
I112Louis J. Goodman
June 19, 2015

I112-1 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.

I112-2 The comment questions the environmental impact and commercial viability of the project. Specifically, the comment notes existing traffic, water, sewer, and other infrastructure limitations. These issues are all addressed in 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.

With respect to the comment concerning overbuilding and commercial viability, these are not inherently environmental impacts requiring CEQA analysis. See Impact 4-5 on pages 4-29 through 4-31 of the DEIR regarding economic or social changes resulting in physical environmental changes. Also, see the Master Response regarding occupancy assumptions.

I113

Maywan Krach

From: Benjamin Hatchett <benjamin.hatchett@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2015 9:18 AM
To: Placer County Environmental Coordination Services
Subject: Comments on Squaw Valley Draft Environmental Impact Report
Attachments: SquawEIRcomments_bh.docx

Please find attached some comments on the Squaw Valley Draft Environmental Impact Report.
Thank you for considering these.
Sincerely,
Benjamin Hatchett
1780 Uplands Ct
Reno, Nevada 89523

I 1113-1

- 1. Section 2.3.4
The widening of Squaw Valley Road would produce significant, unavoidable, and irreversible changes to the Squaw Creek fluvial and meadow system. Negative impacts on the fishery, riparian, and meadow habitats through erosion, compaction, channel alteration, and loss of natural flow regimes would further degrade this already disturbed system. This alternative would require a separate EIR, correct?

I113-1
- 2. Section 2.3.7
In an era of over-exploitation of natural resources in the interest of short term capital gains and characterized by regional, state, and global economic instability, this alternative is clearly the most sustainable choice for maintaining the existing natural resource value and ecosystem services provided by Squaw Valley. The financial feasibility would be difficult to characterize, as often natural and ecological resources are not properly valued, nor are the costs of negative impacts of develop. This alternative would promote long-term viability of Squaw Valley as an outdoor recreation destination and location to enjoy and learn about the natural world. With this viability would come significant and enduring economic benefits to the region. Such language should be added to the existing text to better reflect the immediate, short, and long-term benefits of this alternative and economically superior outcome.

I113-2
- 3. Section 3 overview
The text currently poorly characterizes the irreversible damage that will be caused to the lower Squaw Creek watershed by construction disturbance (e.g., noise, air and water pollution, soil compaction, and addition of impermeable surfaces), increases in water use, and increases in population. The text should be revised to state that "unavoidable negative impacts to natural resources in Olympic Valley will occur with this project. Mitigation techniques such as habitat restoration will be implemented in an attempt to minimize damage to Squaw Creek's natural functions."

I113-3
- 4. Section 3 overview
What is a "peer world class North American ski destination?" Please provide examples and further details, including details about how such "peer world class North American ski destination(s)" have negatively changed their natural environmental settings.

I113-4
- 5. Section 3.1
The following statement must be quantified in both in units of acres and as a unitless fraction multiplied by 100 (to yield a percentage) to allow characterization of the meaning: "Most of the plan area has been previously developed or disturbed". What is "most" of 94 acres? 51%? 98%? These differences are important to be able to correctly estimate the magnitude of significant and unavoidable impacts.

I113-5
- 6. Exhibit 3.1
The location of the Reno Airport is incorrect. It is not located on the edge of the urban area in the Virginia Mountains. Please use correct coordinates when producing maps.

I113-6
- 7. Exhibit 3.1
The location of the Carson City place name should be shifted to the southwest to more accurately represent the actual location of the Carson City urban area.

I113-7
- 8. Exhibit 3.1
If Placer County is named and shown, why is Nevada County named and not shown? In addition, why are other counties not shown (e.g., Washoe, Douglas, Sierra, El Dorado, etc.?).

I113-8

<p><i>Similarly, why is Grass Valley shown but not Placerville, South Lake Tahoe, or Tahoe City? What is the significance of Grass Valley in the map's purpose? The map (Exhibit 3.1) must be made to conform with basic cartographic standards which include consistency in place names and map symbology.</i></p>	<p>I113-8 cont.</p>
<p>9. Exhibit 3.2 <i>Based upon this map, it appears that significantly more than "most of the plan area has been developed", in particular, the East Parcel and the western and northern portions of the plan area. Just because there is a road developed within the section of the plan area (e.g., northeast of Olympic Valley Lodge), this does not constitute most. The importance of proper quantification is necessary; see also comment 5.</i></p>	<p>I113-9</p>
<p>10. Exhibit 3.2 <i>An inset map must be provided to give the reader proper context as to precisely where the developments are located. As it stands, one cannot glean such information from either Exhibits 3.1 or 3.2 without prior knowledge.</i></p>	<p>I113-10</p>
<p>11. Exhibit 3.2 <i>The color selection of red for the plan area is a poor choice against a generally green background. This represents poor cartography as it presents challenges for the fraction of the population who suffer from red-green color blindness (deuteranomaly and protanomaly). The plan area line color selection must therefore be changed.</i></p>	<p>I113-11</p>
<p>12. 3.2.2 paragraph 2 <i>A plain is by definition flat, therefore the more accurate landform term should be used (pedmont). The first sentence should be re-written as "The topography of the main Village area is a gently eastward sloping piedmont with a topographic gradient of x ft / 1000ft".</i></p>	<p>I113-12</p>
<p>13. Exhibit 3.3 <i>Same comment as number 11, do not use red with green on maps. The map symbology must be changed accordingly.</i></p>	<p>I113-13</p>
<p>14. Exhibit 3.3 <i>Why does this map have a legend but the previous two (Exhibits 3.1 and 3.2) not have a legend? All maps must be consistent for clarity; please add legends to Exhibits 3.1 and 3.2.</i></p>	<p>I113-14</p>
<p>15. Section 3.4.1 Design Concept Paragraph 1 <i>How would the natural landscape be extended into the Village, and how would this create a strong sense of place? This language needs to be quantifiable or at the very least made more descriptive. The "sense of place" concept has its roots in geographical thought and thus the language in the text should be clarified to characterize this concept.</i></p>	<p>I113-15</p>
<p>16. Section 3.4.1 Design Concept Paragraph 1 <i>The language as it stands of "A coherent mix of building masses, heights, and materials..." is ambiguous and must be clarified. What constitutes "coherent"?</i></p>	<p>I113-16</p>
<p>17. Exhibit 3.4 <i>See above comments about cartographic consistency; why does this map have a locator inset map while others do not? The lack of consistency in the mapping exhibits is deeply concerning and must be addressed in the final EIR. These comments apply to all map exhibits hereafter.</i></p>	<p>I113-17</p>

- 18. Section 3.4.1 Design Concept Paragraph 2
The geometric aspects of building heights appear inconsistent with aesthetics of aforementioned 'view preservation'. A diagram showing how the views will be preserved for buildings of such height must be added, particularly in light of how closely spaced the buildings will be as diagrammed in Exhibit 3.5.

