

I127

Maywan Krach

From: PATTY HECK <heck.patty@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 07, 2015 2:33 PM
To: Placer County Environmental Coordination Services
Subject: Draft Environmental Impact Report - Village at Squaw Valley

As a homeowner in Squaw Valley since 1999, I am seriously concerned about the effect that the development by Squaw Valley Ski Holdings will be having on the quality of my life.

In 2001 when Intrawest began construction on the village, I was not opposed to it. I welcomed it! The idea of an attractive area offering new restaurants, shops and a theatre was very appealing. The size of the original plan was compatible with the character of this valley. Unfortunately, due to the economic downturn, that plan was not completed. Subsequent to the sale of Ski Corp. to KSL, a new proposal by SVSH - vastly larger than the Intrawest Village, was presented. That new plan infringes upon, not only the life style, but more importantly, upon the basic needs of the residents.

I127-1

With the increased population, and all that it entails, come new demands on the valley's services. In addition to the removal of the sewage and the crowded roads, there will be new demands put upon the aquifer. I know water was not mentioned as one of the significant and unavoidable impacts, but I find it hard to believe, with the possibility of an ongoing drought, that water will not be a factor. If groundwater throughout the state is diminishing - why not Squaw Valley? Add to this the increased use of water for the Mountain Adventure Camp, plus the need for additional snowmaking, and I fear our vital resource will be compromised.

I127-2

My other concern as a valley resident is the effect of increased traffic. We all know, given certain conditions, that the backup can be major. If an emergency should occur: avalanche, flood, earthquake, fire, what is the alternative emergency exit route? I have been told that The Resort at Squaw Creek will not permit egress through their land. How will all of those new homeowners exit this narrow valley? How will I exit this narrow valley?

I127-3

Hopefully, common sense will guide you to recognize the need to downsize this unrealistic plan, and be wise enough to choose the reduced density option.

I127-4

Patricia C. Heck
370 Winding Creek Road
Olympic Valley, CA

I127 Patricia C. Heck
July 7, 2015

- I127-1 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.
- I127-2 The project's impacts related to water supply and groundwater are addressed in Chapters 13, "Hydrology and Water Quality," and 14, "Public Services and Utilities." Also, see the Master Response regarding water supply for a discussion of the drought conditions included in the WSA Update, and the Master Response regarding the MAC for a discussion of the facility's water use.
- I127-3 See response to comment I54-26 regarding the project's potential to interfere with an adopted emergency evacuation plan.
- I127-4 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. Also, see the Master Response regarding the Reduced Density Alternative.

I128

Maywan Krach

From: Skier Guy <skier_guy77@yahoo.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2015 3:54 PM
To: Placer County Environmental Coordination Services
Subject: East Parcel EIR

Maywan Krach,

My wife and myself live at 294 Indian Trail Rd in Olympic Valley. We are trying to raise our 3 young children here, fulltime. Our backyard is the "East Parcel" which is proposed to have the employee housing and new shipping and receiving.

In 2014, we paid \$30,209.84 in property taxes to Placer County. If KSL builds what they want on the East Parcel, it would destroy our property value, as well as everyone else's home value surrounding this parcel. Go check out Northstar's employee housing, would you want that in your backyard??? Northstar employee housing has been a complete disaster, I will not allow this in my backyard. It would also be ridiculous to put it on the main road in town for all the visitors to see, as well.

Olympic Valley cannot handle what KSL wants to build in town. Yesterday, it took me 9 minutes 24 seconds (I timed it) to be able to make a left turn from Indian Trail Rd onto Squaw Valley Rd. How many more cars and trucks will come into town if KSL builds what they want???

KSL should put any employee housing and there new shipping & receiving together where it is not adjacent to any "existing paying property taxpayer" in this town. I would be in support of putting it where they have a bunch of existing decrepit buildings adjacent to the hiking trail going up Shirley Canyon. I can only imagine what harmful chemicals are presently going into our Squaw Creek from those buildings. KSL would object to this because that land is too valuable for real estate. Well, if KSL needs employee housing and a new shipping & receiving buildings, they should have to shoulder the burden of it, not individual people paying there property taxes for living in Olympic Valley.

If KSL builds out the parking lot at the base of the ski resort, then KSL should build ample parking at the same site for all the local residents who have been skiing here for years before KSL showed up.

