

I61

Maywan Krach

From: Mark Childress <mark@markchildress.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 15, 2015 5:01 PM
To: Placer County Environmental Coordination Services
Subject: To the commissioners of beautiful Placer County

Dear Commissioners,

I am not a resident of your beautiful county but I have been teaching at the Community of Writers in Squaw Valley every summer for 26 years. I would respectfully like to add my voice to all those protesting the plans for massive development in the Olympic Valley. Plainly Placer County has two choices: deny the permission to develop, which will reap lower tax benefits in the short run but ensure a prosperous future for all by protecting the Valley's most important resource, its serenity and natural beauty, or approve the development, which will bring the county more tax money in the short run but will kill the "goose that laid the golden egg." I request that you deny permission for this development to take place.

I61-1

Best regards,
Mark Childress
1507 Fifth St
Key West FL 33040

I61

Mark Childress
July 17, 2015

I61-1

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.

I62

Maywan Krach

From: Samuel Clark <sam.a.clark@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 18, 2015 12:55 PM
To: Placer County Environmental Coordination Services
Subject: Comment to Placer Country: Reject KSL Proposal

Dear Placer County,

KSL's proposal for Squaw Valley is awful. I urge you to reject it.

I have come to ski and relax in Squaw Valley for many years. I come for the natural beauty, world-class snowsports, and the great atmosphere. KSL's proposal would lessen all of these, irrevocably, making Squaw Valley just another copy of Aspen or Vail. If I wanted to go to Aspen or Vail, I would go there. I don't. I go to Squaw Valley. And KSL's proposal would ruin the Squaw Valley that we have now and should treasure, preserve, and in turn develop responsibly.

KSL's proposal is wrong for Squaw Valley. There are lots of ways to develop the valley without destroying it. Have KSL come back with a plan that does so.

KSL's proposal should be rejected.

Sincerely,
Sam Clark

Samuel Clark
443.223.5588

I62-1

I62

Sam Clark
June 18, 2015

I62-1

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.

163

July 9, 2015

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

RE: Squaw Valley Draft EIR

To Whom It May Concern:

My name is Kathleen Cohen. I am a homeowner at 301 Indian Trail Road in Squaw Valley, directly next to the East Parcel. I have lived there for almost 20 years and occupy my residence both summer and winter. I am a Registered Nurse and have worked at Tahoe Forest Hospital and in the North Lake Tahoe area since that time. I've worked night shift for much of my career in nursing. I spoke at the draft EIR public hearing in Kings Beach on June 25, 2015 and commented specifically on issues related to the planned shipping and receiving facility on the East Parcel. In this letter I would like to elaborate my concerns regarding the excessive noise, toxic air quality, and negative traffic patterns as a result of the planned shipping and receiving facility on the East parcel, within 75 FEET of my home.

163-1

While the EIR is truly a daunting document for a layperson to understand, the issues and potential mitigating strategies related to the shipping and receiving facility received very minimal attention in the document. For example, Table 2-1 (Summary of Comparison of Alternatives) indicates that even under the "Reduced Density" alternative, the shipping and receiving would still be built in the proposed location. Thus it is unclear what alternatives were really considered for this facility. Moreover, the EIR completely fails to address in a meaningful way the specific impacts from the proposed facility. For example, Impact 11.3 (Noise) includes the following:

163-2

"Noise sources associated with loading dock and delivery activities can include trucks idling, on-site truck circulation, trailer-mounted refrigeration units, pallets dropping, and the operation of forklifts. Based on reference noise values and accounting for typical usage factors of individual pieces of equipment, such activities could result in noise levels of approximately 82dB Lmax 86 dB Lmax at a distance of 50 feet."

Based on these reference noise levels, the County's daytime noise standards would be exceeded within approx. 200 feet, and the County's nighttime noise standards would be exceeded within 300 feet.

"The proposed shipping and receiving dock located on the East Parcel could be located within approximately 200 feet to the east of the existing residences located on Indian Trail Court and therefore loading activities at this location could exceed Placer County's daytime and nighttime noise standards. However, under the anticipated configuration for the East Parcel (see Exhibit 3-6 in chapter 3, "Project Description"), the Shipping and Receiving building would be located between the loading dock and the nearby residences, providing a barrier to loading dock noise. Under this configuration, it is far less likely that Placer County's noise standards would be exceeded at the residences located on Indian Trail Court"

163-3

The EIR is concluding that the loading dock is likely to produce noise in EXCESS of both daytime and nighttime standards. The unsupported assertion that the placement of a busy shipping and receiving building (Exhibit 3-6) would somehow mitigate the noise seems absurd. No data is provided in support of this.

As a nurse who frequently works night shift I know that disturbed sleep from excessive noise will interfere with my ability to function in my professional capacity. It will essentially rob me of my livelihood.

I will hear every truck, every “beep beep beep” that comes into Squaw Valley FOREVER. This borders on abusive. I don’t know who could tolerate that and function under those noise conditions.

I 163-3
| cont.

Similar concerns apply to the air quality impacts and proposed mitigation related to shipping and receiving. There are no continuous diesel engines currently operating in the vicinity of my home and I have noted no noxious odors in all the years I’ve lived there. Yet this is what the EIR says about Impact 10-5 (odors):

“The project would introduce new odor sources into the area (e.g. diesel exhaust emissions from delivery trucks and snow removal equipment). However, these types of odor sources already operate in and near the plan area and do not result in odor complaints. Also, the Specific Plan would not locate land uses in close proximity to any existing odor sources. This impact would be less than significant.”

| 163-4

Given that the proposed loading dock will be in very close proximity to my home and my neighbors, I do not believe that the impact will be “less than significant.”

