 Mitigation Measure 6-1b in the DEIR (pages 6-48 through 6-49) would be implemented to avoid or compensate for the loss or degradation of stream or riparian habitat, ensure consistency with Fish and Game Code Section 1602 and County Policies, and further reduce potential adverse effects on riparian habitats. The comment does not provide specific reasons specifying why the above mitigation is unclear. Therefore, no further response can be provided.
- 142-6 See response to comment letter O8c regarding impacts to Sierra Nevada yellow-legged frog habitat.
- 142-7 The commenter provides no additional studies or substantial evidence to support that the DEIR did not use the best available information to determine impacts to the Loyalton-Truckee deer herd. The DEIR does not rely exclusively on the 1982 Loyalton-Truckee Deer Herd Management Plan for information. Most importantly, the DEIR cites the 2010 update to the 1982 Loyalton-Truckee Deer Herd Management Plan. This Plan Update is only five years old and includes data from radio-collared tracking of deer within the herd in 2006-2010 that showed current winter and summer use of the radio-collared deer that did not extend further than just south of Truckee, and thus not into the Specific Plan vicinity. Other tracking data from 2002-2005 showed minimal deer use in the Specific Plan area; highlighting again that the Specific Plan area does not appear important for the deer herd. The DEIR acknowledges that the 1982 Plan calls the Specific Plan area and vicinity summer range, but the 2010 Plan Update indicates that the deer in the migratory herd may no longer use this area and that the deer in Olympic Valley may be residential rather than migratory. Additional studies that were referenced included data from migratory studies from 2009 (Town of Truckee 2014) that showed migration patterns around the Canyon Springs Development just south of Interstate 80 near Truckee. Additional information was gathered from surveys conducted by EDAW (EDAW/AECOM 2009) that documented fawning occurred in nearby Martis Valley and Northstar-at-Tahoe. The DEIR acknowledges the effects of development on the deer herd (see pages 6-64 and 6-65), and bases conclusions on the substantial evidence provided by the studies cited, including those mentioned above and others.

- I42-8 See response to comment I3-5 regarding destruction of American black bear habitat.
- I42-9 The comment provides a listing of the project's significant and unavoidable cumulative impacts related to visual resources. These are also identified in Section 18.2, "Significant Environmental Effects Which Cannot Be Avoided," of the DEIR. No specific issues related to the content, analysis, or conclusions in the DEIR are raised in this comment. No further response is provided here.
- I42-10 See the Master Response regarding traffic and response to comment O8d-14 regarding effectiveness of traffic mitigation measures
- I42-11 See the Master Response regarding noise and the Master Response regarding the 25-year construction period.
- I42-12 See the Master Response regarding the 25-year construction period.
- I42-13 The comment summarizes some of the project's potential impacts related to hydrology and water quality. These are also identified in Chapter 13, "Hydrology and Water Quality," of the DEIR. The project's increased demand for potable and irrigation water is addressed in Chapter 14, "Public Services and Utilities," of the DEIR (see Impact 14-1 on pages 14-31 through 14-35). Secondary effects to local wildlife related to water supply shortages are addressed in Chapters 6, "Biological Resources," and 13, "Hydrology and Water Quality," of the DEIR.
- The commenter states that the project's increased demand for water could lead to a shortage of water for the purpose of fighting forest fires. There is no evidence to suggest that this would occur. Forest fires cannot be predicted; however, if one were to occur, it is unknown how much water would ultimately be taken from the valley floor groundwater aquifer to fight the forest fire. It is also unknown how much water would be added to the watershed if it is brought in via truck and plane from other locations to fight the forest fire. Other unknowns include the nature of the fire scenario (e.g., size, location, severity), how it is fought (e.g., cut fire line vs. direct application of water or retardant), etc. Therefore, this issue is too speculative to assess.
- Also see the Master Response regarding water supply.
- I42-14 Mitigation Measure 6-3 in the DEIR (pages 6-56 through 6-57) would be implemented to avoid and minimize effects on nesting raptors and special-status birds, including yellow warbler. The comment does not provide specific reasons specifying why the above mitigation is not sufficient. Therefore, no further response can be provided.
- I42-15 The project's potential to expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildfires is addressed in Chapter 15, "Hazardous Materials and Hazards," of the DEIR (see Impact 15-6 on page 15-20). Mitigation Measures 15-6a and 15-6b would be implemented to ensure the appropriate precautions are in place to reduce the risk of wildfires.
- During project construction, the project applicant would comply with regulations and requirements of the Squaw Valley Fire Department and Placer County Environmental Health Services to reduce the risk of wildfires as a result of construction activities. All construction equipment—including welding torches as well as concrete, tile, and masonry saws—would be operated in accordance with California Occupational Safety and Health Administration requirements and manufacturer's instructions. Additionally, the project applicant would be required to prepare an emergency response plan as part of the Hazardous Materials Business Plan that would be required pursuant to the State of California Hazardous Materials Release Response Plans and Inventory Law of 1985 (Business Plan Act, California Health and Safety Code, Division 20, Chapter 6.95, Article 1) (see page 15-15 of the DEIR).
- I42-16 See the Master Response regarding significant and unavoidable impacts.