I113-18
- 19. Section 3.4.1 Design Concept Paragraph 3
The statement that the "maximum building heights... would not be exceeded" lies in stark contrast to historical Squaw Valley development behaviors, which completely neglected to remain consistent with prior acknowledgements to established law (recall the removal of fir trees along Red Dog or channel alteration of Squaw Creek...).

I113-19
- 20. Exhibit 3.5
It appears from the figure that significant channel constriction of Squaw Creek will occur and that the creek will not be allowed to naturally meander though its reaches passing through the Plan Area. This would result in higher flow velocities and promote channel incision, bank erosion, loss of habitat, and contribute to a lowering of the shallow aquifer's water table. As a result, reduced in-stream flows, higher water temperatures, and loss of aquatic habitat and species would be expected. Has a hydraulic model been implemented to address these concerns?

I113-20
- 21. 3.4.1 Mountain Adventure Camp
It is unclear to me why a need exists for extensive indoor/outdoor water based recreation when the Truckee River and Lake Tahoe are so close. This indoor/outdoor water based recreation would require significant energy and water resource consumption and produce pollution of freshwater resources via chlorination. How will consumptive water use for this facility be treated prior to return the Squaw Creek and eventually to the Truckee River where the requirements of Clean Water Act must be met? Will this facility jeopardize the existing Truckee River Operating Agreement? What is the justification for the construction of such a camp when natural recreational water opportunities exist in such proximity? What is the expected cost of this facility? Would the money spent on these indoor/outdoor water based recreation facilities not be better spent on restoration and environmental education efforts to promote long-term environmental sustainability and public enjoyment?

I113-21
- 22. Section 3.4.1 Parking
The 10,663 daily skiers for whom parking exists appears to be low by a factor of two to the total capacity of the mountain and additional village tourists. What is the total skier capacity of the mountain (in units of people)? What is the estimated number of people expected to visit the Village on any given day? What are the ranges (please report +/- two standard deviations of the mean expected value) of skier visitors and tourists expected for a holiday weekend versus "any ski day"?

I113-22
- 23. Section 3.4.1 Parking
The phrase "any ski day" is ambiguous; from personal experience and statistics of ski resort visitors, the day before Christmas is completely different from the second Tuesday in April. This phrase must be clarified.

I113-23
- 24. Section 3.4.1 Parking
The offsite overflow parking locations are not defined, just ambiguously referred to as "other facilities". Where are these specifically? What is their capacity (in units of vehicles or skiers,

I113-24

please)? It is stated that out-of-valley parking is not proposed and is not needed to satisfy County or Specific plan requirements. However, this would present an undue burden on existing resources outside of the valley when parking fills up within the valley and likely will contribute to significant and avoidable impacts, such as traffic congestion, interference with snow removal, environmental degradation, and clear and present dangers to public safety (should emergency access be limited due to traffic and/or pedestrians on Highway 89, for example). These negative impacts will be absorbed by County and State resources with no monetary compensation from Squaw Valley Real Estate et al.

I113-24
cont.

25. Section 3.4.3 Storm Drainage

In a future characterized by climatic change and uncertainty, a 100-year design flow is insufficient to convey stormwater and mountain runoff. The design should be changed to at least a 200-year (if not 500-year) design flow. Overwhelming scientific consensus exists that suggests increased frequency of high impact weather events, such as rain on snow events, increased mean temperatures, and likely longer drought periods. The hydrological implications of these changes will be increased overland flow and higher streamflow volumes resulting in the need for more robust conveyance systems for runoff. The text and design must be changed to highlight these factors in future planning to ensure sustainable development practices.

I113-25

26. 3.4.3 Fire Protection and Emergency Services

Further building along the urban-wildland interface and increased population density will certainly increase fire risk in the Village. How will the Plan Area incorporate increased future fire danger in light of enhanced risks of extreme and persistent drought (e.g., Cook et al. 2015 Sci. Adv.) which produce higher fire danger?

I113-26

27. Section 3.4.4 Village Open Space Network

How will the Village Open Space Network contribute to maintaining and increasing native biodiversity along the open space network? Will the Landscape Corridors and Buffers be composed of native or non-native plant species?

I113-27

28. Exhibit 3-16 (see also Exhibit 3-14)

If the snow storage area is considered a Landscape Area & Buffer, what will this area be composed of during the snow-free months? Bare soil? Revegetated meadow? If this is to be a vegetated surface in the snow-free months, how will the vegetation and soil function be preserved during the snow-covered months from negative impacts of compaction from overland snow removal equipment? A bare soil area would be inconsistent with an area defined as a "Landscape Corridor" as it is not a visual buffer nor does it provide ecosystem function, rather it would provide a source of sediment, visual blight, and likely a host region for invasive plant and animal species. These numerous ambiguities must be clarified in the text.

I113-28

29. 3.4.5 Squaw Creek Restoration

The creation of a low-flow meander channel in the bottom of a larger channel will not be a sustainable means to restore the functionality of Squaw Creek; although the effort should be applauded. Examination of historical maps (e.g. Wheeler Survey 1879 Map) shows broad sinusoidal meanders that span nearly the breadth of the valley. The present plan would likely only marginally, if at all, improve the fluvial system temporarily until a high volume event results in significant channel incision and loss of restoration efforts. A larger scale, and certainly more costly effort would be required to properly restore the channel morphology; however this cost is still fractional compared to overall costs of the complete project.

I113-29

30. Exhibit 3-18

I113-30

- This figure requires a scale bar to comply with cartographic standards and for correct interpretation. Just because this is a 'concept plan' image does not exempt it from maintaining a high standard for correct interpretation.*

I 1113-30
cont.
- 31. Exhibit 3-19
See above comment regarding the need for a scale bar; furthermore, this image depicts a stream system that cannot meander on the order of naturally occurring streams. The meander length should be on the order of <10x the channel width, which is clearly not the case. The image, conceptual and restoration plans must be altered accordingly.

I 1113-31
- 32. Exhibit 3-20
See above comments regarding a scale bar.

I 1113-32
- 33. Exhibit 4-1
How is the snow storage area to be both a Landscape Area and Buffer (See section 3.4.4) and a newly-defined Conservation Preserve and function as a location for snow storage where heavy equipment will be frequently traveling and compacting?