The ARB (2005:9) stated “the majority of the estimated health risks from toxic air contaminants (TAC’s) are attributed to relatively few compounds, the most prominent being diesel PM, which is a complex mixture of hundreds of substances.” Other contaminants mentioned in the draft EIR, within a 75 ft. proximity to our homes, are carbon monoxide, nitrogen dioxide, and particulate matter. This is toxic. Period. Between the noise and the toxic fumes, we won’t be able to open our windows for air.

| 163-5

Besides the noise and the toxic air, the third problem with shipping and receiving on the East Parcel is the negative traffic pattern and congestion it will create. Every single semi truck and trailer that comes into the valley is then going to have to make a LEFT hand turn onto Squaw Valley road to get out of the valley. With the millions of deliveries this project will require for 25 years, it is going to create such a clot of traffic and congestion it is insane to contemplate. Every semi, every truck must make a left hand turn to get onto Squaw Valley road to get out... imagine all the semis making a left in front of the blind curve at the East Parcel onto SV road. Talk about a traffic pattern from hell. The shipping and receiving facility could be in Truckee next to the freeway. Another option is rather than renting/buying all of the East Parcel acreage, reduce the amount and use the money to buy/rent the land around the entrance (7-11 area) and put the shipping/receiving station there, behind attractive planting/screening. It would remove the noise problem, the toxic air next to homes, and a better traffic flow in and out.

| 163-6

The bottom line is this: the East Parcel abuts a quiet residential neighborhood with working people, young children, and retirees. The proposed construction of a day/night shipping and receiving facility and loading dock, essentially in our back yards, will have more than significant impacts. The mitigation strategies considered in the draft EIR are superficial at best and highly conjectural in any event (e.g. the shipping and receiving building placement will “make it far less likely” that noise standards will be exceeded and the impact of odors would be “less than significant”).

| 163-7

Rather than trying to placate homeowners with nonsensical mitigation arguments, SV/KSL should have rigorously considered alternatives to these plans. A shipping and receiving facility does not belong on the East Parcel. It would constitute noise abuse and a toxic air quality of the highest degree, and will create a horrible traffic pattern for all of Squaw Valley FOREVER.

| 163-8

The homeowners in our neighborhood, and all of Squaw Valley deserve a much more carefully considered, accurate proposal that would allow the commission to make decisions in an appropriate context. In the absence of a genuine discussion of alternatives, with the faulty assumptions made in the EIR document, and with impacts that are significant and devastating for the homeowners and all of Squaw Valley, I urge the commission to reject the draft EIR.

Thank you very much for addressing these concerns, and for your consideration. I would like to be sent all future notices related to the project and the EIR.

Sincerely,

Kathleen Cohen
heligirlsv@aol.com
Physical address: 301 Indian Trail Road
Olympic Valley, CA 96146
Mailing address: 409 Avila Road
San Mateo, CA 944
Home phone: 530-583-8053
Cell phone: 650-773-4849

I63Kathleen Cohen
July 9, 2015

- I63-1 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 comment also provides a summary of detailed comments provided below. See responses to the detailed comments below.
- I63-2 See the Master Response regarding the Reduced Density Alternative, which includes an introduction about the DEIR alternatives analysis. As described therein, CEQA requires that “An EIR shall include a range of reasonable alternatives to the project, or to the location of the project, which would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6[a]). The DEIR evaluated a number of alternatives to the project (see Chapter 17, “Alternatives,” of the DEIR), as well as provided mitigation measures for the proposed project for all significant and potentially significant impacts in an effort to “substantially lessen the significant effects of the project.” These mitigation measures, many of which are applicable to, or pertain directly to, the East Parcel, are identified throughout the DEIR and compiled in Table 2-2 of the DEIR’s Executive Summary. Further, as described in Section 2.1, “Project Modifications,” of this FEIR and the Master Response regarding the East Parcel, the applicant has proposed changes to the East Parcel layout in response to concerns expressed by the Squaw Valley Design Review Committee and members of the public.
- With the exception of acquiring additional land, there are no other viable locations for the shipping & receiving facility that achieve the project objectives of reducing large truck traffic to the western portion of Olympic Valley.
- I63-3 See the Master Response regarding the East Parcel.
- I63-4 See the Master Response regarding the East Parcel.
- I63-5 The potential air quality impacts associated with the East Parcel are addressed in Chapter 10, “Air Quality,” 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. Also, see the Master Response regarding the East Parcel.
- I63-6 The potential traffic impacts associated with the East Parcel 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.
- I63-7 See the Master Response regarding the East Parcel. Also see response to comment I63-2 regarding the alternative locations that were considered for the shipping & receiving facility.
- I63-8 The comment provides a summary of detailed comments provided above. See responses to the detailed comments above.
- 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.

164

Maywan Krach

From: Ed Colloff <ecolloff@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 15, 2015 12:16 PM
To: Placer County Environmental Coordination Services
Subject: KSL Capital Partners "Squaw Valley Village Specific Plan"

July 15, 2015

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

Dear Ms. Krach,

I understand that Placer County is about to make a decision regarding expanded development in Squaw Valley. While I am not a resident of Squaw Valley, I feel I have a close connection there I learned how to ski at Squaw before the 1960 Olympics. I skied there (a well as at Alpine and Heavenly!) during high school and college and continue to ski there as an adult with my family. 164-1

Squaw Valley is a place of special beauty. I can well understand why Wayne Poulsen fell in love with it. Unfortunately, over development tends to ruin that beauty. If KSL is allowed to go ahead with its proposed development, Squaw will look more Disneyland in the mountains than the truly beautiful place that it is. 164-2

Moreover, it will aggravate the already (in my opinion) problematic traffic in and out of the Valley. It will place more of a strain on the utilities needed to provide our already limited water and manage waste removal/treatment. 164-3

In short, I do not think this kind of development is in keeping with environment of Squaw or the needs of the greater Tahoe community. 164-4

Sincerely,

Ed Colloff MD

San Mateo, CA

I64Ed Colloff MD
July 15, 2015

- I64-1 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.
- I64-2 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.
- I64-3 The project's potential effects related to traffic and public utilities (including water supply and wastewater removal/treatment) are addressed in Chapters 9, "Transportation and Circulation," and 14, "Public Utilities and Services," respectively, 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.
- I64-4 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.

