

I136

Maywan Krach

From: Gail High <mntjoy@jps.net>
Sent: Tuesday, June 16, 2015 10:28 PM
To: Placer County Environmental Coordination Services
Subject: Proposed Squaw Valley development

To whom it May Concern,
PLEASE, PLEASE, PLEASE don't allow this completely out of scale, unnecessary development which will destroy all that's precious about this unique site! This is NOT an appropriate place for such a huge development ---& I can't even begin to imagine what it will do to the traffic and therefore the air pollution in the area. It's unfathomable that a development of this scale has been allowed to even be considered. Please don't let the monetary gain of a few destroy for many, this precious asset!!!! Make the developers decrease the size to something that's reasonable.
Most sincerely,
Gail and Ken High
Kings Beach, CA

I136-1

I136

Gail and Ken High
June 16, 2015

I136-1

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.

The comment notes concerns related to traffic and air pollution in the area. These issues are 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.

I137

Maywan Krach

From: Dan Hikel <1artisan@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Wednesday, June 10, 2015 2:26 PM
To: Maywan Krach
Cc: Jennifer Montgomery; Alexander Fisch
Subject: Squaw dEIR comments
Attachments: SV Development NOP Comments dEIR June 2015.pdf

Dear Maywan,

Please note attached letter in .pdf document form as my public comment for the Squaw Valley Development dEIR during this public comment period.

Quite baffled as to why Squaw Valley's designation as State Historical Site number 724, Pioneer Ski Area, is not even mentioned in the dEIR but had been mentioned in a Northstar dEIR previously in 2013.

I had originally brought this issue up w supes Montgomery and Fisch in January of 2013 during the NOP comment period and it has not been addressed in the dEIR whatsoever.

Please see attached .pdf document though quite long it details the importance of Squaw as a culturally and historically significant designated site as following proper guidelines under the California Environmental Quality Act, and Appendix F, there in proper mitigation measures to conserve energy, which this proposed project will not in its current scope and protect culturally significant buildings such as Nevada and California buildings from demolition. The aforementioned Northstar dEIR is also part of this submission as it details Squaw's designation as Pioneer Ski Area, Historical Site number 724 and provides much detail all mitigation measures of their proposed project for comparison to the current Squaw dEIR which does not.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Dan Hikel
Truckee, CA

I137-1

To Placer County Board of Supervisors, Jennifer Montgomery, Alexander Fisch, et al.

Subject: Squaw Valley real estate development proposal, dEIR

After reading the dEIR on the proposed Squaw Valley development specific plan there are major omissions that are quite troubling in regard to the State Historical Designated Site no 724 Pioneer Ski area. This illustrates intent to purposely omit from section 7, Cultural resources of the dEIR.

Below are excerpts from CERES and CEQA specific to the Squaw Valley development proposal which is omitted from the dEIR specific plan.

California Environmental Resources Evaluation System

A division of California Natural Resources Agency

California State Historical Landmarks in Placer County

Properties of historical importance in California are currently designated as significant resources in three state registration programs: State Historical Landmarks, Points of Historical Interest, and the California Register of Historic Places. Below is a list of the State Historical Landmarks for Placer County. This data is provided by the Office of Historic Preservation - California Department of Parks and Recreation and is also available in the California Historical Landmarks Book.

NO. 724 PIONEER SKI AREA OF AMERICA, SQUAW VALLEY - The VIII Olympic Winter Games of 1960 commemorated a century of sport skiing in California. By 1860 the Sierra Nevada-particularly at the mining towns of Whiskey Diggings, Poker Flat, Port Wine, Onion Valley, La Porte, and Johnsville, some 60 miles north of Squaw Valley-saw the first organized ski clubs and competition in the western hemisphere.

Location: Squaw Valley Sports Center, NE corner of Blyth Olympic Arena Bldg, Squaw Valley Rd, Squaw Valley

This may have major legal implications for both the developer and Placer County board if this proposal is approved without proper evaluation and consideration as a State Historical Registered site under the California Environmental Quality Act, "Substantial Change to a Historical Resource"

1137-2

“Substantial adverse change includes demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration such that the significance of an historical resource would be impaired (PRC Section 5020.1(q)).