I 1113-33
- 34. Section 4.1.8 Village Commercial-Core
How will a "connection to the mountain environment" be ensured by 108 ft tall buildings and impervious surfaces? Will bird-friendly glass be used on these buildings? Furthermore, as the text stands, it implies that the "tourist commercial uses" listed in the subsequent sentence are consistent with a genuine "connection to the mountain environment", which they are not. The text should be revised to separate this paragraph into two to avoid consistency issues.

I 1113-34
- 35. Section 4.2.3 Squaw Valley General Plan and Land Use Ordinance
The current project scope, due to the large buildings (108 ft tall) and number of bedrooms (up to 1,493) as well as the "mountain adventure center" are totally inconsistent with plans to "conserve, protect, and enhance the aesthetic, ecological, and environmental aspects of Squaw Valley. On the contrary, and as identified throughout the EIR and other impact reports, the current scope of the plan will irreversibly damage aesthetic, ecological, and environmental aspects of Squaw Valley. These losses must be more completely quantified in the next version of the present EIR.

I 1113-35
- 36. Section 4.2.3 Squaw Valley General Plan and Land Use Ordinance
The development goals as listed lie in broad contrast to the scope of the project, which clearly will damage existing vegetation, does not guarantee restoration and revegetation of disturbed areas to their natural state, and will damage stream environment zones. The text should clearly state that these goals are not consistent with the current project as sub-points in the text, but I apologize if this is done later in the document.

I 1113-36
- 37. Policy CP-1 (page 4-23)
The "relatively small number of days per year" in which peak periods of traffic occur is an ambiguous statement that does not reflect the actual impact on traffic flow patterns and delays caused to those wishing to navigate state and federally funded roadways (Highway 89 and Interstate 80). This statement must be revised to state "Peak periods at Squaw Valley occur on weekends between November and March and present traffic delays and congestion for multiple hours during both the morning and afternoon periods.

I 1113-36
- 38. Exhibit 12-2

I 1113-37

A correctly annotated geologic map will include a legend with all geologic units defined and ordered chronologically. Please add a legend with all geologic units defined and described (usually one sentence each). The body text refers to volcanic rocks and then cites the figure (Exhibit 12-2) however nowhere is Tsd, Tsp, Tsha, etc. completely defined.

I113-37
cont.

39. Exhibit 12-2

The geologic map must be altered to correctly display faults to conform with geologic mapping standards. Are these strike slip faults, normal faults, thrust faults? The purpose of a geologic map is to convey and characterize the geology and regional tectonics; as it stands this map only serves to confuse. What do the dotted blue lines represent? Are these moraine crests? What do the purple lines represent? Furthermore the map symbology is inconsistent. Concealed and approximate faults have a different line spacing in the legend than they do in the figure. Please alter the map and use correct annotation and symbology that is consistent with geologic mapping standards.

I113-38

40. Section 12.1.2

Where on the map are the lacustrine deposits (no geologic unit given) located? If lake sediments are mentioned, where are these and what is the lacustrine history? Was this lake found in the valley during the Little Ice Age, during Heinrich Stadial 1, when? The text needs to be altered to resolve this ambiguity.

I113-39

41. Section 12.1.2

Please define Tioga and Tahoe ages.

I113-40

42. Section 12.1.2 Local Seismicity

The Holocene is not technically defined as beginning 11,000 years before present. Most define it as 11,700 years before present (e.g., Walker et al. 2009 J. Quat. Sci doi:10.1002/jqs.1227) or ca 11,500 years before present (e.g., the peer reviewed journal The Holocene). Please select a proper definition and alter the text accordingly, or add "approximately" or "ca" to the statement. This would make it consistent with the approximate definition given for the Quaternary Period.

I113-41

43. Exhibit 13-3

The data used to create the climograph is likely of insufficient length to compose a climate average or normal based upon World Meteorological Organization standards, which require 30 years. Please utilize other methods to incorporate longer duration climate data to develop a more robust curve.

I113-42

44. Section 13.1.3

*Please add "represent" to fix the grammar in this sentence and report the bias (in %): "The calibration statistics show a slight bias towards underestimating average groundwater elevations, but **represent** an improved calibration relative to previous model iterations (HydroMetrics WRI 2014)."*

I113-43

45. Section 13.1.3

Add a space between "wells" and "(i.e., the simulated...).

46. Section 13.1.3

The period of record (1992-2011) is too short and does not include periods characterized by extended drought conditions (e.g., 1987-1991) for the current wording to be valid. Groundwater elevations may not recover to within 15 feet in extended drought periods and the text should be altered to reflect this fact. Better yet, a new water supply assessment should be performed

I113-44

including water years 2012-2015 to be able to make these statements robust as these years were characterized by significant below normal precipitation (and recharge) departures. Until this is done, the findings of the EIR are not sufficient to robustly project future water supply or characterize the significance of impacts under various scenarios of changing demand or climate.

I113-44
cont.

47. Section 16.1.3

The installation of electric car charging stations cannot be used as a way to suggest reductions in CO2 loading. Electricity must be generated somewhere and this measure only shifts the source of CO2 elsewhere. Globally, CO2 is a well-mixed gas and therefore this measure makes no difference to radiative forcing and atmospheric greenhouse gas loading. The line should be removed.

I113-45

48. Impact 16-3

It is unclear how changes in water supply due to climate change will result in a less than significant impact. The scientific consensus overwhelmingly points towards reduced water availability in midlatitude mountains and increased 20-50 year severe drought risks. The water supply assessment does not sufficiently address climate change through either a satisfactory past-dry year analysis or through possible future extended drought analyses. These factors combine to make the statement that climate change impacts would be less than significant on the project null and void, pending more detailed and robust analyses of climate change impacts. Such robust assessments would likely, but not certainly, result in more significant impacts than "less than". Should the conclusion stand, the project can more confidently move forward knowing that it has assessed its vulnerabilities and established adaptation and mitigation plans for climate change impacts.

I113-46

49. Appendix C

The water supply assessment (WSA) is currently insufficient to estimate future water supply. It utilizes a period of time characterized by many wetter than normal (compared to 1981-2010 averages) water years and too few drier than normal water years. The modeling methodology is sound, although a distributed surface water model would be recommended for use as well to better characterize runoff production and groundwater capture. However, the bias towards wet years in the simulation period reduces the likelihood that water supply is accurately estimated during extended (>5 year below normal) drought periods. The WSA would be made far more robust by including water years 2012-2015 (even up to June of 2015) and re-performing the model simulations. Since the model is already calibrated, this effort should require relatively little additional human and computational time inputs. A future 20 year drought scenario should also be included to ensure that water supply is sufficient under a 'megadrought' scenario. This would ensure that significant and unavoidable impacts on drinking water supply and ecological water supply will not occur.