I65

Maywan Krach

From: Lee <plcopeland@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Wednesday, July 15, 2015 1:42 PM
To: Placer County Environmental Coordination Services
Subject: Squaw

No more development. Enough already!
Thanks,
Lee Copeland

I I65-1

Sent from my iPhone

I65Lee Copeland
July 15, 2015

I65-1

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.

I66

Maywan Krach

From: Alysson Coulter <alyssonc@yahoo.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2015 10:36 AM
To: Placer County Environmental Coordination Services
Subject: Lake Tahoe squaw valley building

To whom it may concern,

I love Lake Tahoe. My family owns a house there, and prior to that we spent many a family vacation enjoying the beautiful scenery. This building sounds atrocious and wasteful, not to mention an eye sore. There is already limited water for the current residents, and more development is the last thing we need. The environmental effect will be great and for generations to come. Please do not allow this building to come to fruition.

I
166-1
I

Best regards,

Alysson

I66

Alysson Coulter
July 17, 2015

I66-1

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.

I67

Maywan Krach

From: Peter J Crosby III <papaebe@icloud.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2015 7:02 AM
To: Placer County Environmental Coordination Services
Subject: Comments on dEIR

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft EIR relating to SVSH's application seeking adoption of "The Village at Squaw Valley Specific Plan". My name is Peter J Crosby and I and my family have been full time residents of Alpine Meadows for 36 years. I first fished Squaw Creek in 1946 with my Dad and have been skiing at Squaw since 1949 so I have seen significant change in the valley over the years. However the scope and density of this proposed project truly alarms me. We have plenty of areas suitable for high rise developments and "Disneylands). Squaw Valley is not one of them.

I67-1

While I have a number of concerns and comments regarding the environmental impacts of the proposed project and the conclusions arrived at in the Draft EIR I will limit them to the following:

--Traffic

I do not agree with the selection of the 2011-2012 year for the traffic analysis. I cannot understand why that year chosen as it certainly does not represent a typical winter even by a long shot. Given that fact I believe that the Traffic Analysis should be completely redone using a typical year or average of one or more reasonably typical years. Of course there is the trickle down effect of the faulty traffic analysis e.g. parking, noise, air quality etc. For me this unbelievably glaring error tends to casts suspicion on the sourcing of much of the other data used in the Draft EIR. I note that the traffic, parking and visitation data was collected by the project applicant team and independently reviewed (verified ?) by Fehr & Peers. Are you convinced that the data is reliable when it is provided by the Applicant?

I67-2

--Parking

I do not agree with the notion that there is a 22% turnover during the day. How was that number arrived at? I suspect that it was provided by either the applicant or their consultants. The dEIR should be required to substantiate it and If it cannot be verified then the entire parking analysis needs to be redone.

I67-3

--Visual Impacts

108' tall buildings in an environment as beautiful as Squaw Valley? They will obstruct views, create shadows, and increase night light through winter reflectivity. We here in Alpine Meadows lost our beautiful, starry nights when High Camp, was developed and this proposed development will certainly exacerbate the problem.

I67-4

WSA

Why didn't the 2014 recalibration include the precipitation numbers for the drought years of 2012-2014?

I67-5

--Alternatives

I don't believe one of the most viable of the alternatives has been adequately analyzed in the dEIR. The applicant should be required to submit an alternative plan that reduces density by 50% and maximum building heights to 72' in order to reduce or eliminate the substantial unavoidable impacts outlined in the dEIR.

167-6

--Conclusion

In my opinion Placer County should not approve this overly massive project in its present form because it clearly violates Placer County's code 1.G.1 as the project's significant and unavoidable impacts, as enumerated in the dEIR, cannot be adequately mitigated. Why have a policy if you don't adhere to it.

167-7

Thank you again for allowing me to provide my comments on the dEIR

Cordially
Peter J Crosby

Sent from my iPad

I67Peter J. Crosby
June 21, 2015

- I67-1 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.
- I67-2 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. The DEIR analyses of parking (see Chapter 9, "Transportation and Circulation," and the Master Response on this topic), noise (see Chapter 11, "Noise," and the Master Response on this topic), and air quality (see Chapter 10, "Air Quality," and Master Response on this topic) are similarly adequate and no changes to the DEIR are necessary.
- In response to the comment regarding the source of data used in the DEIR, all information provided by the applicant was reviewed by County staff and the County's EIR consultant to verify that the methods and techniques used to collect and analyze the information were credible. None of the information was accepted without analysis of its veracity, to the degree needed to provide for an independent review. The traffic analysis is based on data collected by the applicant's consultant and the County's EIR consultant; and published data from the Institute of Traffic Engineers, Transportation Research Board, Caltrans, and Placer County. Before considering approval of the project, the lead agency's decision-making body, the Placer County Board of Supervisors, is required to certify that the EIR has been completed in compliance with CEQA, that it has reviewed and considered the information in the EIR, and that the EIR reflects the independent judgment of the lead agency.
- I67-3 See the portion of the traffic Master Response regarding the adequacy of parking supply. Parking turnover was identified based upon observations of arrivals and departures over a busy ski day in the primary day skier parking area. It reflects factors such as season pass ski holders that choose to ski in the morning, departing prior to the peak day skier parking period in early afternoon. For additional discussion of the 22 percent parking turnover cited in the DEIR, as referenced in the comment, see Table 5 of the *Village at Squaw Valley Parking Analysis* (LSC Transportation Consultants 2014).
- I67-4 The project's potential impacts related to visual resources are addressed in Chapter 8, "Visual Resources," of the DEIR.
- I67-5 See the Master Response regarding water supply.
- I67-6 The comment states that the applicant should be required to submit an alternative plan that reduces density by 50 percent and maximum building heights to 72 feet to reduce or eliminate the significant and unavoidable impacts identified in the DEIR. Alternatives to the proposed project are described and evaluated in Chapter 17, "Alternatives," of the DEIR. As described therein, the Reduced Density Alternative would reduce the overall size of the project by approximately 50 percent, as the comment suggests; this alternative is described and evaluated on pages 17-24 through 17-31 of the DEIR. See also the Master Response regarding the Reduced Density Alternative, including a discussion of why this alternative may not be feasible. The DEIR also includes a discussion of the Reduced Buildings Heights Alternative, which was considered, but not evaluated further in the DEIR. This alternative would reduce building heights to conform with the existing Intrawest Village (i.e., 75 feet), similar to what the comment suggests. The rationale for why this alternative was not evaluated further in the DEIR is described on page 17-12 of the DEIR. All feasible