Please make it clear to anyone, and I will find out who, who votes in favor of KSL building there "proposed" East Parcel: You ruin my backyard, I'm going to make it my life mission to ruin your backyard as well!!!

Feel free to contact me anytime,

Thank you,
Jeff Hekemian
skier_guy77@yahoo.com
Cell: (530)388-8038

I128-1

I128-2

I128-3

I128-4

I128-5

I128Jeff Hekemian
July 17, 2015

- I128-1 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.
- See the Master Response regarding the East Parcel. Property value is not inherently an environmental impact 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.
- I128-2 Traffic 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.
- I128-3 See the Master Response regarding the East Parcel.
- I128-4 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.
- I128-5 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.

I129

Maywan Krach

From: Rachel Hekemian <skier_grl@yahoo.com>
Sent: Friday, June 12, 2015 10:54 PM
To: Placer County Environmental Coordination Services
Subject: Olympic valley development

I'm a full time resident of Olympic Valley ca. I have three small children and live on Indian Trail rd. We are a young family We take a lot of pride in where we live. In this town we already don't have enough full time residents. Try trick or treating here. Home values are high here. We bought our home hoping that it would be our forever home, that we would create our family memories in. Now a few years later, there's a new reality.. If we even came to the idea to sell bc of the east parcel development, our house value is going to change dramatically.
How would you feel if this was going on, in your backyard. Especially knowing the land and hearing the wildlife. Every spring we have croaking frogs. The tadpoles right now are abundant. We have two coyotes living next to our house and several bunnies. The birds that fly through here are amazing. We often see an eagle.
Impact this great will lessen this type of wildlife and completely change the animals lives none the less our pleasure of enjoying these animals.
What's the percentage of the people with all these ideas for Olympic Valley that actually live and pay taxes in this valley??? Our property owns two lots. Taxes here are not cheap. KSL has a school in their parking lot, Creekside / Squaw Prep. Hopefully by having a school in your community your taxes will lower. The fire dept had no idea they didn't even have a sprinkler system.. Try pulling in and out of Indian trail during 8:20 am on a school morning or 2:35 in the afternoon. On heavy ski days, I can't cross the street with my kids to get to the bike path. They make extra lanes and no one cares about us locals.. How would a five year old on a bike get through all the extra lanes you make? They don't care They care about the money they are making. I know Andy Wirth lives in Lahaton. He doesn't live in Squaw. He's no long term resident. If he gets the approvals it's a matter of time before they sell out to another corporation.
Joni Mitchell has famous lyrics that say "They paved paradise and put up a parking lot." That's what is proposed to happen to Olympic Valley. That's not okay to me. Think about how it would be for you? KSL Killing Squaw Locals..
Sincerely, Rachel Hekemian Sent from my iPhone

I129-1
I129-2
I129-3

I129Rachel Hekemian
June 12, 2015

- I129-1 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.
- See the Master Response regarding the East Parcel. Property value is not inherently an environmental impact 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.
- I129-2 The project's potential impacts to wildlife and their habitat are addressed in Chapter 6, "Biological Resources," 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.
- I129-3 No specific issues related to the content, analysis, or conclusions in the DEIR are raised in this comment. No further response is provided here.

I130

RECEIVED

JUL 06 2015

To the Placer County Planning Commission,

ENVIRONMENTAL COORDINATION SERVICES

My name is Gretchen Heneveld and I have been a Truckee resident for 37 years. I taught at Truckee Elementary for 20 years and skied at Squaw during those years and well before - traveling to and from the Bay Area with throngs of others.

I130-1

"Build it and they will come." Well, they haven't built it yet but they have already come - way too many! Traffic is a huge problem in the Tahoe Basin!!! It is a well known fact that locals regulate their schedules around Squaw's opening and closing on ski days, but also around all SV events. All try to avoid going to Safeway mid-day during X-mas break, MLK, Spring Break, etc. And this traffic congestion goes all the way to the Bay Area! Friday and Sunday evenings are very frequently slow going along Hwy. 80 due to the popularity of the Tahoe Basin.

I130-2

There is one road in and out of SV. Once out of the valley, it's #89 either North or South along the Truckee River Corridor. This corridor is already very busy and congested frequently. There is not enough room to expand the SV road - even the dEIR admits this. And adding "three lane operations with cones, signage and traffic personnel" is NOT going to solve the problem! Just too many people love this area (understandably so!) Horror stories abound regarding traffic delays and many times with no weather complications. The quality of any Tahoe experience is diminished by traffic delays and obstructions.