143

**Maywan Krach**

---

**From:** steve buich <sbuich@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, July 15, 2015 2:15 PM  
**To:** Placer County Environmental Coordination Services  
**Subject:** Proposed KSL Squaw Valley Development Project

Before going any further this one question should be answered and resolved: Highway 89 is and always will be a 2 lane road and currently has difficulties digesting the traffic ... how will the KSL project further impact this situation?

143-1

STEVE L. BUICH  
3738 Meadow Lane  
Lafayette, Ca. 94549  
(925) 284-7660  
273 Basque Drive  
Truckee, Ca. 96061  
(530) 562-0141

---

**I43**

Steve L. Buich  
July 15, 2015

---

I43-1

The project's potential impacts to traffic along SR 89 are addressed in Chapter 9, "Transportation and Circulation," of the DEIR. No specific issues related to the content, analysis, or conclusions in the DEIR are raised in this comment. No further response is provided here.

144

**Maywan Krach**

---

**From:** Elizabeth Burch <elizabeth.burch@sonoma.edu>  
**Sent:** Monday, May 18, 2015 3:04 PM  
**To:** Placer County Environmental Coordination Services  
**Cc:** Sierra Watch  
**Subject:** Squaw Valley Development

Hello,

As a long time tourist to the area I want to tell you that I oppose these plans for development. If implemented, they would be the exact reason why I and other loyal tourists to the area would not return. If losing my business along with 1000s of other tourists like me is what you would like to do, this project accomplishes that plan perfectly.

I  
|  
144-1  
|  
I

I urge rejection of this plan.

Please protect the natural beauty of the Sierras we love so dearly.

Dr. Elizabeth Burch  
Professor, COMS, SSU  
<http://www.sonoma.edu/communications/>  
My office is closed for the summer.

Typos courtesy of my phone

"Hope relentlessly."  
Dr. Lamont Hill

---

**I44**

Dr. Elizabeth Burch  
May 18, 2015

---

I44-1

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.

145

**Maywan Krach**

**From:** Melissa Burroughs <melissaburroughs@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, July 17, 2015 9:37 AM  
**To:** Placer County Environmental Coordination Services  
**Subject:** Proposed development at Squaw Valley

Good Morning,

This email is in regards to the proposed development at Squaw Valley mentioned in the following article:

<http://www.sacbee.com/news/business/real-estate-news/article23293791.html>

I love Tahoe for the place it is - a natural, rustic, beautiful-beyond-words sanctuary. Not a corporate-worshipping, greedy, make a man richer at any costs wasteland. Tahoe is not Aspen and I would hate to see it become Aspen. Once this type of development is completed, Tahoe will never be the same and the environmental footprint left behind will be devastating.

I45-1

Adding 10, 100-foot-tall buildings? You have got to be kidding me. The only skyline I want to see in Tahoe is the majestic peaks at the top of Siberia, the spine down KT-22, the ridges at Granite Creek. Not some yuppy, latte sipping millionaires.

I45-2

Think of all the construction runoff that will end up in our beautiful lake (which is having a hard enough time maintaining its beauty given the drought). Think of the massive influx of cars that will create backups up and down 80 and 89. Think of the chill, relaxed Tahoe culture that will be lost in favor of millionaire CEO's in their hummers.

I45-3

Please, please PLEASE for the love of Tahoe do NOT move forward with this development.

Thank you for your time,  
Melissa

---

**I45****Melissa Burroughs**  
July 17, 2015

---

- I45-1 No specific issues related to the content, analysis, or conclusions in the DEIR are raised in this comment. No further response is provided here.
- I45-2 No specific issues related to the content, analysis, or conclusions in the DEIR are raised in this comment. No further response is provided here.
- I45-3 The Olympic Valley watershed does not flow into Lake Tahoe. The watershed, which drains via Squaw Creek, flows to the Truckee River, which flows towards the Town of Truckee at this location, not Lake Tahoe. Therefore, any construction runoff that might occur would not enter Lake Tahoe. The project's potential impacts to traffic along I-80 and SR 89 are addressed in Chapter 9, "Transportation and Circulation," of the DEIR. No specific issues related to the content, analysis, or conclusions in the DEIR are raised in this comment. No further response is provided here.