I113-47

I113 Benjamin Hatchett
July 17, 2015

This comment letter contains multiple requests for text/exhibits changes in the DEIR. While many of these requested changes will not be made, for reasons described below, the County appreciates the commenter's obviously thorough review of the DEIR.

- I113-1 The Widened Squaw Valley Road Alternative is described and evaluated in Chapter 17, "Alternatives," of the DEIR (see pages 17-31 through 17-35). It is not proposed, and therefore the need for additional CEQA analysis has not been contemplated. As described therein, this alternative would have similar or greater impacts compared with the proposed project due to the additional impact area along Squaw Valley Road. However, it was carried forward for analysis in the DEIR because it would reduce the project's significant and unavoidable traffic impacts. When the Placer County Board of Supervisors considers whether or not to certify the EIR, the Board will also determine whether to approve the proposed project or an alternative. If this alternative was selected, the County would need to determine if the EIR contained sufficient analysis.
- I113-2 The Reduced Density Alternative is described in detail in Chapter 17, "Alternatives," of the DEIR. Potential impacts and benefits of this alternative are described therein. Also, see the Master Response regarding the Reduced Density Alternative.
- I113-3 The DEIR text referenced by the commenter is intended to be introductory, and cannot, by definition address all aspects of the project or its potential consequences. Construction-related impacts to the lower Squaw Creek watershed are addressed in Chapters 6, "Biological Resources," and 13, "Hydrology and Water Quality," of the DEIR. Other construction impacts mentioned in the comment, including noise, air and water pollution, soil compaction, and the addition of impermeable surfaces, are addressed in various chapters in the DEIR. Further, increases in water use and population are also addressed in the DEIR. Chapter 3, "Project Description," describes the project location, study area characteristics, and project objectives as well as presenting the proposed project components in detail. Project impacts and mitigation measures are presented in chapters 4 through 16 of the DEIR. No text change is warranted.
- I113-4 This description is related to one of the fourteen project objectives, which are listed in Section 3.3, "Project Objectives," of the DEIR. Also, see Appendix K to the DEIR which contains a Competitive Marketing Analysis that was prepared for Squaw Valley/Alpine Meadows to compare the types of facilities/experiences available at other world class North American ski destinations.
- I113-5 The characterization of the plan area as being previously developed and disturbed is further described, and quantified as the comment requests, in Chapter 6, "Biological Resources," of the DEIR. Specifically, Table 6-1 on page 6-9 of the DEIR identifies approximately 53 acres of developed land and 21 acres of disturbed land within the project site. These categories are described on page 6-4 and shown in Exhibits 6-1 and 6-2.
- I113-6 The comment indicates that Reno Airport's location is misrepresented on the Regional Location Map (Exhibit 3-1). This exhibit is meant to show the location of Squaw Valley in relation to other regional features, such as roadways, cities, and airports. While the indicated location may not be exact, it does not affect the analysis or conclusions in the DEIR.

- I113-7 The comment indicates that Carson City should be identified on Exhibit 3-1 to the southwest of where it is shown in the Regional Location Map. This exhibit is meant to show the location of Squaw Valley in relation to other regional features, such as roadways, cities, and airports. While the indicated location may not be exact, it does not affect the analysis or conclusions in the DEIR.
- I113-8 The comment is concerned that several regional features, particularly some city and county names are not indicated on the Regional Location Map (Exhibit 3-1). This exhibit is meant to show the location of Squaw Valley in relation to other regional features, such as roadways, cities, and airports. While additional regional features may be helpful in discerning the project location, it would not affect the analysis or conclusions in the DEIR.
- I113-9 See response to comment I113-5.
- I113-10 The comment expresses concerns that a reader may not be able to determine the location of the project site, based on Exhibits 3-1 and 3-2. The County appreciates concerns related to the need for full public disclosure in a CEQA document, including the use of plain language and appropriate graphics so that decision makers and the public can easily understand the document. The DEIR contain several graphics that show the project location, both at a regional scale (Exhibit 3-1) and a detailed, aerial view of the project site (Exhibit 3-2). Exhibit 3-3 depicts the site and surrounding area. Furthermore, the project location is described in detail in Section 3.1, "Project Location," in the DEIR. This is consistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15124(a), which states that, "[t]he precise location and boundaries of the proposed project shall be shown on a detailed map, preferably topographic. The location of the project shall also appear on a regional map." While additional regional features may be helpful in discerning the project location, it would not affect the analysis or conclusions in the DEIR. Finally, no other comments expressed difficulty actually determining where the site is located.
- I113-11 Concern for the ability for those who experience color-blindness to differentiate between the aerial background and the red project boundary line on Exhibit 3-2 are noted. Exhibit 3-2 shows the outline of the project boundary laid over an aerial that contains several different colors (greens, grays, browns). While a color-blind person may have trouble with an exhibit that contains only red and green, given that various colors are shown as a background, it is unlikely that this exhibit would present a particular challenge. In addition, one of the senior authors of the DEIR is color-blind, and can differentiate these colors on Exhibit 3-2. Regardless, changing the color of the project boundary line would not affect the analysis or conclusions in the DEIR. Finally, no commenters expressed difficulty discerning map features.
- I113-12 The comment suggests the use of the term: piedmont, rather than plain, when describing the topography of the main Village area. While "piedmont" may accurately describe the topography, the use of plain, in this context and for this purpose, is appropriate. Regardless, changing this terminology would not affect the analysis or conclusions in the DEIR.
- I113-13 See response to comment I113-11.
- I113-14 The comment requests that a legend be added to Exhibits 3-1 and 3-2. A legend would not provide a benefit to Exhibit 3-1, as labels are used to show relevant roads, counties, cities, and lakes. A legend is already provided in the bottom left corner of Exhibit 3-2.
- I113-15 The comment questions how extension of the natural landscape into the Village would create a strong sense of place. A sense of place is a unique collection of qualities and characteristics – visual, cultural, social, and environmental – that provide meaning to a location. A sense of place is what makes a city or town unique from another, and give values

to those who appreciate the specific qualities and characteristics of a site. While the concept of “sense of place,” does not constitute an environmental impact, this concept is generally addressed under Impact 4-3 (Development of incompatible uses and/or creation of land use conflicts) in the DEIR. As described under this impact, “the proposed Specific Plan would expand upon existing similar uses within the plan area and would not be expected to result in any substantial, new long-term land use conflicts.” It is not necessary to quantify this discussion because it is a qualitative concept. See Chapter 4, “Land Use and Agricultural Resources,” in the DEIR for further details.