"Peak periods at SV occur for limited periods of time during a relatively small number of days per year." Well, if you live in the area and are impacted every weekend and every day during holiday periods, this doesn't seem like a "relatively small number of days."

I130-3

I applaud the "specific plan" for supporting transit services which, if people used them, would be an assist to helping solve this traffic problem. But, from my experience, often times these buses are running empty or nearly so. We are just too in love with our vehicles!

I130-4

25 years of road construction and destruction, pollution of air and noise to draw more people into an area that is already over crowded makes no sense to me!

I130-5

Thank you for reading my comments. I appreciate your attention to this matter!

Gretchen Heneveld

Gretchen Heneveld

10061 E. River St., Truckee, CA 96161

(530) 386-4921

I130 Gretchen Heneveld
July 11, 2015

- I130-1 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.
- I130-2 See the portion of the traffic Master Response regarding the effectiveness of Mitigation Measure 9-1a.
- I130-3 See the portion of the traffic Master Response regarding use of 2011-2012 ski season data.
- I130-4 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.
- I130-5 See the Master Response regarding the 25-year construction period.

I131

Maywan Krach

From: Trevor Heneveld <trevor.heneveld@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2015 1:04 PM
To: Placer County Environmental Coordination Services; Maywan Krach
Subject: Letter on proposed development in Squaw Valley

Dear Placer County (Attention: Maywan Krach),

I was born in Truckee; I was raised in the same house my parents still occupy; it is on the main road into Squaw Valley. I still remember playing on the far side of the meadow when the Resort at Squaw Creek didn't exist and was only a series of beautiful mountain trails. I acknowledge that some development is inevitable, but when it comes to one of the most special valleys in the Sierra, we must take a critical eye to new development. I have many concerns on KSL's proposed project.

I131-1

First, to request entitlements for development for the next 25 years is ridiculous. No one can predict what will happen that far into the future. Looking back at the changes of the past 25 years, we can only expect exponential changes in the next 25. I believe rights to development 10 years in the future is more than enough to allow so we can adapt future development plans to this dynamic valley and community.

I131-2

Secondly I am concerned about noise. As a child I played on my 3 wheeler in our driveway that connected to the main road with only the occasional car passing by. Now the constant roar of the road makes it unpleasant to sit outside our house and enjoy the amazing mountain views. I know the days of serenity along the main road have passed, but KSL should be held accountable to noise regulations that already exist. This is especially true if the community of long time local residents who live along the main road have to listen to huge trucks rumble down the road for the next 25 years. Additionally KSL has stated that the, "Project construction would require night time construction work that would exceed applicable Placer County noise standards." This is unacceptable. There needs to be stricter regulations on noise and more mitigation than simply stating this is "significant and unavoidable". One possible helpful mitigation could be to slow traffic speeds, especially on big trucks. Another way to lessen this impact would be to have KSL be required to have electric shuttles that bring people into the valley cutting down on noise and green house gas emissions.

I131-3

John Muir inspired millions to, "Climb the mountains and get their good tidings." Without the foresight of people like Muir the Sierra today would look much different. I don't think it is in the spirit of the mountains or the spirit of Squaw Valley to have an enormous indoor amusement park located in our special valley. With one of the most beautiful alpine lakes in the world only a few miles away, do we really need an indoor water park? When people come to the mountains, they need to get outside and breath the fresh mountain air, not choke on the chlorine fumes from an indoor pool.

I131-4

I believe what draws people to the mountains is to escape the city and its urban noise, congestion, high rise buildings, and concentrated humanity. I think few would argue this point. Let's not change Squaw into a urbanized city of 100 foot condominiums and water parks.

Sincerely,
Trevor Heneveld

I131 Trevor Heneveld
July 17, 2015

- I131-1 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.
- I131-2 See the Master Response regarding the 25-year construction period. With regard to predicting the impacts of the project into the future, the commenter makes an important point on the difficulty of predicting these long-term outcomes. In anticipation of this, the DEIR bases many of the project impacts and mitigation measures on the need to attain performance standards that would reasonably be expected to reduce significant effects, to the degree feasible (and as stated in the DEIR) over the life of the project.
- I131-3 See the Master Response regarding the 25-year construction period, and the Master Response regarding noise for a discussion of additional Placer County review that all proposed nighttime construction must go through. With regards to additional mitigation such as electric shuttles, new mitigation has been included in the FEIR (see the Master Response regarding noise) to apply rubberized asphalt to Squaw Valley Road. This measure would reduce noise impacts associated with the project on Squaw Valley Road to a less-than-significant level.
- I131-4 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.