alternatives have been described and evaluated to the level needed to provide a comparative analysis of impact to the project, which conforms to CEQA's requirements of alternatives analysis (see CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6). Detailed design is not necessary; rather, the description of the alternatives needs to be sufficient to allow for a reasonable analysis of impacts compared to those associated with the project.

As described in Section 2.1, "Project Modifications," of this FEIR, the applicant has provided changes to some of the proposed building heights in response to concerns expressed by the Squaw Valley Design Review Committee and members of the public, to the degree feasible while still attaining the underlying purpose of the project. Specifically,

- ▲ All 108-foot-tall building heights have been reduced to a maximum height of 96 feet, with the exception of about 50 percent of the MAC;
- ▲ A large portion of Building 8-A has been reduced in height from 108 feet to 84 feet;
- ▲ Buildings 13 A-C have been reduced in height, with the maximum height being 84 feet;
- ▲ Building 15 has been reduced in height, with the maximum height being 84 feet, and a portion of the southwest wing has been reduced to 66 feet; and
- ▲ Building 6 has been reduced to a height of 56 feet.

No changes in density are proposed. See Table 3-1 on page 3-10 of the DEIR for information regarding the project's proposed number of units and bedrooms by land use type.

Ultimately, it is up to the Placer County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors whether or not to approve the proposed project (as modified by Section 2.1 of this FEIR) or an alternative.

I67-7

See the Master Response regarding significant and unavoidable impacts, including a discussion of Placer County General Plan Policy 1.G.1.

168

Maywan Krach

From: From Marnie Dam <marniedam@aol.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 15, 2015 2:54 PM
To: Placer County Environmental Coordination Services
Subject: Squaw Valley

I own a condo at Northstar. The north part of Lake Tahoe is already very crowded. I do not think that adding more homes and businesses in North Lake Tahoe will help. Move them all to Reno or Sacramento and keep the Lake Tahoe area pristine for visitors to enjoy. 168-1

Marnie Dam
600 N. Las Casas Ave.
Pacific Palisades. CA 90272

I68

Marnie Dam
July 15, 2015

I68-1

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.

169

Maywan Krach

From: danelelizabeth@gmail.com
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2015 12:01 PM
To: Placer County Environmental Coordination Services
Cc: danelelizabeth@gmail.com
Subject: Draft EIR for Squaw Valley Real Estate Co.

To the Placer County Planning and Community Development Agency,

I am a full time resident of Squaw Valley and an architect and developer. I have build approximately 10 homes in Squaw Valley between 1997 and 2007 so I feel I have some understanding of construction procedures, especially in Squaw Valley. In addition, I own a home and a few lots in Squaw Valley. My primary residence is approximately 200ft above the Village and above the ski area parking lot on Washoe Dr., a small cult-de-sac at the west end of town. I am writing to make a few comments about the Draft EIR which Squaw Valley Real Estate Co has submitted.

169-1

I have several concerns which I would like to address. The first is Noise. The General Plan states that "Noise created by new transportation noise sources, including roadway improvement projects, shall be mitigated so as not to exceed the levels specified in Table 11-7 (60db) at outdoor activity areas or interior spaces of existing noise-sensitive land uses." However it allows some exceptions including construction noise between 6am-8pm M-F and 8am - 8pm S & Sun are exempt from the ordinance.

169-2

This brings to light an important element in this application, the span of 25 years proposed for this project. For the Squaw Valley residents to tolerate construction noise for 25 years is unthinkable. It would drive many people out of the valley. Many houses are 2nd homes and those people come to Squaw in the summer, the biggest building season, for peace and quiet. The constant construction noise and roadway noise with trucks and construction equipment and deliveries would literally deprive residents of the biggest reason they come to Squaw Valley. As a developer I favor a reasonable amount of time allocated for all construction projects but 25 years far exceeds what anyone can consider reasonable. From my home I can hear the music from the Village during summer concerts and I have no doubt that I will hear the construction noise because the noise travels up the hill. There is no way to mitigate this noise. I would sympathize with a request for a few years of construction, but 25 years deprives the residents of Squaw Valley of their peace and quiet for far too long. This noise issue should NOT be treated as "Construction Noise" as referred to in the general plan, because it is PERMANENT noise and should be treated as such. 25 years of noise is not a construction project. It is longer than the average American owns their home, and for someone like me, it would be very hard to sell my house because people would find out that the noise would continue for 10 or 20 more years. This is a permanent noise that cannot be mitigated. I suggest the length of the project be drastically reduced to mitigate the noise and bring in into a timeline that can be considered construction noise. One of the mitigating factors mentioned in the DEIR is that homes are heavily insulated with dual pane windows. Most people in Squaw Valley, myself included, do not have air conditioning and we keep our windows and doors open as much as possible to enjoy the outdoors and to cool down the inside air temperature during the warm midday hours. SV is not Arizona and we do not want conditioned air, we want natural breezes created by opened windows and doors. It is unrealistic to expect people to keep their houses sealed up 6 months of the year to mitigate road and construction noise.