While demolition and destruction are fairly obvious significant impacts, it is more difficult to assess when change, alteration, or relocation crosses the threshold of substantial adverse change. The CEQA Guidelines provide that a project that demolishes or alters those physical characteristics of an historical resource that convey its historical significance (i.e., its character-defining features) can be considered to materially impair the resource’s significance.”

State Codes and Regulations Related to CEQA and Historical Resources 1

**California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Chapter 3
15064.5. Determining the Significance of Impacts to Archeological and Historical Resources**

(a) For purposes of this section, the term "historical resources" shall include the following:

(1) A resource listed in, or determined to be eligible by the State Historical Resources Commission, for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources (Pub. Res. Code SS5024.1, Title 14 CCR, Section 4850 et seq.).

(2) A resource included in a local register of historical resources, as defined in section 5020.1(k) of the Public Resources Code or identified as significant in an historical resource survey meeting the requirements section 5024.1(g) of the Public Resources Code, shall be presumed to be historically or culturally significant. Public agencies must

treat any such resource as significant unless the preponderance of evidence demonstrates that it is not historically or culturally significant.

(3) Any object, building, structure, site, area, place, record, or manuscript which a lead agency determines to be historically significant or significant in the architectural, engineering, scientific, economic, agricultural, educational, social, political, military, or cultural annals of California may be considered to be an historical resource, provided the lead agency’s determination is supported by substantial evidence in light of the whole record. Generally, a resource shall be considered by the lead agency to be "historically significant" if the resource meets the criteria for listing on the California Register of Historical Resources (Pub. Res. Code SS5024.1, Title 14 CCR, Section 4852) including the following:

I137-2
cont.

(A) Is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California's history and cultural heritage;

(B) Is associated with the lives of persons important in our past;

(C) Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represents the work of an important creative individual, or possesses high artistic values; or

(D) Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

(4) The fact that a resource is not listed in, or determined to be eligible for listing in the

California Register of Historical Resources, not included in a local register of historical resources (pursuant to section 5020.1(k) of the Public Resources Code), or identified in an historical resources survey (meeting the criteria in section 5024.1(g) of the Public Resources Code) does not preclude a lead agency from determining that the resource may be an historical resource as defined in Public Resources Code sections 5020.1(j)

or 5024.1. (b) A project with an effect that may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource is a project that may have a significant effect on the environment.

(1) Substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource means physical demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of the resource or its immediate surroundings such that the significance of an historical resource would be materially impaired. State Codes and Regulations Related to CEQA and Historical Resources

(2) The significance of an historical resource is materially impaired when a project: (A) Demolishes or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical characteristics of an historical resource that convey its historical significance and that justify its inclusion in, or eligibility for, inclusion in the California Register of Historical Resources; or

(B) Demolishes or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical characteristics that account for its inclusion in a local register of historical resources pursuant to section 5020.1(k) of the Public Resources Code or its identification in an historical resources survey meeting the requirements of section 5024.1(g) of the Public Resources Code, unless the public agency reviewing the effects of the project establishes by a preponderance of evidence that the resource is not historically or culturally significant; or

(C) Demolishes or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical characteristics of a historical resource that convey its historical significance and that justify its eligibility for inclusion in the California Register of Historical Resources as determined by a lead agency for purposes of CEQA.

I137-2
cont.

Also under CEQA guidelines for a State Designated Historical site are as follows:

15126.4 Consideration and Discussion of Mitigation Measures Proposed to Minimize Significant Effects

(a) Mitigation Measures in General.

(1) An EIR shall describe feasible measures which could minimize significant adverse impacts, including where relevant, inefficient and unnecessary consumption of energy.

(A) The discussion of mitigation measures shall distinguish between the measures which are proposed by project proponents to be included in the project and other measures proposed by the lead, responsible or trustee agency or other persons which are not included but the lead agency determines could reasonably be expected to reduce adverse impacts if required as conditions of approving the project. This discussion shall identify mitigation measures for each significant environmental effect identified in the EIR.

(B) Where several measures are available to mitigate an impact, each should be discussed and the basis for selecting a particular measure should be identified. Formulation of mitigation measures should not be deferred until some future time. However, measures may specify performance standards which would mitigate the significant effect of the project and which may be accomplished in more than onespecified way.