I132

Maywan Krach

From: Marilyn Henriques <mhenriqu4@hotmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 10, 2015 7:53 PM
To: Placer County Environmental Coordination Services
Subject: Development at Squaw Valley

I am opposed to the proposed development of Squaw Valley. We do not need, nor want anything that resembles Vail, Beaver Creek, or any other Colorado mega Resort. The valley is too fragile to accomodate any such development. Lake Tahoe needs to be preserved, not exploited to make a few rich. Please say no to this development.

I live in Tahoe City, my husband and I have raised our four children here. We have been permanent resedents for 37 years. I fear that the development planned for Squaw Valley will will permanently and negatively affect this beautiful Lake Tahoe environment. Please protect it for future generations to come. Vote no to the proposed development.

Marilyn Henriques
mhenriqu4@hotmail.com
(530) 386-2192

I132-1

I132 Marilyn Henriques
July 10, 2015

I132-1 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.

I133

Maywan Krach

From: Michael Henriques <henriques.michael.j@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 07, 2015 9:24 AM
To: Placer County Environmental Coordination Services
Subject: Squaw Valley Proposal

The development proposal for Squaw Valley is super sized to a fault. The plan, as proposed, creates far too many impacts that are mitigable, if only the scale were reduced.

I 1133-1

The developers have no right to extract every last dollar in their effort to maximize ROI. The valley, its residents and the region will be negatively affected, forever more, if allowed to proceed as they propose.

I 1133-2

I am a 35 year, full time resident of Tahoe City. I don't deny the owner's right to develop their land. I do object to their collateral impacts, that will negatively impact my quality of life.

Scale back this proposal.

Michael J. Henriques
(530) 583-0696
henriques.michael.j@gmail.com

I133 Michael J. Henriques
July 7, 2015

I133-1 See the Master Response regarding significant and unavoidable impacts. Also, see the Master Response regarding the Reduced Density Alternative.

I133-2 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.

I134

HICKS | 1

To whom it may concern,

The purpose and need for the expansion of the Olympic Valley is the following of the other big ski ‘resorts’. There is a difference between a ski area, and a ski resort; a ski area is not really catered to tourists, it is typically smaller, without a village, and is just a area for locals or ski activists to come and ski. A ski resort is catered to tourists and has many more amenities like villages, hotels, snow making equipment, and activates other then skiing for people who aren’t really there for the mountain. According to Colorado Ski Blog; “The overall consensus is that a ski area is little more that that: an area where one can ski. Ski areas have no condos, no shopping, no glamor. OK, so what do ski areas have? The answer: really great skiing” Squaw is trying to separate themselves from this as much as possible and they are aware that they are tourist driven, so they are trying to build more places and attractions to bring in more revenue. The proposed action is to build as many attractions as allowed and try to bring in as much revenue as they can to try to compete with resorts like Northstar, Homewood, and Heavenly.

I134-1

“Although the plan has gone through many scaled-down revisions, the Village at Squaw Valley Specific Plan still calls for construction of up to 1,493 bedrooms in up to 850 hotel, condo, and timeshare units. The development also proposes almost 300,000 square feet of commercial space that will be the heart of a new retail and restaurant base for Squaw. And while the much-maligned 132,000-square-foot aquatic park has been downscaled to a 90,000-square-foot Mountain Adventure Camp, the latest environmental impact report details just how significantly the 94-

I134-2

acre project would impact Squaw Valley” (ski curbed). As we deal with drought, habitat destruction, the environmental impact of destroying wetlands (like the Tahoe keys), I’m personally not really sure why anyone thinks that destroying the Olympic valley to make squaw bigger, is a good idea. In the submitted environmental impact draft, squaw states; “significant or potentially significant effects associated with population, employment, and housing; biological resources; cultural resources; visual resources; traffic and circulation; air quality; noise; soils, geology, and seismicity; hydrology and water quality; public services and utilities; hazardous materials and hazards; air quality; and greenhouse gases and climate change, even with the application of feasible mitigation measures, some impacts would be significant and unavoidable.” So really their mitigation proposals aren’t doing enough because the environment is going to be negatively impacted in one way or another, and while we are working so hard to pull back on our eco-footprint, squaw and KSL is basically saying, we are going to do this, we are going to do some things to help the environment and ecosystem not completely collapse, but, some of the things we are going to do are going to fuck up the Olympic valley anyway. Sorry. When KSL did their water report it was in 2011 after one of the biggest we have seen in recent years. Since 2011 however, we have had nothing but drought and KSL continues to refer to these numbers to say they don’t have any water issues. I challenge them to re-do their water report and try to say they don’t have a problem with water. This is just one example of how KSL is knowingly disregarding the environment in favor of capital gain.