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.

146

**Maywan Krach**

**From:** Michael Bush <skidad63@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, July 17, 2015 10:25 AM  
**To:** Placer County Environmental Coordination Services  
**Subject:** Squaw Valley

To whom it may concern,

During the last 30 years I have been a loyal patron to both Squaw Valley/Alpine Meadows ski areas. During this time my family has also had a home in North Lake Tahoe. I am very concerned about the proposed "New Village" at Squaw Valley. My concerns are that I don't feel that the ends of this project justifies the consequences that will be felt not only in Squaw Valley, but in the whole Tahoe basin. My family uses the resources of the Tahoe Basin to escape from the urban life of the Bay Area, and introduce our up coming generations to the wilderness, fresh air, and the jewel we call Lake Tahoe.

I46-1

I feel that the proposed plan at Squaw Valley, will deteriorate something that can never be replaced. I also feel that there really is no need for this village, or the indoor amusement park. As it stands now, how often is the current village actually "sold out"? I don't see the need to build more for something that is all ready sufficiently accommodating the demand of its patrons.

I46-2

I feel that if this proposal is accepted that it will destroy something that man can never restore. It will cause too much traffic for the current infrastructure to handle. It will create smog inversions that will effect the whole basin. I also feel that the basin, in the natural state that it is now, provides plenty of recreational resources for the people that use these resources. Do we need to create artificial things to do, in an area that is so abundant in recreation in its natural state?

I46-3

The things being proposed does not belong in such a place, they belong in a place that has already been urbanized. Would we build Disneyland in the middle of Yosemite, just so we can make a profit? Do we want to ruin the majesty that Mother Nature has provided us with views of buildings? Do we want to deplete lakes and rivers, and the wild life that goes a long with it, to supply such a monstrosity in an area that is currently struggling with drought? Do we need 25 years of construction and the noise and congestion that goes all long with it? When will this project end? The echo systems of the Tahoe Basin are all ready hard enough to balance, without this kind of a development.

I do feel the development at Squaw should be done to improve an already deteriorating infrastructure that is all ready in place, while making it possible for the sensitive echo systems of the Tahoe Basin to survive.

I46-4

Placer County has been blessed with the resources it has now. Places like Lake Tahoe are unique in their own right, and should be preserved, not modernized beyond the regions capabilities. The people that frequent Placer County in whole, for the most part, do so to escape the exact kinds of things being proposed at Squaw Valley. There are plenty of places all ready in place for people to find huge hotels and amusement parks.

In conclusion, as someone who's family has been attracted to Placer County, and the Tahoe Basin for decades, I would hope that the planners and developers would look at the long term goals of the County, and to protect a place that is very unique.

Sincerely,  
Michael Bush  
Martinez Ca

---

**I46** Michael Bush  
July 17, 2015

---

- I46-1 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.
- I46-2 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.
- Also, see the Master Response regarding the MAC and the Master Response regarding occupancy assumptions.
- I46-3 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.
- I46-4 No specific issues related to the content, analysis, or conclusions in the DEIR are raised in this comment. No further response is provided here.

147

**Maywan Krach**

---

**From:** Alexander Fisch  
**Sent:** Friday, July 17, 2015 4:55 PM  
**To:** Maywan Krach  
**Subject:** FW: re Development Proposals by Squaw Valley Ski Holdings and KSL

FYI

---

**From:** Kally Keding-Cecil  
**Sent:** Friday, July 17, 2015 4:53 PM  
**To:** Alexander Fisch  
**Subject:** FW: re Development Proposals by Squaw Valley Ski Holdings and KSL

The below email was sent to the general Planning email.

Thanks,

Kally

---

**From:** sandra butler [<mailto:sandranbutler@yahoo.com>]  
**Sent:** Friday, July 17, 2015 3:44 PM  
**To:** Placer County Planning  
**Subject:** re Development Proposals by Squaw Valley Ski Holdings and KSL

Board members:

We are long time vacationers in the North Lake Tahoe area and are now full time residents. The current proposal for the development of Squaw Valley is way out of sight for this area. The magnitude and time scenario for completion of such a giant undertaking is going to eliminate the environment we taught our children to expect when coming to the mountains. Squaw Valley is unique. Please, please, don't approve plans to make it another Vail or Beaver Creek.