169-3

Another issue I would like to address is Traffic. The DEIR chose 2011-12 as the winter for their traffic analysis. This was a below average year in snowfall and therefore a below average year in traffic. This study should be redone and an average snowfall year should be chosen. We have been in a drought, which has happened in the past, and drought years are not typical for winter traffic. The Traffic Study impacts many

169-4

other findings so it is very important that it be redone. Once it is redone, the parking portion of the DEIR also needs to be reconsidered.

I 169-4
cont.

Lastly, I would like to address the Lot 16, 17 and 18 proposal. This is a prime aquifer recharge area and construction would put our water supply at risk per the SVPSD consultant, Hydrometrics WRI.

I 169-5

In conclusion, I believe that the SVRE project has too many "significant and unavoidable impacts" per the DEIR and that such impacts are unacceptable. Policy 1.G.1 states that "The County will support the expansion of existing winter ski and snow play areas and development of new areas ... where environmental impacts can be ADEQUATELY MITIGATED." I do not believe that this is the case based on the DEIR and hence, I hope that the scope of this project will be substantially reduce.

I 169-6

Thank you in advance for addressing my concerns,

Elizabeth Danel
1809 Washoe Rd.
Olympic Valley
415-531-0617 cell
DanelElizabeth@gmail.com

Sent from Surface

I69Elizabeth Danel
July 17, 2015

- I69-1 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.
- I69-2 The comment summarizes General Plan Policy 9.A.9 related to new transportation noise sources and construction noise. No specific issues related to the content, analysis, or conclusions in the DEIR are raised in this comment. No further response is provided here.
- I69-3 See the Master Response regarding the 25-year construction period and the Master Response regarding noise. The commenter states that there is no way to mitigate the construction noise. This is not correct. Mitigation Measure 11-1a (Implement construction-noise reduction measures), Mitigation Measure 11-1b (Implement construction-noise reduction measures during noise-sensitive time periods), Mitigation Measure 11-2a (Implement vibration noise reduction measures) and Mitigation Measure 11-2b (Develop and implement a vibration control plan) are included in the DEIR, and would reduce the effects of construction noise and vibration associated with plan area construction. However, due to the relatively long period of time over which project construction would take place, off and on for 25 years, the effects of construction noise were determined to be significant and unavoidable.
- I69-4 See the portions of the traffic Master Response regarding use of the 2011-2012 ski season data to represent existing winter conditions and adequacy of the parking supply.
- I69-5 See the Master Response regarding the mountain maintenance facility and the Master Response regarding water supply.
- I69-6 See the Master Response regarding significant and unavoidable impacts, including a discussion of Placer County General Plan Policy 1.G.1.

170

Maywan Krach

From: Patrick Davis <pdavis@vectorid.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 15, 2015 10:37 AM
To: Placer County Environmental Coordination Services
Subject: Squaw Valley dEIR

Hello,

I'm hoping to add my voice to the many that are concerned about development in Squaw Valley. Overall, I think an opportunity exists to develop something great, and the current proposals are far from this ideal. Specifically, I'm very concerned about the quantity of buildings, their height, and negative impacts on Squaw Valley's natural beauty. A mistake in building too much, too tall, too ugly, too bland would take far too long to correct, if it was possible to correct at all.

For me, the most important thing about Squaw Valley is it's natural beauty and the ability to access the surrounding area year round.

Excessive building, housing, and transportation would negatively impact this beauty and access. Please make careful considerations of the EIR and the long-term impacts of the choices being made.

Thank you for your consideration.

Patrick Davis
10141 Columbine Rd.
Truckee, CA 96161
(530) 582-1841

170-1

170

Patrick Davis
July 15, 2015

170-1

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.

171

Maywan Krach

From: Daniel day <dannydayski@yahoo.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2015 8:59 PM
To: Placer County Environmental Coordination Services
Subject: Squaw Development

Hey Placer County,

I was born and raised in Olympic Valley, CA. I have concerns that the proposed development by KSL would tarnish this unique and special place. I know there will be future development in this valley, but let it be smart development. 171-1

Sincerely,
Daniel Day

171

Daniel Day
July 17, 2015

171-1

No specific issues related to the content, analysis, or conclusions in the DEIR are raised in this comment. No further response is provided here.

172



Tom Day

1700 Navajo Court
P.O. Box 2151
Olympic Valley, CA 96146
(530) 412-1158
tomday@jps.net

July 15, 2015

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

Dear Placer County Planning Commission,

I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the dEIR for the development proposed by KSL at the base of the ski area here in Squaw Valley.

172-1

I attended the June 25th 2015 meeting held in Kings Beach. What caught my attention and concern was the huge number of unavoidable impacts. To me this is a red flag that the project is too big. As you move forward with this EIR and the project in general, please consider what is appropriate in terms of significant unavoidable impacts. Also, keep in mind your own policy, I.G.1.

172-2

By far, our largest water source is our aquifer that sits under the western part of our valley, directly under the current village and proposed expansion. This needs to be protected at all costs. How lucky we are to be able to have our drinking water come directly from the source of the mountain. How fragile we are to have only one water source. I believe any analysis (water studies) of our aquifer needs to include the four year drought period that we are currently in. Lot 19 (15.1 dEIR) is being proposed to rezone this location from Forest Recreation to Heavy Commercial. This is unacceptable. This is the most fragile part of our aquifer, where Shirley Creek meets the valley floor and gets absorbed into the ground. This is proposed to have heavy maintenance activities, chemical and toxic waste materials stored and 200,000 gallons of propane stored here. Shirley Canyon is a gem to this valley that deserves better respect.