- I113-16 The comment requests that the term “coherent” be defined, as it relates a “mix of building masses, heights, and materials...” Here, on page 3-8 of the DEIR, the reader is directed to “see more details below,” where the number of units, density, and height are described. The use of the word “coherent” in this context, means that the development would not create incompatible uses or create land uses conflicts, and is used to further describe the creation of a strong sense of place. Also, see response to comment I113-15.
- I113-17 The comment is concerned that Exhibit 3-4 does not contain a locator insert. See response to comment I113-10.
- I113-18 The comment relates concerns associated with building heights that would be inconsistent with aesthetics and concepts of view preservation. These types of issues are discussed in Chapter 8, “Visual Resources,” in the DEIR. Chapter 8 describes existing views of the project site and shows simulated views of the project, post-construction. Also, see Section 2.1 of this FEIR, which describes the applicant’s proposed changes to the project, including a reduction in some building heights and increased building separation.
- I113-19 The comment makes reference to “historical Squaw Valley development behaviors, which completely neglected to remain consistent with prior acknowledgements to established law.” It is unclear how this comment relates to the project. Because no specific issues related to the content, analysis, or conclusions in the DEIR are raised in this comment, no further response is provided here.
- I113-20 The comment expresses concern related to potential channel constriction of Squaw Creek. Reconfiguration of Squaw Creek and the Olympic Channel are discussed under Impact 13-6 in the DEIR. As discussed in this impact on page 13-75:

As part of proposed Squaw Creek Restoration, implementation of the proposed project would reconfigure the flow lines, channel shapes, sizes, and overbank areas along the segments of Squaw Creek and the Olympic Channel within the main Village area. This modification of the existing surface water features and drainage will help correct and compensate for past direct disturbances to these channels and restore more natural geomorphic conditions and channel and floodplain functions. While successful implementation would be a beneficial impact, without monitoring, adaptive management, and assurances of ongoing funding to support these activities, creek restoration efforts might not provide the anticipated benefits and could result in greater disturbance to hydrologic conditions and water quality than benefit. This impact would be **potentially significant**.

Mitigation Measure 13-6 is proposed to mitigate this impact to a less-than-significant level because it would reduce the uncertainty regarding the potential effectiveness of the stream restoration actions, and provide a funded means to perform necessary maintenance or adaptive response.

Chapter 6, “Biological Resources,” in the DEIR describes the project’s potential impacts related to biological resources. Impact 6-1 addresses impacts on Squaw Creek.

Implementation of Mitigation Measures 6-1a through 6-1d would reduce significant impacts on sensitive habitats to a less-than-significant level because they would ensure that sensitive habitat is avoided to the extent feasible, that groundwater wells are installed and operated consistent with the parameters of the WSA and applicable groundwater plans, water quality degradation is avoided, and that sensitive habitats that cannot be avoided are restored following construction or compensated for in a manner that results in no net loss of these habitats.

I113-21 See the Master Response regarding the MAC and the Master Response regarding water supply.

I113-22 The comment requests data related to the number of people expected to visit the Village on any given day. Anticipated population levels resulting from project implementation are discussed in Chapter 5, "Population, Employment, and Housing," in the DEIR. As discussed under Impact 5-2, "the Olympic Valley is anticipated to have 383 new full-time residents and an average transient population of 682 people by 2040, excluding the proposed project ... As described above, the project would generate an average population of 1,307 additional individuals (1,196 visitors and 111 staff)."

The level of detail requested in the comment (+/- two standard deviations of the mean expected value) would not affect the analysis or conclusions in the DEIR and is thus not provided as a response.

Also, see the Master Response regarding traffic, a portion of which discusses the adequacy of parking supply.

I113-23 The comment states that the use of the term "any ski day" does not differentiate between peak season and low season attendance at the ski resort. The sentence in question is on page 3-16 of the DEIR: "The overall parking supply is proposed to accommodate at least 10,663 daily skiers in any ski day, through all phases of development." Parking for 10,663 daily skiers for any ski day is a performance criterion. That is to say that any day where skiing is available, sufficient parking for at least 10,663 day skiers must be available. Based on the parking study, many of those day skiers ride together with multiple skiers in one car, so this day skier number translates into a particular number of cars/parking spaces. The 10,663 is also based on the number of skiers during the 5th busiest day of the year. The comment is correct to state that Christmas and a Tuesday in April would reflect different attendance numbers; however, the 10,663 performance criteria still stands, because it must be met on all but the 5 busiest ski days. Also, see the portion of the traffic Master Response related to parking demand for further information related to the concept of "every ski day."

I113-24 The comment requests information related to overflow parking. The East Parcel would serve as both employee parking and overflow day skier parking as the plan area builds out, and would be flexibly managed to meet total project parking demand. The East Parcel would serve as the key parking location outside the main Village area, providing a parking structure with two levels of structured parking over grade with a maximum overall height of 35 feet including railings and architectural elements. Also, see the Master Response regarding the East Parcel for a list of proposed changes to the East Parcel layout since release of the DEIR.

The comment states that not providing out-of-valley parking would present an undue burden on existing resources and contribute to traffic congestion, interference with snow removal, environmental degradation, and adverse effects on emergency services. As noted on page 3-16 of the DEIR, "Additional off-site parking areas may be provided on an as-needed basis and would primarily be used for employees and day skiers. Temporary parking outside the Olympic Valley may be considered, but no specific sites have been identified." It is important to note that build-out of the project is anticipated to take approximately 25 years, thus, if

additional parking is needed, it will be determined at a later date according to market demand. It is likely the applicant would seek an agreement to use underutilized parking, such as at a school on a weekend, but these details have not been established because the demand for these facilities would occur in the future, if at all. In the case that new sites are required, the appropriate level of CEQA review would be completed. If environmental impacts of new sites are not acceptable, they would not be permitted.

I113-25 The comment addresses issues related to climate change and suggests considering changes to increased overland flow and higher streamflow volumes. Impact 16-3 in the DEIR addresses the effects of climate change on the project. In summary:

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 wildland fire risk; changes to timing and intensity of precipitation, resulting in increased stormwater runoff and flood risk; and potentially changes to snow pack conditions that could be more favorable to avalanche formation. However, there are numerous programs and policies in place to protect against and respond to wildland fire, as well as to protect new land uses and facilities from flooding and avalanche exposure. This impact would be less than significant.

In regards to flood hazards, Impact 13-8 addresses risks related to the 100-year floodplain boundary. This analysis is based on significance criteria derived from Appendix G of the State CEQA Guidelines as well as flood risk management from the Federal Emergency Management Agency and adequately addresses risks of flooding for the purposes of the project.

I113-26 The comment expresses concerns related to increased fire risk because of building along the urban-wildland interface and increasing population levels in the area. This issue is addressed in the DEIR under Impact 15-6; impacts would be considered less than significant upon implementation of mitigation. See response to comment I113-25 for the effects of climate change on the project.