147-1

Respectfully,  
 Sandra and Tim Butler  
 Truckee

---

**I47**

Sandra & Tim Butler  
July 17, 2015

---

I47-1

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.

148

**Maywan Krach**

---

**From:** troy caldwell <troy.caldwell@att.net>  
**Sent:** Friday, July 17, 2015 4:08 PM  
**To:** Placer County Environmental Coordination Services  
**Cc:** Troy Caldwell  
**Subject:** Comments on Draft EIR

Dear honorable Board of Supervisors,

Thank you for the notification and opportunity to comment on the Draft EIR on the Village at Squaw Valley. I represent the property on the south border of the applicants properties.  
Thank you to you, your staff and all the consultants contributing to the reports. Also thanks to all that have participated in this process and the applicants willingness to listen and respond.  
I offer my support of the Draft EIR document, as presented, with no reservations to its accuracy. Having no expertise beyond that of your consultants, I believe and trust in the document and the proceedings set forth in this application process as well as the right to comment on the document and applicants rights to use their properties in a lawful manner.

148-1

Sincerely,  
Troy Caldwell

---

**I48**

Troy Caldwell  
July 17, 2015

---

I48-1

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.

149

**Maywan Krach**

**From:** Peter M. Callahan <PCallahan@ctsclaw.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, July 16, 2015 4:35 PM  
**To:** Placer County Environmental Coordination Services  
**Subject:** Squaw Valley Village construction plan

I am and for several decades been a homeowner in the Alpine Meadows area of the Tahoe basin, and I am emailing in complete opposition to this money grab at the expense of our recreational area.

The proposed *Squaw Valley Village Specific Plan* includes a series of highrise condo projects with more than 1,500 new bedrooms and a massive indoor amusement park with waterslides, fake rivers, arcades, and simulated sky-diving. THIS IS A TERRIBLE DESTRUCTION OF A BEAUTIFUL, HISTORIC FAMILY RECREATIONAL AREA! **PLEASE REJECT THIS SELL-OUT OF OUR GRANDCHILDREN'S FUTURE.**

149-1

Thank you!



**Peter M. Callahan | Partner | Cell: (714) 264-5594**  
2601 Main Street, Suite 800, Irvine, California 92614 | 101 California Street, Ste 2300 San Francisco, CA 94111  
Tel: (949) 261-CTSC(2872) | Fax: (949) 261-6060 | Tel: (415) 593-5700 Fax: (415) 593-6984  
E-Mail: [pcallahan@ctsclaw.com](mailto:pcallahan@ctsclaw.com) | Website: [www.ctsclaw.com](http://www.ctsclaw.com)

NOTICE: This e-mail and any attachments contain information from the law firm of Callahan, Thompson, Sherman & Caudill, LLP, and are intended solely for the use of the named recipient or recipients. This e-mail may contain privileged attorney/client communications or work product. Any dissemination of this e-mail by anyone other than an intended recipient is strictly prohibited. If you are not a named recipient, you are prohibited from any further viewing of the e-mail or any attachments or from making any use of the e-mail or attachments. If you believe you have received this e-mail in error, please notify the sender immediately and permanently delete the e-mail, any attachments, and all copies thereof from any drives or storage media and destroy any printouts of the e-mail or attachments. Thank you.

---

**I49**

Peter M. Callahan  
July 16, 2015

---

I49-1

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.

I50

**Maywan Krach**

---

**From:** Mary <marycamel@earthlink.net>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, July 15, 2015 12:55 PM  
**To:** Placer County Environmental Coordination Services  
**Cc:** Mary Camarillo  
**Subject:** Squaw Valley Expansion Project

Dear Placer County Officials,

I have just heard about the Squaw Valley Expansion Project in the Sierra Sun regarding the expansion project planned for the Squaw Valley area.

As a resident of Southern California that needs a place like Squaw Valley to escape to, I am emailing today to express my concern and disapproval of this project. The addition of shops and restaurants and hotels have already started to diminish the region's peaceful quality. Further expansion would turn Squaw Valley into one of the many generic and soulless shopping and dining destinations that we have too much of all ready.

I50-1

I urge you to stop this expansion project!

Thank you,

Mary Camarillo  
16192 Brent Circle  
Huntington Beach, CA 92647

---

**I50**

Mary Camarillo  
July 15, 2015

---

I50-1

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.