(C) Energy conservation measures, as well as other appropriate mitigation measures, shall be discussed when relevant. Examples of energy conservation measures are provided in Appendix F.

(D) If a mitigation measure would cause one or more significant effects in addition to those that would be caused by the project as proposed, the effects of the mitigation measure shall be discussed but in less detail than the significant effects of the project as proposed.

1137-2
cont.

And further, Appendix F, of the CEQA for State Designated Historical Sites:

CEQA: California Environmental Quality Act

154 • APPENDICES

Appendix F

ENERGY CONSERVATION

I. Introduction

The goal of conserving energy implies the wise and efficient

use of energy. The means of achieving this goal include:

- (1) decreasing overall per capita energy consumption,
- (2) decreasing reliance on natural gas and oil, and
- (3) increasing reliance on renewable energy sources.

In order to assure that energy implications are considered in project decisions, the California Environmental Quality Act requires that EIRs include a discussion of the potential energy impacts of proposed projects, with particular emphasis on avoiding or reducing inefficient, wasteful and unnecessary consumption of energy.

Energy conservation implies that a project's cost effectiveness be reviewed not only in dollars, but also in terms of energy requirements. For many projects, lifetime costs may be determined more by energy efficiency than by initial dollar costs.

II. EIR Contents

Potentially significant energy implications of a project should be considered in an EIR. The following list of energy impact possibilities and potential conservation measures is designed to assist in the preparation of an EIR. In many instances, specific items may not apply or additional items may be needed.

A. Project Description may include the following items:

1. Energy consuming equipment and processes which will be used during construction, operation, and/or removal of the project. If appropriate, this discussion should consider the energy intensiveness of materials and equipment required for the project.
2. Total energy requirements of the project by fuel type and end use.
3. Energy conservation equipment and design features.
4. Initial and life-cycle energy costs or supplies.
5. Total estimated daily trips to be generated by the project and the additional energy consumed per trip by mode.

B. Environmental Setting may include existing energy supplies and energy use patterns in the region and locality.

C. Environmental Impacts may include:

1. The project's energy requirements and its energy use efficiencies by amount and fuel type for each stage of the project's life cycle including construction, operation, maintenance and/or removal. If appropriate, the energy intensiveness of materials may be discussed.
2. The effects of the project on local and regional energy supplies and on requirements for additional capacity.
3. The effects of the project on peak and base period demands for electricity and other forms of energy.
4. The degree to which the project complies with existing energy standards.
5. The effects of the project on energy resources.

I137-2
cont.

6. The project's projected transportation energy use requirements and its overall use of efficient transportation alternatives.

D. Mitigation Measures may include:

1. Potential measures to reduce wasteful, inefficient and unnecessary consumption of energy during construction, operation, maintenance and/or removal. The discussion should explain why certain measures were incorporated in the project and why other measures were dismissed.

2. The potential of siting, orientation, and design to minimize energy consumption, including transportation energy.

3. The potential for reducing peak energy demand.

4. Alternate fuels (particularly renewable ones) or energy systems.

5. Energy conservation which could result from recycling efforts.

E. Alternatives should be compared in terms of overall energy consumption and in terms of reducing wasteful, inefficient and unnecessary consumption of energy.

F. Unavoidable Adverse Effects may include wasteful, inefficient and unnecessary consumption of energy during the project construction, operation, maintenance and/or removal that cannot be feasibly mitigated.

G. Irreversible Commitment of Resources may include a discussion of how the project preempts future energy development or future energy conservation.

H. Short-Term Gains versus Long-Term Impacts can be compared by calculating the energy costs over the lifetime of the project.

I. Growth Inducing Effects may include the estimated energy consumption of growth induced by the project.

For reasons of comparison, the Northstar Mountain village development dEIR clearly states under Cultural Resources heading, that Pioneer Ski Area was within the vicinity of their development in Placer County. For Squaw Valley developers to ignore the significance of this state designation is in my opinion a purposeful intent to deceive and dis-inform Placer County and the public about this important designation of Squaw and the implications it obviously has with wise and efficient use of energy in regards to development plans.