I113-27 The comment asks how the open space network would contribute to maintaining and increasing native biodiversity along the open space network and ask if plants would be native or non-native species. Impacts related to biological resources are discussed in Chapter 6, "Biological Resources," of the DEIR. While biodiversity is not specifically addressed, this chapter examines related issues, including: degradation of sensitive habitats and individuals, disturbance or loss of animal movement and migratory corridors, and disturbance or loss of special-status plants. These topic areas are appropriate and consistent with the Placer County CEQA checklist and Appendix G of the State CEQA Guidelines. Per Mitigation Measure 6-8, a Revegetation Plan, prepared by a licensed landscape architect or similar professional, shall be submitted and approved by the Development Review Committee to ensure proper protection from weedy or non-native species that could impact special status plant populations if present. It would also be consistent with VSVSP policies (OS-3 and OS-6) to use native and naturalized vegetation in landscape buffers and green spaces and protect native vegetation in the Squaw Creek corridor.

I113-28 The comment expresses concerns related to the use of snow storage areas during snow-free months. There are many existing snow storage areas in and around the Village, and new snow storage areas would be treated in a similar manner during the snow-free months. Many are landscaped areas within the development and the vegetation is dormant in the winter, as it would be without snow storage. Compaction is not anticipated in snow storage areas because most areas would receive the snow when snow blowers blow the snow off the roads into the snow storage area. Long-term management of snow storage areas is discussed under Impact 13-7 in the DEIR, where issues such as sedimentation are also discussed.

- I113-29 The County appreciates suggestions associated with restoration of Squaw Creek. Impacts related to reconfiguration of Squaw Creek and the Olympic Channel are discussed under Impact 13-6 in the DEIR. The preliminary creek restoration design would return the Squaw Creek trapezoidal channel to a wider corridor with a meandering alignment (also termed “planform”) (see Exhibits 3-18 and 3-19 in Chapter 3, “Project Description”). Overall conveyance would be increased and an inset floodplain would allow sediment deposition upstream of the meadow and detain water in the alluvial fan reach. Installation of riffle material in the bed and buried logs with rootwads intact in the banks would stabilize the channel and prevent excess erosion; bioengineered step outfalls would be installed at stormwater outfall locations to dissipate bank-eroding velocities. While successful implementation of the creek restoration would be a beneficial impact overall, without monitoring, adaptive management, and assurances of ongoing funding to support these activities, creek restoration efforts might not provide the anticipated benefits, and could ultimately result in greater disturbance to hydrologic conditions and degradation of water quality than benefit. However, Mitigation Measures 6-1a and 6-1b are recommended, which assure the development of performance criteria for creek restoration, monitoring and adaptive management for the restoration, and ongoing funding to support these activities.
- The comment does not provide any evidence to suggest that this conclusion is incorrect. Thus, no changes to the project or DEIR analysis are required.
- I113-30 The comment requests a scale bar for Exhibit 3-18. This exhibit shows the western confluence restoration area, and provides a conceptual plan that depicts a representative site plan to show the development that would occur based on the zoning and design standards set forth in the Specific Plan. It is intended to be illustrative, as noted in the exhibit. This exhibit provides adequate information to the public and decision makers to understand concepts related to the western confluence restoration area. It is also adequate for the purposes of determining environmental effects of the project. Addition of a scale bar to this exhibit would not alter the environmental analysis or conclusions in the DEIR. No changes are necessary.
- I113-31 See response to comment I113-30 regarding the addition of a scale bar.
- I113-32 See response to comment I113-30 regarding the addition of a scale bar.
- I113-33 See response to comment I113-28 regarding snow storage areas.
- I113-34 See responses to comments I113-15 and I113-16 regarding a connection to the mountain environment.
- With regard to birds, as shown in various visual simulations (see, for example, Exhibit 8-18), buildings would use a combination of wood, other solid material, and glass, but would not be dominated by the type of reflective glass that results in bird strike problems.
- I113-35 The project’s potential to conflict with the *Placer County General Plan*, the SVGPLUO, designations or zoning, or plan policies adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect is addressed under Impact 4-2 in the DEIR. As stated on page 4-21 of the DEIR:
- With approval of the proposed policy amendments and implementation of the proposed development programs that are a part of the proposed project, the project would be consistent with relevant *Placer County General Plan* and SVGPLUO policies. Moreover, although a General Plan amendment is needed, the project and its programed land uses and development standards would be consistent with the overall anticipated land uses, including density, and policy framework of the *Placer*

County General Plan and the SVGPLUO. The proposed Specific Plan land use designations would be consistent with the land use designations of the *Placer County General Plan* and the SVGPLUO with approval of the proposed rezone. Conflicts would not occur if the Specific Plan is approved and implemented because land use policies for the plan area are predominantly consistent with existing *Placer County General Plan* and SVGPLUO policies, and minor adjustments to existing policies and reorganization of where land uses would occur would achieve consistency. Therefore, no conflicts with the overall intent of relevant plans, policies, or zoning would occur and this impact would be **less than significant**.

No changes to the DEIR are required.

Regarding environmental impacts of the current scope of the plan, these are described and evaluated throughout the DEIR and quantified where appropriate. The comment suggests that “these losses must be more completely quantified in the next version of the present EIR.” However, the comment does not provide specific reasons specifying why the DEIR is inadequate. Therefore, a response cannot be provided

- I113-36 The comment requests a text change to Policy CP-1. This text is used to explain why LOS F is acceptable within the plan area, not to indicate the periods in which peak traffic occurs. Regardless, this change would not alter the environmental analysis or conclusions presented in the DEIR. No changes to the document are necessary.
- I113-37 The geology of the plan area is described in Section 12.1.2, “Geology,” of the DEIR. As described therein, the main Village area is sited on alluvial deposits, including some of the coarser fan deposits (Qf) that extend along the base of the mountain front from side slope chutes (Exhibit 12-2 in the DEIR). The northern margin of the site and the infrastructure corridor along Squaw Valley Road is at the contact between glacial till (Qti) and the meadow alluvium (Qa), and the East Parcel is within the glacial moraine ridges (recessional moraines) forming the downstream boundary of the meadow. Thus, while the particular types of volcanic rocks are not defined in Exhibit 12-2 (Tsd, Tsp, Tsha, etc.), adding these definitions would not alter the environmental analysis or conclusions presented in the DEIR. No changes to the document are necessary.
- I113-38 The comment requests specific information related to the geologic map (Exhibit 12-2) in the DEIR. The existing conditions (described in Section 12.1.5, “Faults and Seismicity”) and analysis presented in the DEIR reflect the project’s Fault Evaluation Report (Holdrege & Kull 2015). The map presents information relevant to potential environmental impacts of the project, and the text on pages 12-1 through 12-5 provide various references to information on the exhibit. CEQA requires that information is presented in lay terms, to the degree possible; thus, while the exhibits could be enhanced with far more technical information, they would not provide more information relevant to the impacts of the project.
- The Fault Evaluation Report (Holdrege & Kull 2015) contains additional information related to faults and seismicity in the plan area. This report is available as part of the DEIR reference materials at <http://www.placer.ca.gov/departments/communitydevelopment/envcoordsvcs/eir/villageatsquawvalley/draft%20eir>.
- I113-39 See response to comment I113-38 regarding requested changes to the geologic map.
- I113-40 See response to comment I113-38 regarding requested changes to the geologic map.
- I113-41 The comment disagrees with the time period described for the Holocene epoch. This comment is noted, however, it does not alter the environmental analysis or conclusions presented in the DEIR. No changes to the document are required.