July 8, 2015

Re: DEIR Village at Squaw Valley

To: Placer County Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors

I have been a Squaw Valley resident since 1985 and know the culture and legacy of this pristine mountain valley. I am a Doctor with a full-time medical practice in Tahoe City and my husband is the local Placer County Senior Deputy District Attorney. I am a member of the North Lake Tahoe Kiwanis and Tahoe City Downtown Association. Having lived and skied at Squaw Valley for the past 45 years, I have seen many development changes including The Resort at Squaw Creek, the golf course, Squaw Valley Lodge, and the existing Village at Squaw Valley. I am not against productive and environmentally sound growth, but I am against the irreversible, serious environmental impacts the massive Village at Squaw Valley project imposes on our small valley.

151-1

In reading the DEIR, I have found multiple errors in calculations and conclusions within the numerous sections of the 23 “significant and unavoidable impacts”. These impacts are unacceptable and will cause extreme degradation of the environment and the quality of life for residents and visitors. I would like to comment on two of these significant and unavoidable impacts: traffic and noise.

The traffic analysis should be redone to simulate an average non-drought year experience because it currently understates the congestion impacts. Traffic analyzed from the 2011-12 ski season’s peak hour and day traffic volume is NOT reflective of actual conditions. This is because lack of snow in that season created less skier traffic. The consultants need to re-evaluate the traffic on an average year, not a dry winter year with decreased skier volume. Even with 4 years of drought conditions, the intense amount of traffic driving into Squaw Valley during peak periods backs up for miles and effects my business in Tahoe City as patients cannot reach Tahoe City from Truckee due to lengthy backups at Squaw Valley. Furthermore, the traffic impacts need to be accurate to effectively understand the noise impact and greenhouse emissions.

151-2

With the traffic study significantly inaccurate, the noise will exceed the allowed threshold volume much more than currently projected in the DEIR. Additionally, the number of hours construction is allowed (6am-8pm or longer, on most days of the week) and the unbelievable 25 year length of construction is unacceptable. Squaw Valley is a narrow box valley with granite walls. Noise reflects and amplifies tremendously within our valley. The mitigation to this solution is to decrease the massive project to half the size (which still makes it double what exists today), and allow an ample 5 -10 years to build...not 25 years of excessive noise pollution. Summer visitors relish in the peaceful quietness Squaw Valley has to offer. This will be ruined for a quarter of a century, and perhaps for all time, if the current proposed project is not denied and mandated to adopt a more reasonable, reduced scale alternative project.

151-3

Do you remember the world 25 years ago? How can there be approval for a massive 25 year construction project when we don't even know what the world and its demands will be like in 2040! The project should be reduced in scale and given a more realistic 5-10 year time frame.

151-4

I honorably ask the Placer County Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors to **reject the proposed Village at Squaw Valley Project** because it has too many unacceptable and serious impacts. The project has excessive objectives. It does not have to meet all of these objectives! The mitigation to all of these issues is to require the applicant to resubmit a 50% reduced scale version with 50% or fewer bedrooms and lower heights on building structures to reduce the impacts on traffic, noise, visual beauty, water quality, aquifer safety, and pollution.

151-5

Squaw Valley has been my home for 30 years. My concern is if this massive, irreversible project is allowed to destroy our environment and quality of living, I will leave. Squaw Valley, one of Placer County's jewels, cannot handle the environmental abuse and mistreatment.

Thank you for your time, your understanding, and for allowing me to address these important concerns. Please forward me all future notices related to the project and EIR.

Very Sincerely,

Dr. Christina R. Campbell

530-583-0002  
1750 Navajo Court  
PO Box 2743  
Olympic Valley, CA 96146

doctorcampbell@sbcglobal.net

---

**I51**

Dr. Christina R. Campbell  
July 8, 2015

---

- I51-1 The comment is an introductory statement and summary of topics addressed in subsequent detailed comments. It does not address the content, analysis, or conclusions in the DEIR. See responses to the detailed comments below. Regarding the reference to 23 significant and unavoidable impacts, see the Master Response addressing this topic.
- I51-2 See the portion of the traffic Master Response regarding use of 2011-2012 ski season data to represent existing winter conditions. For the reasons described therein, the DEIR traffic analysis is adequate and no changes to the DEIR are necessary. As such, the DEIR analyses of noise and GHG emissions are similarly adequate and no changes to the DEIR are necessary.
- I51-3 See the Master Response regarding the 25-year construction period and the Master Response regarding noise. Also see the Master Response regarding the Reduced Density Alternative.
- I51-4 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.
- I51-5 See the previous responses to this letter. Since publication of the DEIR, the applicant has proposed reduced heights for several buildings. See Section 2.1 of this FEIR for information on these proposed project modifications. 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.