For Placer County officials to allow this glaring omission can also be seen as abetting the developer's intent to deceive and dis-inform.

1137-2
cont.

As public officials, the board should be representing the public as much as required by law in this matter.

I 1137-2
cont.

Mitigation measures mentioned in the dEIR pertaining to the issue of energy conservation for this proposed development are currently considered not feasible. Yet energy conservation is feasible under a smaller proposed development plan, less construction, smaller footprint and the use of renewable energy sources such as roof top solar panels, graywater collection facilities and L.E.E.D. certified building design.

A project of this proposed size that will only experience full occupancy no more than and estimated 8 total weeks out of a calendar year as historically proven in this type of development, is very wasteful in energy consumption and does not fall within the CEQA appendix F guidelines of conserving energy in it's long term useful lifespan.

1137-3

For the Board to not address these issues as well seems like a purposeful omission of process as well.

I hope I am incorrect in this statement but the dEIR as submitted is incomplete and flawed in regards to the State Historical Designation of Squaw Valley as Pioneer Ski Area and should be disallowed and resubmitted with proper inclusion and re-design and effective mitigation measures within the specific plan to accommodate the CEQA under Appendix F for State Designated Historical Sites.

1137-4

Below is the attached Northstar dEIR from November 2013 for reference to the State Historical Designated site of Pioneer ski area no. 724 located at Squaw Valley.

Thank you for the opportunity to address this issue.

I137Dan Hikel
June 10, 2015

- I137-1 The comment expresses concern that State Historical Designated Site No. 724, Pioneer Ski Area, is not mentioned in the DEIR. The comment is correct that the historical landmark is not mentioned in the DEIR. As a “Pioneer Ski Area,” Squaw Valley is designated as a California Historical Landmark for its role in the VIII Olympic Winter Games of 1960, which commemorated a century of sport skiing in California beginning in 1860. The reason for the designation, the Winter Olympics of 1960, is best expressed by the remaining 1960s Olympic-related buildings (the Olympic Valley Lodge and the Far East Center). In addition, Pioneer Ski Area is designated site No. 724, and the Office of Historic Preservation has made the decision that any site numbered 1 through 769 needs to be reevaluated for its eligibility as a California Historical Landmark using current standards (California State Office of Historic Preservation 2004). The marker itself, located near the tram building, is not eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) or the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR). As described in Chapter 7, “Cultural Resources,” of the DEIR, the historic significance of these buildings were evaluated using NRHP and CRHR criteria. Mention of Site No. 724 would not change this analysis because impacts to historic resources, including the two 1960s Olympics-related buildings located within the plan area, have been adequately addressed in the DEIR under Impact 7-1 (Demolition of historically significant buildings) and mitigation measures have been provided. Even with mitigation, the loss of these historic resources was found to be significant and unavoidable.
- I137-2 The comment quotes the definition of the Pioneer Ski Area and text from the State CEQA Guidelines regarding historic resources and energy conservation.
- See response to comment I137-1 regarding State Historical Designated Site No. 724, Pioneer Ski Area and response to comment I137-4 regarding the Northstar DEIR.
- I137-3 Energy usage in the context of Appendix F of the State CEQA Guidelines is addressed in Chapter 14, “Public Services and Utilities,” of the DEIR (see Impact 14-4 [Result in inefficient and wasteful consumption of energy] on pages 14-39 through 14-41). As described therein, the project would be designed to incorporate modern building code energy efficiency requirements and would include additional energy conservation and efficiency improvements. Energy efficient policies of the proposed VSVSP are listed in the DEIR on pages 14-26 through 14-27. Mitigation Measures 10-2 and 16-2, which address air and greenhouse gas emissions, also include elements that could reduce project energy use. The comment suggests energy conservation is feasible with a smaller development, but offers no support for this proposition. The DEIR does evaluate two alternatives that are smaller than the proposed project, and these will be considered by the Board of Supervisors. The comment also states it is “historically proven” that similar-size projects experience full occupancy for 8 weeks of the year, but cites no evidence in support. The comment also fails to explain, with any proof, how this occupancy rate would result in wasteful energy consumption or fall outside of Appendix F.
- I137-4 The comment provides a summary of detailed comments provided above. See responses to the detailed comments above. The comment is incorrect that failure to mention Pioneer Ski Area No. 724 renders the EIR incomplete or flawed, as its inclusion was not required by CEQA, nor would its inclusion have changed the EIR’s conclusions; loss of historic resources was found to be significant and unavoidable.