I134-2
cont.

I134-3

I134-4

In terms of alternatives, if KSL offered a permanent mitigation plan where the mitigations would be permanent and could not be changed and offered mitigations that wouldn't just stop harmful effects on the environment, but helped the local ecosystem grow and flourish with the presence of these new buildings. I don't think that this project can be stopped all together, but if it was scaled back more, that would make a lot of people feel better. If squaw was to start small and build into the mountain and build as a community instead of a village I believe that this would be a better use of the place.. Build a place more catered to locals and build community values, more people will come to live then to visit and they will still make money. If people would actually take the environmental impact into account and not just do the bare minimum of what they have to put on paper people would be more open to ideas. If I were them I would still try and make It have that small town feel to it and maybe partner with a wildlife organization or a pro-environmental group to show that the project actually cared about the wildlife and ecosystem and not just about the money. KSL and Squaw are just disregarding these peoples concerns instead of working with them and hearing them out. That is the most important change they could make, actually showing that they care about squaw valley and its ecosystem and the local people. In my opinion this would move their process along faster and get them going and support from people but they are doing the bare minimum and are clearly showing that all they care about is the paycheck they are going to get out of it.

1134-5

1134-6

1134-7

From what I have read and heard about this project, I think it is in KSL's best interest, and their plan to at lease get the plans passed and then sell. That will make

HICKS | 4

them the most money. In terms of squaw itself, I think that some new attractions on a smaller scale could potentially bring in more revenue and help them and still not be too harmful to the environment. In a perfect world, Squaw could make enough money to not have to put in all these attractions and go from owner to owner, they could just stay the same and maybe update what they have to be more eco-friendly and tourist friendly. I think the squaw is beautiful just the way it is and doesn't need changing, but from an economic standpoint, this might not be the situation which is sad, but it is my hope that the locals will stand up and say that this project is too much and has too much negative impact on the environment to go any further and something needs to be done to halt it and shut it down. If squaw were to close that would really be a shame, but if KSL destroyed the Olympic valley that would be a bigger same and I would rather see squaw close and be taken over by the land and wildlife, then over run with people and pollution.



1134-7
cont.

Regards,
Danielle Hicks

Works Cited

Barber, Megan. "New Report Details Potential Environmental Impact of Proposed Squaw Valley Base Village." *Curbed Ski*. Ski.curbed.com, 29 May 2015. Web. 20 June 2015.

Fisher, Mark. "Squaw Valley: Green Or Greenwashing?" *UnofficialAlpine.com*. Unofficial Alpine, 04 Jan. 2015. Web. 20 June 2015.
<<http://unofficialalpine.com/?p=7183>>.

Trousdale, John. "Is Loveland a Resort or Ski Area? - Club Colorado Ski Blog." *Club Colorado Ski Blog*. N.p., 30 Nov. 2011. Web. 20 June 2015.
<<http://blog.coloradoski.com/2011/11/30/is-loveland-a-resort-or-ski-area/>>.

I134 Danielle Hicks
no date

- I134-1 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.
- I134-2 The comment provides a summary of the project and notes concerns such as drought, habitat destruction, and the environmental impact of destroying wetlands. 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.
- I134-3 See the Master Response regarding significant and unavoidable impacts.
- I134-4 See the Master Response regarding water supply.
- I134-5 Alternatives to the proposed project are described and evaluated in Chapter 17, “Alternatives,” of the DEIR. Regarding a permanent mitigation plan, see response to comment I41-7 for a discussion of the MMRP.
- The remainder of 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.
- I134-6 See response to comment I134-1.
- I134-7 See response to comment I134-1.

I135

Maywan Krach

From: Dave Higgins Jr. <klondike15@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2015 4:21 PM
To: Placer County Environmental Coordination Services
Subject: Village at Squaw Valley Specific Plan EIR

Please accept my comments regarding the draft EIR for the Village at Squaw Valley Specific Plan.