152

To: Placer County Community Development Resource Agency  
Attention: Maywan Krach Email: cdraecs@placer.ca.gov

Subject: Comments regarding Village at Squaw Valley Specific Plan

I would like provide my comments on the Village at Squaw Valley Specific Plan as delineated in the draft Environmental Impact Report (dEIR), dated May 2015.

By way of introduction, my family and I have resided at 1560 Squaw Valley Road, Unit 2 since 1996. As such, we are no more than 50 feet from Squaw Valley Road. Our family (along with 15 other unit owners) will be adversely affected by the construction that is expected to last 25 years. We will further be impacted by the increased traffic on Squaw Valley Road that this plan will produce during and after construction is completed.

152-1

In summary, I am concerned that the County is allowing the applicant to violate many of the County’s regulations - as according to the dEIR there are no feasible mitigating solutions for a large number of the items detailed in the plan (cultural, visual, transportation, noise, climate change and greenhouse gasses).

dEIR 2.2.1

Implementation of the proposed Specific Plan would result in the following significant unavoidable environmental impacts, following implementation of feasible mitigation measures:

The County’s regulations were enacted for a reason – to protect its citizens and its environment. The Applicant should not be allowed to violate them.

152-2

Regarding the plan, here are additional comments and concerns relative to the proposed plan:

**1. Noise Levels exceeded for Valley Residents on Squaw Valley Road**

The plan provides for no mitigation of noise levels that exceed County standards for residents located within the 60dBA average noise level. The plan specifically notes this impact will be significant (for 25 years!).

dEIR Page 18-34, 18-35

noise would exceed applicable noise standards on roads that currently comply with Placer County noise standards. Therefore, project operation would result in a considerable contribution to long-term noise. While implementation of Mitigation Measure 11-5 would reduce interior noise from Squaw Valley Road at new sensitive receptors, no feasible mitigation exists to reduce the project’s impacts to existing sensitive land uses (i.e., residences located within the 60 dBA day-night average noise level [L<sub>dn</sub>] noise contour of Squaw Valley Road), which would be exposed to exterior noise levels that exceed applicable Placer County noise standards, although only during a select number of days during summer. Therefore, this cumulative impact would be significant and unavoidable.

152-3

The noise level standards as defined by Placer County should be enforced!!!

**2. Permitted Construction Hours**

Given the length of time construction (25 years), the County should shorten the allowable construction hours during which time building is permitted. This change should also dictate that construction vehicles are not allowed on Squaw Valley Road before or after said revised construction hours and that the noise ordinance standards be enforced for all construction equipment.

dEIR Page 11-14

According to Article 9.36.030, "Exemptions," some noise-generating activities are exempt from the above noise ordinance standards, including construction that is performed between 6:00 a.m. and 8:00 p.m., Monday through Friday, and between 8:00 a.m. and 8:00 p.m. Saturday and Sunday, provided that all construction equipment is fitted with factory-installed muffler devices and maintained in good working order.

152-4

**3. Maintenance and plowing of bike path**

There is an assumption in the plan that the bike path will be maintained all year, but no statement of responsibility. We should expect Squaw to pick up this activity and/or expense as funding for plowing the path is always in question - particular as the East Parcel will be connected to the existing bike path and will increase the use of path by corporation employees.

dEIR Page 9-36

- ▲ Year-Round Bicycle and Pedestrian Trail Network - A comprehensive network of multiuse paths and sidewalks would be provided throughout the Village Area and maintained year-round by providing snow removal.

dEIR Page 9-37

- ▶ Provide continuous Class I Multi-Purpose Path linkage between the East Parcel (employee housing) and the Village.

As relief, the bike path plowing cost should count toward the Corporation's recreation funding commitment.

152-5

**4. Extend use of Employee Shuttle**

The proposed Employee Shuttle from the East should be accessible for Valley residents from 2-3 designated stops on Squaw Valley Road (Post Office for example) to and from the Village. In the past this service was provided by the Corporation as well as the Resort, but in recent years has been discontinued. This would reduce the use of cars by local residents and their guests.

dEIR Page 9-37

The majority of new employees (both residing on the East Parcel and outside of Olympic Valley) would be transported between the East Parcel and the Village Area by shuttle during peak winter conditions. However, some employees (estimated at 10 percent of hospitality staff) are expected to drive to the project site due to the need to have a car during their work shift.