The comment also includes, as an attachment, the Northstar DEIR from November 2013 for reference to the State Historical Designated site of Pioneer Ski Area No. 724. The only mention of Pioneer Ski Area in the Northstar DEIR is in the setting section, defining the area as follows,

No.724 Pioneer Ski Area of America, Squaw Valley: The VIII Olympic Games of 1960 commemorated a century of sport skiing in California and took place at Squaw Valley Sports Center, northeast corner of Blyth Olympic Arena Building, Squaw Valley Road, Squaw Valley. By 1860, the Sierra Nevada, particularly at the mining towns of Whiskey Diggings, Poker Flat, Port Wine, Onion Valley, LaPorte, and Johnsville, some 60 miles north of Squaw Valley, saw the first organized ski clubs and competition in the western hemisphere.

As noted in response to comment I137-1, the reason for the historical designation of the site, the Winter Olympics of 1960, is best expressed by the remaining 1960s Olympic-related buildings (the Olympic Valley Lodge and the Far East Center). The historic significance of these buildings was evaluated in the VSVSP DEIR. The marker itself, located near the tram building, is not eligible for listing in the NRHP or the CRHR.

I138

Maywan Krach

From: Dan Hikel <1artisan@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Thursday, June 25, 2015 9:22 AM
To: Jennifer Montgomery; Alexander Fisch; Maywan Krach; Laurie Oberholtzer; Tom Mooers
Subject: Fw: Squaw Notice of Preparation

Dear Ms. Montgomery,

It is with concern that the issue of State Historical Designated Site No 724 Placer County, Pioneer Ski Area is not mentioned in the current Squaw Development plan dEIR.

Because the marker is located near the tram building, does not indicate what the actual designation of the site or area is intended.

Alarming is that in a previous dEIR filed with Placer county officials by Northstar in 2013 that dEIR mentions specifically the state designated historical site 724 as a cultural resource.

For Placer County officials to ignore this matter and not investigate what the actual historical documents entail and pass off as inconsequential as in the below email thread from late 2012 and early 2013 on this matter shows intent to dis inform the public on this matter and also possible collusion with the developer due to the implications regarding development in State historical designated sites and the CEQA.

If due diligence is properly performed by Placer County Board of Supervisors on this matter it will be shown that the marker was originally placed at the NE corner of the old Blythe Area and the original intent of the designation was to preserve the natural beauty of Squaw Valley and prevent gross over development by developers as we see being proposed today.

Thank you for your attention to this matter and performing diligence on the historical document designation for Squaw and the definition and scope of what that covers and protects.

Please see thread below.

Sincerely,

Dan Hikel

Truckee CA

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: Alexander Fisch <AFisch@placer.ca.gov>
To: 'Ed Heneveld' <dosed@att.net>; Jennifer Montgomery <JenMonten@placer.ca.gov>; Dan Hikel <1artisan@sbcglobal.net>
Cc: Maywan Krach <MKrach@placer.ca.gov>; jamie schectman <shecky@mountainridersalliance.com>
Sent: Thursday, January 3, 2013 2:18 PM
Subject: RE: Squaw Notice of Preparation

A quick clarification: These issues will be detailed in the EIR, but for now I can offer that the historic marker for the 1960 Winter Olympic Games is located just outside the Tram Building entry and, as of this time (2013), the Tram Building does not meet the criteria for historic listing though it does have some historic association with the resort. The stone monument and historic marker are located at the southeast corner of the building near the steps.

There are three buildings within the plan area that meet criteria for listing in the State and National Register of Historic Places. Those include the California Spectator Center (locker rooms), the Nevada Spectator Center, and the Athlete's Center. Detailed descriptions of those buildings, their historic significance, project impacts to those resources, and

I138-1

mitigation measures will be detailed in the EIR. The EIR is being prepared now and is tentatively scheduled to be circulated for the 45 day public review period in late spring, assuming of course that the production schedule is able to be maintained and there are no delays.