I113-42 The comment states that data used to create the climograph (Exhibit 13-3 in the DEIR) is of insufficient length. Squaw Valley monthly precipitation and monthly temperature averages are shown from 1992 through 2011. The DEIR is intended to inform public agency decisions makers and the public of the significant environmental effects of the project, as required by CEQA Guidelines Section 15121. The environmental setting discussion, referenced in this comment, provides enough information to allow for an understanding of the significant effects of the project and alternatives (see CEQA Guidelines Section 15125[a]). As such, no changes to the document are required.

I113-43 The comment requests a text change and the percent bias associated with the existing conditions discussion related to groundwater. The DEIR is intended to inform public agency decisions makers and the public of the significant environmental effects of the project, as required by CEQA Guidelines Section 15121. The environmental setting discussion, referenced in this comment, provides enough information to allow for an understanding of the significant effects of the project and alternatives (see CEQA Guidelines Section 15125[a]). No changes to the document are required.

Please note that the text references *Technical Memorandum: Squaw Valley Groundwater Model 2014 Recalibration* (HydroMetrics WRI 2014). Additional information related to the groundwater can be found in this study, available as part of the DEIR reference materials at <http://www.placer.ca.gov/departments/communitydevelopment/envcoordsvcs/eir/villageatsquawvalley/draft%20eir>.

I113-44 See the Master Response regarding water supply. For the reasons described therein, the DEIR water supply analysis is adequate and no changes to the DEIR are necessary. As such, the DEIR analyses of climate change impacts are similarly adequate and no changes to the DEIR are necessary.

I113-45 The comment concerns one of the voluntary actions the Squaw Valley Ski Resort has taken to reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions associated with existing operations. This and other GHG reduction actions are listed in the DEIR under Section 16.1.3, "Existing Squaw Valley Ski Resort Greenhouse Gas Reduction Measures." This section was included to inform readers about what the Squaw Valley Ski Resort is already doing to minimize GHGs. The DEIR, however, is not analyzing the impacts of existing operations or these existing GHG reduction measures. The DEIR is analyzing the impacts of the proposed VSVSP.

Of note, a substantial portion of the electricity consumed in California is from renewable (i.e., GHG-neutral) sources and the portion of renewable electricity will continue to grow due to the requirements of the California Renewable Energy Resources Act of 2011, which is summarized on page 16-6 of the DEIR. The Advanced Clean Cars Program is also summarized on page 16-6 of the DEIR. This program aims to limit GHG emission from cars by requiring greater numbers of zero emission vehicles (ZEVs) and electric vehicles quality as ZEVs under this program.

I113-46 The comment states that the WSA does not adequately address climate change. As discussed on page 14-35:

While the model period included a single dry year (2007) and multiple year dry period (1999-2001), ongoing drought conditions in the Tahoe region and throughout California may produce a more severe multiple year drought than any within the available historical dataset or model study period (Farr West Engineering et al. 2014). A change in snowmelt in the Squaw Creek watershed due to climate change would result in a relatively small decrease in groundwater recharge in the Basin, as in current conditions only a small portion of the snowmelt is captured as groundwater recharge while most of the snowmelt runs off as overland flow. It would be

speculative to consider this and other scenarios beyond the 25-year horizon (which is beyond the 20-year projection requirements of WSAs). In addition, demand for water may be reduced as fewer people visit the resorts due to reduced amenity quality and availability (i.e., less snow to attract skiers).

See also the Master Response regarding water supply. The comment does not provide substantial evidence that would suggest that facts or conclusions presented in the WSA are not accurate.

I113-47 See the Master Response regarding water supply.

1114

Placer County Community
Development Resource Agency
Attn: Mywan Krach
3091 County Center Dr.
Suite 190
Auburn, CA

July 2, 2015

To Whom It May Concern:

This letter is sent to you to express my unequivocal objection to the development of Squaw Valley as explained in the Auburn Journal. Approving such development would be irresponsible stewardship of one of the most beautiful natural wonders on this planet. Once taken, no amount of money or persuasion can return it to its present state.

1114-1

Squaw Valley is not ours! It is for us to experience and appreciate while on this earth. With our right to enjoy it now, we also bear the responsibility of preserving it for our children and grandchildren.

Very sincerely,
Layne C. Hackett
231 Mellow St.
Auburn, CA 95603



I114 Layne C. Hackett
July 2, 2015

I114-1 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.

I115

Maywan Krach

From: Becca Hall <happy lucky fool@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2015 3:04 PM
To: Placer County Environmental Coordination Services
Subject: Squaw Valley Development

To Whom it May Concern,
I have come to the Squaw Valley Writer's Conference for two years, and find the valley to be a completely magical place. I am very concerned about the proposed developments. I think the valley is erring on being overdeveloped as it is. The magic of Squaw Valley has to do with how wild it is. There is plenty of human comforts already there.

I realize that communities grow and change, however, good change is change that works to keep what is special about a place alive.

Please act with caution, and preserve the character and wildness of Squaw Valley.

Sincerely,
Becca Hall
Seattle, Washington

I115-1

I115 Becca Hall
July 16, 2015

I115-1 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.

I116

Maywan Krach

From: Sands Hall <sands@sandshall.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2015 10:03 AM
To: Placer County Environmental Coordination Services
Subject: Regarding KSL's proposed Squaw Valley development

To the members of the Placer Community Development Resource Agency:

I am writing to vehemently protest the proposed development in Squaw Valley.

I grew up in Squaw Valley — my parents built a house there in 1958, which we still own — and while I have lived all over the country during the ensuing decades, I have returned every year for several weeks to enjoy what I think of as my home. I have watched with dismay the changes that have been made to the Valley over these many years, but what KSL is proposing is of a whole new magnitude.