I have been visiting Squaw Valley since the mid 1970's for recreational purposes. I was a lift operator there during the 1982-83 ski season. I have been visiting Squaw Valley annually since then.

I135-1

I have a degree in Civil Engineering from Santa Clara University and am a **Leed** Accredited Professional. I am a resident and homeowner on the West Shore at 2670 Rustic Lane.

I take exception to the following mitigation measures:

Traffic - Squaw Valley is a dead end. That means all of the vehicles have one way in and one way out. All of the other resorts I have visited such as Aspen, Mammoth, Whistler, Snowbird, Alta, etc can be characterized as small towns at the base of a mountain with multiple points of access. Those areas have a base environment with all of the lodging, food and retail in a consolidated cluster. The Tahoe basin has all of those amenities, but spread out between Truckee, Tahoe City, South Lake Tahoe, Incline Village, and Reno. Accordingly, our region is much more dependent on vehicle traffic to get around from place to place.

I135-2

Increasing the density of Squaw Valley will add to the already horrible traffic that is experienced between Truckee and Tahoe City. Currently during certain holiday periods we don't leave our home to avoid the gridlocked traffic. Adding more traffic in the Highway 89 corridor won't help. No matter what Squaw Valley does to become a destination resort, it is still a local ski area that attracts visitors from Northern California, that come and go on a daily basis. The mountain can't be expanded, so you can only handle so many visitors on a daily basis. It is unreasonable to assume that visits will ever "level out" so their customer base will be normalized, there will always be times of high demand and periods of lower utilization during the week. The overlap of the new visitors with the weekend peaks will overload the Valley with vehicles.

Per the Executive Summary Impact Items 9.2, 9.4, and 9.5 show significant and unavoidable impacts after mitigation. This should be an obvious red flag this project is too big for the existing valley. I object to the size of the project and these impacts it will bring to an already stressed roadway infrastructure.

Hydrology - Water is a precious resource, irregardless of the current drought. The additional occupants will place more demand on an aquifer that has a limited ability to store water and recharge itself based on the rock basin. What will happen if the water tank fails? Shouldn't there be two of them for redundancy? What will they do during years of low or no snow?

I135-3

Per the Executive Summary - I believe the classification of Impact Items 13-4 and 13-5 as Less than Significant after mitigation is in error. If the WSA is in error, there will be significant impacts to all of the residents of Olympic Valley.

The visual impacts described in 8-1 Adverse effect on a scenic vista are very real. The elevations shown in the renderings show nothing more that cookie cutter architecture that is boring and uninspiring. Use the Resort at

I135-4

Squaw Creek as an example. Black curtain wall? Not very complementary to the existing scenery. Please don't let something like that happen again.

I 1135-4
cont.

The 90ksf "Mountain Adventure Camp" is totally inconsistent with the whole Squaw Valley experience. People that come to Squaw Valley should be outside enjoying mother earth. Otherwise they shouldn't waste their time and our natural resources and the corresponding impacts to visit. At a minimum this portion of the project should be eliminated.

I 1135-5

The theme that appears to run through the recommendations is "oh well, there is nothing we can do about it, so let's approve this project anyhow". The other theme is if all of the assumptions provided in the mitigation measures work out, everything will be great. But if they don't, there will be significant impacts. There is no Plan B.

I 1135-6

This re-development of Squaw Valley has the potential to achieve the applicant's goal of making Squaw Valley a world class destination resort. The submission in its current form would deliver a Wal-Mart type maximum build out focused on maximizing their profits. Please bring this project in alignment with the reality of what really makes sense for the ultimate development of Squaw Valley. The residents of Olympic Valley and Placer Country deserve better than this.

I 1135-7

Dave Higgins Jr

I135

Dave Higgins Jr.
July 17, 2015

- I135-1 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.
- I135-2 See the Master Response regarding traffic and the Master Response regarding significant unavoidable impacts.
- I135-3 See the Master Response regarding water supply. The comment does not provide specific reasons why Impacts 13-4 and 13-5 should not be less than significant after mitigation. Therefore, a response cannot be provided.
- I135-4 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.
- I135-5 See response to comment I135-4. Also, see the Master Response regarding the MAC.
- I135-6 See the Master Response regarding significant unavoidable impacts. Regarding mitigation measures, see response to comment I41-7 for a discussion of the MMRP.
- I135-7 See response to comment I135-5.