Thank you all for your interest in this project and your continued patience while the EIR is prepared.

Alex Fisch
Senior Planner
Placer County Planning Services
530.745.3081
www.placer.ca.gov

From: Ed Heneveld [mailto:dosed@att.net]
Sent: Thursday, January 03, 2013 2:01 PM
To: Jennifer Montgomery; Dan Hikel; Alexander Fisch
Cc: Maywan Krach; jamie schectman
Subject: Re: Squaw Notice of Preparation

It seems odd that the tram building would be 'historic' in that it was not (to my knowledge) part of the Olympics but both the locker room and opera house (Nevada building) were part. I certainly would like this confirmed. Besides, as Dan notes: "The fact that a resource is not listed in, or determined to be eligible for listing in, the California Register of Historical Resources, not included in a local register of historical resources, or not deemed significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (g) of Section 5024.1 shall not preclude a lead agency from determining whether the resource may be an historical resource for purposes of this section."

~Ed

From: Jennifer Montgomery <JenMonten@placer.ca.gov>
Date: Monday, December 31, 2012 9:12 AM
To: Dan Hikel <1artisan@sbcglobal.net>
Cc: Maywan Krach <MKrach@placer.ca.gov>, Ed Heneveld <dosed@att.net>, Jamie Schectman <shecky@mountainridersalliance.com>
Subject: Re: Squaw Notice of Preparation

Dan I have personally reviewed the historic designation and it appears to apply only to the actual original tram building and not any other buildings, areas or structures. If you have discovered anything different than that please let us know as the village proposal currently leaves the tram building untouched.

Happy new year,

Jennifer

Sent from my iPhone
Jennifer Montgomery

On Dec 29, 2012, at 3:06 PM, "Dan Hikel" <1artisan@sbcglobal.net> wrote:

Dear Maywan,

I wanted to respectfully request that representatives of Placer County please obtain and review the Historical Designation records of Squaw Valley and its determination under the CEQA prior to making a decision on the Squaw Valley proposed development project prior to allowing them to proceed to the EIR phase of their planning during this extended open comment period of the NOP on this project.

This is from the California Public Resources Code;

21084.1. Historical Resources Guidelines.

A project that may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource is a project that may have a significant effect on the environment.

For purposes of this section, an historical resource is a resource listed in, or determined to be eligible for listing in, the California Register of Historical Resources. Historical resources included in a local register of historical resources, as defined in subdivision (k) of Section 5020.1, or deemed significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (g) of Section 5024.1, are presumed to be historically or culturally significant for purposes of this section, unless the preponderance of the evidence demonstrates that the resource is not historically or culturally significant. The fact that a resource is not listed in, or determined to be eligible for listing in, the California Register of Historical Resources, not included in a local register of historical resources, or not deemed significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (g) of Section 5024.1 shall not preclude a lead agency from determining whether the resource may be an historical resource for purposes of this section.

I believe it is in the best interest of all parties involved that Squaw Valley's state designated historical resource documentation is made available for proper review under state CEQA guidelines.

Thank you for your attention.

Best wishes for a safe and prosperous new year.

Sincerely,

Dan Hikel
Truckee, CA

From: Maywan Krach <MKrach@placer.ca.gov>

To: Dan Hikel <1artisan@sbcglobal.net>

Sent: Thu, November 29, 2012 8:21:43 AM

Subject: RE: Squaw Notice of Preparation

Your comments have been received and forwarded to the planner.

Thanks.

.....
Maywan Krach
Community Development Technician
Environmental Coordination Services
Placer County Community Development Resource Agency
3091 County Center Drive, Suite 190, Auburn, CA 95603
530-745-3132 fax 530-745-3080
8am-4:30pm, Mon-Fri
.....

From: Dan Hikel [mailto:1artisan@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Wednesday, November 28, 2012 10:53 PM
To: Jennifer Montgomery
Cc: Ed Heneveld; Placer County Environmental Coordination Services; jme96160@yahoo.com; info@mapf.org
Subject: Squaw Notice of Preparation

Dear Jennifer,

I wanted to contact you after reading the notice of preparation for Squaw Valley's proposed village development plans.