152-6

**5. Dust Management**

During the last Village construction, the dust for residents near the construction zone was so bad you could not open your door during the day. Control of dust needs to be addressed in the dEIR.

152-7

**6. Performance Bonds**

There is no reference in the dEIR on how the County will insure that all the mitigation, and other commitments (parking structure, creek restoration, recreation etc.) as listed in plan are completed. There should be a specific requirement by the County that requires the posting of guarantee bonds in order to proceed with any development of this time duration (25 years).

152-8

**7. Lack of a Broadband and Internet Service Plan**

The Plan is silent about broadband services. Currently Olympic Valley is without an internet provider. The only provider, AT&T has recently stopped providing new DSL connections. And while it is believed that Suddenlink will install a fiber link for the Valley, Suddenlink has recently been purchased by a French company and the new owner's priorities may change this plan. The County needs to consider internet access like any other utility and demand that the developers address the provision of broadband services for the Valley in its development plan.

152-9

**8. Offsite Snow Removal**

The dEIR allows Squaw to remove snow to offsite storage areas. This means residents will continue to contend with the noise of large trucks using Squaw Valley Road during the early morning hours.

dEIR Page 14-41

Active snow melt practices, such as heated walkways, may be used in areas that are determined to require high accessibility. The option of off-hauling of snow may be utilized when warranted and would be highly dependent upon the snow conditions within any given snow season. Due to the extra expense associated with off-hauling, it would typically only be used during exceptionally heavy snow conditions when on-site storage options have reached their maximum capacity. If off-hauling is used, snow would be transported by truck to various available off-site locations within 20 miles of the plan area that comply with Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board standards and properly impose appropriate Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan and water quality BMP programs.

152-10

Further, taking the snow up to 20 miles away from the Valley can only increase the carbon footprint the Corporation brags so much about reducing!

Simply put, no offsite snow removal should be permitted. There is plenty of land within the development footprint for the developer to designate for on-site snow storage.

**9. Location of Fire Substation**

The plan is silent as to where the new fire substation will be located. The dEIR also implies that the old station will be used as the new substation. At a recent SVPUD meeting, the Olympic Valley residents and the SVPUD Board made it clear they did not want to use the building for that purpose and to hold it for future community use.

The fire substation issue is noted in

dEIR Page 14-44

The project applicant may provide land within the main Village area to the SVFD for construction of the substation. The substation may also ultimately be constructed outside the VSVP, or the "old" fire station on Chamonix Place could be renovated to serve as the substation. The potential impacts of a new fire substation within the plan area are addressed in this DEIR. Separate permitting and environmental review would be required if the substation were built outside the plan area, as indicated in Section 3.4.3, "Public Services and Utilities." If the new substation were established at the old station on Chamonix Place, renovations would likely be relatively minor, resulting in few environmental effects. Construction of a new facility would have similar environmental effects to other relatively small development projects in Olympic Valley, including construction and operational traffic, air emissions, and noise (see Chapter 11, "Noise," for a discussion of noise impacts from emergency facilities).

152-11

Definitive plans delineating the specific location of this substation should be included in the dEIR so residents can review and comment on the proposed location. It should not include use of the old fire station.

**10. Parking on Squaw Valley Road**

During the peak ski days at Squaw, the ban on parking on Squaw Valley Road is constantly violated and enforcement of the winter parking ban is never enforced. This is a particularly dangerous situation when the cones are placed on the road to allow for 2 exit lanes. Further, unless you are a resident of the Valley, most out of town day skiers are not even aware that there is a parking ban in the winter on this road.

152-12

As Day Skier parking use will be reduced in the proposed plan (during and after construction), we can expect more days where parking on Squaw Valley Road will be done.

I would ask that the County (1) post no parking signs on Squaw Valley Road from Christy Hill Road to the Queen of the Snows Church and (2) enforce the no parking rule in this area by ticketing and towing.

**11. Cultural Issues**

County should require that the 1960 Olympic A-frame (old movie theater where Cornice Cafe is located) be save and relocated. It should be converted into an Olympic/Valley museum and community center. This conversion should count toward the Recreation Funding requirements required by the County.

152-13

**12. Size, scale and environmental impacts of Village**

I am concerned over the negative effects that the development will have on the visual appearance of Olympic Valley (10 story buildings and water park grossly out of proportion to existing village, concrete parking garage at entrance to Village) as well as the potential water supply issues that the development might create, I would ask that the County be diligent in its stewardship of the land and our environment.