172-3

Parking: Like any event/arena location, you need to provide enough parking for peak attendance. When the event is not happening, it becomes empty space, that's the nature of the business.

172-4

Heights of buildings: The heights should be determined by the existing heights in the current village. Not by the height of the tallest in the valley, Resort at Squaw Creek, located almost a mile away, up against the forest in the south eastern part of the valley.

172-5

Noise should not exceed Placer County exterior standards by 28%.



Under our current governmental structure, the people who live in Squaw Valley cannot make this important decision that will affect our fate. We are relying on you, the Placer County Planning Commission and Placer County Board of Supervisors to make this critical decision for us.

Thank you very much for allowing me the opportunity to comment on the dEIR for the KSL expansion project that could very well impact the quality of life for the residents and visitors in our community.

172-6

Sincerely,

Tom Day

Squaw Valley Resident since 1982

172Tom Day
July 15, 2015

- 172-1 See the Master Response regarding significant unavoidable impacts, which includes a discussion of Placer County General Plan Policy 1.G.1.
- 172-2 See the Master Response regarding water supply. Also, see the Master Response regarding the mountain maintenance facility.
- 172-3 Parking is 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.
- 172-4 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.
- 172-5 The project’s noise impacts are addressed in Chapter 11, “Noise,” 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.
- 172-6 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.

173

July 12, 2015

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

Dear Sir/Madam,

We are writing about the proposed development at Squaw Valley and the draft EIR. We purchased a unit in the Village at Squaw Valley prior to the acquisition of Squaw Valley by KSL.

We were attracted to Squaw Valley because of its extensive natural beauty, the views from our unit and the area's relatively quiet, peaceful nature. We are very concerned about the proposed plans as we believe they are much too extensive and will create noise, traffic congestion, disruption of the peaceful nature of the area and will block views.

173-1

KSL, by its nature, is a short term owner focused on creating gains for its investors. On its website, KSL states "our strategy involves four critical elements (i) expanding each enterprise by enhancing the existing revenue base, (ii) **creating new business opportunities**, (iii) improving operating efficiencies and (iv) **optimizing the value of associated real estate**."(emphasis added). In the case of Squaw Valley, this mission means finding every way possible to drive more revenues from the land that they own, even if that means overburdening the area with too much development. At some point, this investment will be sold to benefit KSL's investors but the impact of these changes will be irreversible. Thus, it is critical that Placer County make decisions for the long term benefit of Squaw Valley.

173-2

The addition of the large number of hotel rooms and accommodations and the Mountain Adventure Camp will bring exponentially more people to the valley and result in much greater levels of noise and traffic which we do not believe will be adequately handled by the mitigation measures outlined in the report. This additional congestion has the potential to significantly change the nature of the valley in a very negative and harmful way. Additionally the development buildings are too tall, further impacting the natural beauty by affecting views of this wonderful area. The construction period screening described in the report will not mitigate the long term and permanent negative impact of the new buildings.

173-3

We encourage you to reject the current plans and instead require an alternative that will involve considerably less density and lower heights.

173-4

Thank you for considering these concerns and the long term future of Squaw Valley,

Sincerely,



Howard DeBow
Dennis Markus

173**Howard DeBow & Dennis Markus**
July 12, 2015

- 173-1 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 comment also provides a summary of other comments raised below. See responses to the detailed comments below.
- 173-2 The comment focuses on the applicant and potential project profitability. No specific issues related to the content, analysis, or conclusions in the DEIR are raised in this comment. No further response is provided here.
- 173-3 The comment does not provide specific reasons specifying why the mitigation measures identified in the DEIR to reduce the project's noise and traffic impacts are inadequate. Therefore, a response cannot be provided. The comment also states that these impacts will change the nature of the valley. This is not a specific comment on the contents of the DEIR.
- Regarding the height of project buildings, the project's potential to create an adverse effect on a scenic vista is described under Impact 8-1 in the DEIR (see pages 8-47 through 8-50). Both construction and operational impacts are included therein. Mitigation Measure 8-1 would require the installation of screening fences during construction; however, the DEIR concludes that even with this mitigation, the impact during construction would be significant and unavoidable. Regarding operational impacts, the project would adhere to the VSVSP Development Standards and Design Guidelines, which include architectural design, exterior treatments and colors, and landscaping. Nonetheless, the DEIR concludes on page 8-50 that this visual impact would remain significant and unavoidable to residents during project operation.
- 173-4 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.

174

Maywan Krach

From: Joan Dedo <jpdedo@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Wednesday, July 15, 2015 2:08 PM
To: Placer County Environmental Coordination Services
Subject: Squaw Valley development

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

Re the ill-advised projected development of Squaw Valley:

Having lived in the Donner Summit area since 1965, I find it hard to understand any of the reasoning behind this proposed project.

At the best of times, Rte 89's traffic is limited by its geography and during "the seasons" it is a nightmare to travel. Taking several years in the building process and all the trafficking of supplies and construction needs only adds to ecological distress! What can they mean there is no egregious Impact with this plan?

174-1

Limited water is not going to go away, so how can they think that more people, housing, etc., is not Impact and then some? Are they denying the scientific facts of life we are now very aware of and have experienced living with its limitations during the past decade?

174-2

Making a "Manhattan skyline" in the midst of magnificent nature is deplorable, and hardly a 'vacation escape.'

174-3

Please, help everyone use common sense and stop this fiasco, ecological disaster and eyesore as soon as possible.

174-4

Sincerely, Joan Dedo

174Joan Dedo
July 15, 2015

- 174-1 The project's traffic-related impacts 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.
- 174-2 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). No specific issues related to the content, analysis, or conclusions in the DEIR are raised in this comment. No further response is provided here.
- 174-3 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.
- 174-4 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.