I116-1

There is much to say about the details of the proposed development, but I will limit myself to one point. Where does KSL plan to get the water to sluice through the water slide, to power all those showers and dishwashers and restaurants — the water needed to construct the 25-year development at all?

I116-2

While all of California is experiencing the results of the drought, if you have travelled to our region and seen for yourselves the steady drop in water levels of Squaw Creek, of the Truckee River, of Lake Tahoe, you will appreciate my concerns. If you haven't travelled up here, do. The effects of the drought are visible, and devastating. Where does KSL plan to get the water to run this massive project? And what will be damaged, *irrevocably*, as a result?

When individual citizens are being asked to curb their water use, how can the Placer County Development RESOURCE Agency even think of approving such a massive and ongoing squandering of water? How will the State allow it? One has only to look at the history of California to see how stupidly we have managed and do manage water use. Please do not contribute to another disaster.

I116-3

Your agency is in place to steward the *resources* of this region. Approving this development will change the face of Squaw Valley forever. I beg you to carefully consider your actions and what you would visit on this beautiful, natural place with these very unnatural plans.

Sincerely yours,

Sands Hall

I116Sands Hall
June 22, 2015

- I116-1 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.
- I116-2 Water supply is addressed in Chapter 14, “Public Services and Utilities,” of the DEIR (see Impact 14-1). Also please see the Master Response regarding water supply.
- I116-3 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.

1117

TO: Placer County Community Development Resource Agency

ATTENTION: Maywan Krach

3091 County Center Drive, Suite 190

Auburn, CA95603

cdraecs@placer.ca.gov

RE: Squaw Valley proposed redevelopment

Dear Maywah,

As a long time resident who has skied at Squaw Valley since 1959 and attended the 1960 Winter Olympics I feel compelled to give you my input regarding this proposed development in Squaw Valley. Over the years this beautiful Valley has had enough abuse, the former owner, Alex Cushing did as he pleased, blowing up hillsides, removing old growth trees without permission, contaminating soils etc. etc. It's all there in the Placer County records. While I agree that rejuvenation and restoration are very needed in the Valley a proposed project such as this one is definitely not what the Valley needs. We have some very spectacular natural features in this area for tourist and locals to enjoy without building water parks etc. Lake Tahoe and the hundreds of small Lakes and streams that exist naturally in the area will suffice. Twenty five years of construction, noise, pollution and ultimately increased traffic is not what Squaw Valley or the surrounding area needs. If they want to build an amusement park/destination resort there are plenty of areas that will accommodate them as a matter of fact Nevada is very close by. Let's appreciate what nature has bestowed on us and not create a polluting disruptive mega project. Thank you for listening, it's time that we start preserving, restoring and nurturing what nature has given us, it is not time to destroy it further.

1117-1

Chris Hanna

 PO BOX 330

Tahoma, CA 96142

530-412-1654

Chris.hanna@camoves.com

I117 Chris Hanna
no date

I117-1 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.

I118

Maywan Krach

From: Kelli Hare <kelli.hare@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, June 22, 2015 2:20 PM
To: Placer County Environmental Coordination Services
Subject: Squaw Valley expansion comment

Hello,

I have one major issue with the proposed expansion of Squaw Valley Ski Resort, traffic impact. Until there is some solution to increase the flow of vehicles on Hwy 89 it does not seem feasible to me to approve an expansion for Squaw Valley. The highway is already overloaded and the ski traffic gets crazy now, I cannot imagine the gridlock that would ensue if a major expansion were to happen.

Don't get me wrong, I'd love to see Squaw Valley's plans come to fruition as I think the expansion would be great for the North Tahoe area as a whole. However, until Hwy 89 looks like Hwy 50 on the east shore (4 lanes) or there is some sort of heavy traffic lane switch (like on the Coronado Bridge) we would be irresponsible to clog Hwy 89 further.

I have read about some people's ideas to create a bus lane or make Squaw expand the bus system, these ideas seem totally pointless and the people suggesting them are painfully unaware of what actually happens up here and who causes the horrible traffic. A bus offering helps defray a few cars, but not at all enough to make any impact in keeping traffic flowing.

The personal vehicle capacity of Hwy 89 must be expanded before any ski resort expansion can be feasible. My recommendation, do not approve the Squaw Valley expansion until the traffic impact on Hwy 89 is solved.

Best,
Kelli Hare

I118-1

I118Kelli Hare
June 22, 2015

I118-1

Traffic, including traffic along SR 89, is addressed in Chapter 9, “Transportation and Circulation,” of the DEIR. See also the Master Response regarding traffic. 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.

I119

10735 Red Cedar Dr.
San Diego, CA 92131
July 15, 2015

Dear Placer County Community Development,

I am a two week owner at Olympic Village Inn in Squaw Valley. I regularly come to Squaw Valley, due to much of the preserved natural beauty of this area.

The KSL Capital Partners project would damage the environment of this valley of scenic wonder. Please stop KSL's negative impact on a place of tranquility in Placer County.

I119-1

Sincerely,
Mary Ann Harper
(Mary Ann Harper)

I119 Mary Ann Harper
July 15, 2015

I119-1 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.

I120

10735 Red Cedar Drive
San Diego, CA 92131
July 15, 2015

Attn: Maywan Krach
Placer County Community Development Resource Agency

To Whom It May Concern:

I am concerned over how KSL Capital Partners' Squaw Valley Village Specific Plan will negatively impact the natural beauty of Squaw Valley due to the Specific Plan's inappropriately immense scope.

I120-1

I have been coming to Squaw Valley, where I own a 2-week time share at the Olympic Village Inn, for 25 years. The Specific Plan's 10-story tall buildings and the addition of 1,500 bedrooms will degrade the valley's naturally scenic environment. The density and height of the Plan's proposed buildings and beds compete in size, bulk and numbers against Squaw Valley's geographic beauty.

I120-2

The Specific Plan's proposed indoor amusement park, appropriate to an urban setting, is what we leave the city to get away from, and why we come to Squaw Valley with its natural resources and many year-round outdoor sports activities.

I120-3

I ask that the Specific Plan, and any plan with a scope of take 2 - 25 years to construct, be denied as inappropriate for Squaw Valley.

I120-4

Yours,



Hilliard Harper

I120 Hilliard Harper
July 15, 2015

- I120-1 The comment provides a summary of detailed comments provided below. See responses to the detailed comments below.
- I120-2 The project's potential impacts to visual resources are addressed in Chapter 8, "Visual Resources," of the DEIR.
- I120-3 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.
- I120-4 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.