I52-14

**In summary**

Finally, when considering the proposed development, I would ask each County employee charged with determining the final outcome of this development, view the proposal as if they were in my family’s situation – living 50 feet from Squaw Valley Road during a construction that is expected to last 25 years.

I52-15

There is only one Olympic Valley and the proposed changes will alter it forever. Please be mindful of this when making your final determinations.

With regards,

Michael Carabetta & Family  
1560 Squaw Valley Road, Unit #2  
Olympic Valley, CA 96146

---

**I52** Michael Carabetta & Family  
no date

---

- I52-1 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.
- The commenter does not provide specifics related to how the project applicant is violating the County's regulations, or what County regulations are being violated. No further response is provided here.
- Finally, the comment provides a summary of detailed comments provided below. See responses to the detailed comments below.
- I52-2 See the Master Response regarding significant and unavoidable impacts.
- I52-3 See the Master Response regarding noise.
- I52-4 See the Master Response regarding noise and the Master Response regarding the 25-year construction period.
- I52-5 The comment requests information regarding responsibility for maintenance of the proposed bike path. The DEIR states on page 3-22 that, "Snow removal service on the [pedestrian trails/bike] paths will be funded through a maintenance agreement, or as part of an agreement with the SVPSD."
- I52-6 The comment states that the proposed employee shuttle should be accessible for Valley residents from 2-3 designated stops on Squaw Valley Road to and from the Village. The proposed employee shuttle is not intended to be used by Valley residents; however, the project applicant is committed to providing an alternative fuel, in-Valley shuttle for Valley residents. This feature has been added to the master phasing plan.
- I52-7 The comment states that control of dust during construction needs to be addressed in the DEIR. See the discussion of Impact 10-1 on pages 10-14 and 10-15 of the DEIR, which states (with a correction of a grammatical error also provided):
- Fugitive dust PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub> emissions would also be minimized due to implementation of the dust control measures required by PCAPCD Rule 228, including measures that minimize track-out on to paved public roadways, limiting vehicle travel on unpaved surfaces to 15 mph, and stabilization of storage piles and disturbed areas.
- I52-8 See response to comment I41-7 for a discussion of the MMRP.
- I52-9 See response to comment I15-11 for a discussion of the Dry Utility Master Plan to identify the utilities (including telephone/broadband and cable television/broadband facilities) that would be needed to accommodate the proposed VSVSP.
- I52-10 The comment states that no offsite snow storage should be permitted. As referenced by the comment, this issue is addressed in the DEIR under Impact 14-5 on page 14-41. As indicated in the DEIR text provided in the comment, offsite snow storage is only retained as an option, and would be expected to be used only under extreme circumstances, due in large part to the cost associated with such an approach. The VSVSP includes a program for snow storage and removal described in the DEIR on page 3-28, shown in Exhibit 3-14, and

- analyzed for its effectiveness under Impact 14-5. No specific issues related to the content, analysis, or conclusions in the DEIR are raised in this comment. No further response is provided here.
- I52-11 See response to comment 09-13 regarding the issue of identifying the location of the new fire station.
- I52-12 See the portion of the traffic Master Response related to adequacy of parking supply. The comment requests that the County should post “no parking” signs on Squaw Valley Road from Christy Hill Road to the Queen of the Snows Church, and enforce via ticketing and towing. The comment is in reference to existing conditions and is not an impact of the project. Regardless, the County appreciates the commenter’s input and suggests that the commenter contact the Department of Public Works to request they evaluate the need to provide additional notification of parking restrictions and enforcement on public roadways in Olympic Valley.
- I52-13 The project’s potential impacts to cultural resources are presented in Chapter 7, “Cultural Resources,” of the DEIR. With respect to the demolition of the two 1960s Olympic-related buildings (the Olympic Valley Lodge and the Far East Center), see Impact 7-1 and Mitigation Measures 7-1a and 7-1b. Even with mitigation, the loss of these historic resources was found to be significant and unavoidable.
- In addition to Mitigation Measures 7-1a and 7-1b, further mitigation, including relocation and retention, for the loss of the two historic buildings was considered and is discussed on pages 7-19 through 7-20 of 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.
- I52-14 The project’s visual impacts are addressed in Chapter 8, “Visual Resources,” and water supply impacts are addressed in Chapter 14, “Public Services and Utilities,” of the DEIR. Further information on these topics is also provided in the Master Response regarding the visual impact analysis and the Master Response regarding water supply. 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.
- I52-15 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.