175

July 1, 2015

To: **Maywan Krach**
Placer County Resource Agency
Environmental Coordination Services
3091 County Center Drive Suite 190
Auburn, CA 95603

From: **Gaetano DeMattei M.D.**
1529 Christy Lane
Olympic Valley, CA 96146

Subject: **Objections to the Draft ERI**
Submitted by Squaw Valley Real Estate LLC

Dear Sirs,

I have been a great fan of Squaw Valley since the 1960 Olympics where I served as a member of the Medical Support Team for several weeks.

After the first few years of skiing here on weekends and experiencing traffic delays while exciting the valley, we decided to buy a second home here in 1968. In 1977 my family became permanent residents while I visited on weekends. In 2002 I retired and Squaw became my permanent residence.

My 55 years of observing varying conditions at Squaw and relating these variations to the aspirations of Squaw Valley Real Estate’s plans presented in their draft DRI, I would like to present what I think is good and bad about the draft DRI, and why significant modifications should be made.

First, the good things:

- 1) Visual attractiveness of the base area from Squaw Valley road, especially in the Summer, is less than ideal, and some building in the far east area (Designated as VC-C), as proposed by SVRE would be an improvement.
- 2) Family activity in the base area is limited in the Summer, and some kind of activity center with swimming and water slides would be desirable, but it

175-1
175-2

does not have to be a 90,000 square foot Mountain Adventure Center. Maybe 50,000 square feet.

- 3) The Vegetation plans proposed will certainly be a big improvement.
- 4) Putting a second Fire Station near the center of the Village will be good.
- 5) Providing Employee Housing is certainly good.

Second, Things that I don't think will happen even if the present draft DIR is approved:

- 1) I don't think Squaw Valley will be made into a First Class Destination by adding more Hotels and Timeshares and Housing. I have skied at multiple 'Destination Resorts' in the United States and Squaw is at a disadvantage in comparison because of the limited Skiing terrain and unpredictable weather. Over the years, I have visited with people who had their visit wiped out because of inclement weather, and their experience has discouraged friends from coming to Squaw for extended stays.
- 2) Increasing Hotels and Housing will not improve the skiing terrain or control unpredictable weather.
- 3) Economic considerations. In the past, several conglomerates have expanded valley amenities, namely Perini Corporation who built only half of the Resort at Squaw Creek project, Mainline Corp. of Australia who planned a building project in the present parking lot, and never did any building, and Intrawest, who planned to double the size of the present village, only to abandon their projected goals.

175-2
cont.

Third, Things that should be changed in the draft DIR that would make the project acceptable and welcomed by the Squaw Valley Home Owners and guests.

- 1) Limit the number of Units in the VC and VCN regions to 450-500 and the number of bedrooms to 700-800.
- 2) Limit the Building heights so that they do not exceed the height of the present Village's buildings, 78 feet.
- 3) The present views of the mountain would not be invaded by limiting the heights.

175-3

175-4

- 4) There would be less stress on the valley aquifer needed to supply the extra water required by the increased population.
- 5) There would be less green house gas, toxic waste and noise contamination.
- 6) Circulation and Parking. There will still be increased traffic problems on busy days, but by increasing the width of Squaw Valley road's 40 foot wide passage that extends from the Queen of the Snows Church to the Squaw Creek turnoff to a 48 foot wide three lane striped road would make ingress and egress much safer and easier to manage.

I 175-5
I 175-6
I 175-7

I have submitted my analysis of how the proposed draft DIR could be changed to make Squaw Valley a more desirable place to live and to visit for future generations, so they can enjoy what past generations cherished.

Respectively,

Gaetano DeMattei

175

Gaetano DeMattei MD
July 1, 2015

- 175-1 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.
- 175-2 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.
- 175-3 The comment suggests that the project be revised to limit the number of units in the areas zoned as VC and VC-N to 450-500 and the number of bedrooms to 700-800. As described in Chapter 3, "Project Description," of the DEIR (see Table 3-1), the project includes a maximum of 1,493 bedrooms (up to 850 units).
- 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. The Reduced Density Alternative and its potential effects as compared with the proposed project are described on pages 17-24 through 17-31 of the DEIR. This alternative would reduce the amount of development by approximately 50 percent, which equates to a maximum of 747 bedrooms (up to 425 units). However, as stated on page 17-45 of the DEIR,
- The Reduced Density Alternative is the environmentally superior alternative of the other alternatives considered. With this alternative, significant impacts to housing, biological resources, cultural resources, visual resources, traffic, air quality (operations), noise, and greenhouse gases would be reduced or avoided, when compared to the project. However, this alternative would not meet several project objectives, and its financial feasibility is not known.
- Further, see also the Master Response regarding the Reduced Density Alternative.
- 175-4 A Reduced Building Heights Alternative that would limit building heights to the existing Intrawest Village (i.e., 75 feet) is described in Chapter 17, "Alternatives," of the DEIR (see page 17-12). Potential impacts of this alternative are described therein, and it was not evaluated further in the DEIR because it would not meet project objectives.
- 175-5 Alternatives to the proposed project are described and evaluated in Chapter 17, "Alternatives," of the DEIR. For those alternatives selected for detailed analysis in the DEIR, their potential effects—including those related to water supply as mentioned in the comment—are compared with the proposed project. It is unclear to which alternative the comment refers. Therefore, a further response is not provided here.
- 175-6 Alternatives to the proposed project are described and evaluated in Chapter 17, "Alternatives," of the DEIR. For those alternatives selected for detailed analysis in the DEIR, their potential effects—including those related to greenhouse gas emissions, waste, and noise as mentioned in the comment—are compared with the proposed project. It is unclear to which alternative the comment refers. Therefore, a further response is not provided here.
- 175-7 The Widened Squaw Valley Road Alternative and its potential effects as compared with the proposed project are described on pages 17-31 through 17-35 of the DEIR.

176

Maywan Krach

From: Mary Devore <mjdevore@bendbroadband.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2015 4:28 PM
To: Placer County Environmental Coordination Services
Subject: Saving Squaw Valley

Hello and thank you for taking your time to read this email.

I have lived in , enjoyed and visited Squaw Valley since 1975. I will be succinct since I am writing just under the wire and know this is only one of many emails and letters you will be reading. Basically, and obviously, the Valley is beautiful, unique and irreplaceable and should not be ruined for the delight of a few developers who wish to get rich and rich people who want it for their own special playground.

I am hoping that since you have been willing to be on the commission you have the love of the special area you live in and want it to be special for the future generations. It is better to leave something as it is than to have to try and cover over mistakes and environmental damages later. My heart feels such joy as I drive into the Valley and see the beauty. Imagine driving in and seeing Trump towers and Wally's world. NO NO NO There are plenty of other places they can build nearby that would not have the damaging impacts.

Please, keep it special. Developers come and go but there is only one Squaw Valley,

Thanks,
Mary Devore

Mary J. Devore

176-1

176 Mary Devore
July 17, 2015

176-1 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.

177

Maywan Krach

From: bret dezordo <bretdezordo@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2015 4:44 PM
To: Placer County Environmental Coordination Services
Subject: Squaw valley development

To whom it may concern,
I write to you from the County of Marin where I officially reside but in all honesty it is the Sierra where my heart lays. I am one of the thousands of flat landers who has done the roundtrip to Squaw valley and back, all four seasons, since en utero. It was startling to see the meadows turn into a golf course, the resort built, and the village constructed. At what point is it decided that development is enough? I do hope you give ample consideration to the impact this project will have on the current population of users but more importantly to those who have yet to discover how special this valley really is. Thank you for your consideration.....

Bret de Zordo
For Your Gardens Needs'
www.fygn.com
415-595-0227
CA-27 State License #859766

177-1

177

Bret de Zordo
July 17, 2015

177-1

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.

178

Maywan Krach

From: Nada Djordjevich <nada@gibsonandassociates.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2015 8:42 PM
To: Placer County Environmental Coordination Services
Subject: Mountain Adventure Center

Placer County Community Development Resource Agency,

Recently I was made aware of the plans for the development of a mega-resort and recreational facility in Squaw Valley, CA. I would like to state my opposition to this project, and hope that Placer County governmental leadership will reject this application.

The Sierras are a unique and wonderful place of natural beauty. I like many others live in the Bay Area and come to Squaw Valley, to be outdoors, and as a respite from urban life. I am not opposed to the existing developments in the Valley, but layering more onto this valley will not be environmentally sound. Is the mega-resort what we want to leave behind for the generations to follow? Once developed, this cannot be undone.

Please vote no to this large-scale, long-term development for Squaw Valley.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Nada Djordjevich

178-1

178

Nada Djordjevich
July 16, 2015

178-1

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.

179

Maywan Krach

From: David Doherty <ddoherty33@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2015 2:22 AM
To: Placer County Environmental Coordination Services
Subject: Draft EIR Comments

To whom it may concern:

While I was not born and raised in Squaw Valley, I have called it home for the last 20 years. As I was taking a walk through the valley today, I imagined the trucks and tourist traffic driving up and down street, the constant backup beeping from heavy equipment, the light pollution clouding a starry night, and the feeling of living in a city with tall buildings in a concrete jungle. I also had a taste of it a few weeks ago as I had to listen to a helicopter flying low in the valley all day. It sickens me to contemplate what KSL has proposed to develop in this precious area. No thanks.

It baffles me as to how KSL thinks there is a need or demand for any sort of such development. What shocks me even more is that they have no concern that our current infrastructure of roads, water sources, etc, cannot support what they are proposing.

If you have been around Lake Tahoe during the 4th of July or a holiday week in the winter, you will see incessant traffic, careless littering, and general disrespect for the area. Believe it or not, I saw someone throw a cigarette out a car window last week. The goal of KSL is to turn Squaw Valley into an amusement park where these impacts will be seen on a daily basis, not just holiday periods.

While it is important to have tourism and development to sustain our local economy, the idea that you can have too much of a good thing is very real and pertinent here. Unfortunately, KSL has no grasp of this concept. Their myopic views are driven by the almighty dollar with no regard to the short and long term environmental impacts.

Thank you for taking the time to hear our concerned voices.

Sincerely,

David Doherty

179-1

179

David Doherty
July 17, 2015

179-1

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.

180

Maywan Krach

From: Caryn Dombroski <caryn_d@pacbell.net>
Sent: Saturday, July 11, 2015 8:12 AM
To: Placer County Environmental Coordination Services
Cc: caryndombroski@gmail.com
Subject: Squaw Valley expansion project

To: Maywan Krach

I've been just watching and reading so far but the two factors that are, to me, crucial - water and traffic. A chain is only as strong as it's weakest link and, as it has been driven home to us these last few years, one of our weak links here is water. None of the schemes proposed can offset the fact that more people equals more water consumption. No recycling or smart use or dry garden can negate that fact. 180-1

Highway 89 is already heavily used on busy weekends, consistently slowed to a crawl in winter and filled to capacity even in the best weather. It's a beautiful, scenic drive in a canyon that, to my inexperienced eye, seems to have little room for expansion. And I don't think we need another 4 lanes of heavy traffic added to our infrastructure. 180-2

Placer County is gorgeous. People come here for that, not fancy hotels. We need to do everything we can to preserve our best asset. 180-3

Thank you,
Caryn Dombroski
10695 Palisades
Truckee, CA

180

Caryn Dombroski
July 11, 2015

- 180-1 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). No specific issues related to the content, analysis, or conclusions in the DEIR are raised in this comment. No further response is provided here.
- 180-2 The project's traffic-related impacts 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.
- 180-3 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.