As you may or may not be aware, Squaw Valley was designated a historical landmark in 1960 following the Winter Olympic Games of that year.

From California Environmental Resources Evaluation System, CERES site "Properties of historical importance in California are currently designated as significant resources in three state registration programs: State Historical Landmarks, Points of Historical Interest, and the California Register of Historic Places. Below is a list of the State Historical Landmarks for Placer County. This data is provided by the Office of Historic Preservation - California Department of Parks and Recreation and is also available in the California Historical Landmarks Book." No. 724 Squaw Valley.

This designation brings up alarming concerns that the NOP from Squaw has serious deficiencies in regards to the proposed EIR in regards to the California Environmental Quality Act. State Codes related to CEQA mandate any commercial development in or around an historical resource follow specified guidelines for energy conservation, 15126.4 Consideration and Discussion of Mitigation Measures Proposed to Minimize Significant Effects CCR Title 14 Chapter 3, under Appendix F, Energy Conservation, the goal of conserving energy means the wise and efficient use of energy.

The means of achieving this goal include:

- (1) decreasing overall per capita energy consumption,
- (2) decreasing reliance on natural gas and oil, and
- (3) increasing reliance on renewable energy sources.

In order to assure that energy implications are considered in project decisions, the California Environmental Quality Act requires that EIRs include a discussion of the potential energy impacts of proposed projects, with particular emphasis on avoiding or reducing inefficient, wasteful and unnecessary consumption of energy.

Energy conservation implies that a project's cost effectiveness be reviewed not only in dollars, but also in terms of energy requirements. For many projects, lifetime costs may be determined more by energy efficiency than by initial dollar costs.

II. EIR Contents

Potentially significant energy implications of a project should be considered in an EIR. The following list of energy impact possibilities and potential conservation measures is designed to assist in the preparation of an EIR. In many instances, specific items may not apply or additional items may be needed.

A. Project Description may include the following items:

1. Energy consuming equipment and processes which will

be used during construction, operation, and/or removal of the project. If appropriate, this discussion should consider the energy intensiveness of materials and equipment required for the project.

2. Total energy requirements of the project by fuel type and end use.
3. Energy conservation equipment and design features.
4. Initial and life-cycle energy costs or supplies.
5. Total estimated daily trips to be generated by the project and the additional energy consumed per trip by mode.

B. Environmental Setting may include existing energy supplies and energy use patterns in the region and locality.

C. Environmental Impacts may include:

1. The project's energy requirements and its energy use efficiencies by amount and fuel type for each stage of the project's life cycle including construction, operation, maintenance and/or removal. If appropriate, the energy intensiveness of materials may be discussed.
2. The effects of the project on local and regional energy supplies and on requirements for additional capacity.
3. The effects of the project on peak and base period demands for electricity and other forms of energy.
4. The degree to which the project complies with existing energy standards.
5. The effects of the project on energy resources.
6. The project's projected transportation energy use requirements and its overall use of efficient transportation alternatives.

D. Mitigation Measures may include:

1. Potential measures to reduce wasteful, inefficient and unnecessary consumption of energy during construction, operation, maintenance and/or removal. The discussion should explain why certain measures were incorporated in the project and why other measures were dismissed.
2. The potential of siting, orientation, and design to minimize energy consumption, including transportation energy.
3. The potential for reducing peak energy demand.
4. Alternate fuels (particularly renewable ones) or energy systems.
5. Energy conservation which could result from recycling efforts.

E. Alternatives should be compared in terms of overall energy consumption and in terms of reducing wasteful, inefficient and unnecessary consumption of energy.

F. Unavoidable Adverse Effects may include wasteful, inefficient and unnecessary consumption of energy during the project construction, operation, maintenance and/or removal that cannot be feasibly mitigated.

G. Irreversible Commitment of Resources may include a

discussion of how the project preempts future energy development or future energy conservation.
H. Short-Term Gains versus Long-Term Impacts can be compared by calculating the energy costs over the lifetime of the project.
I. Growth Inducing Effects may include the estimated energy consumption of growth induced by the project.

As you can see, for the record, the Squaw Valley Development NOP falls far short of these goals and should not be accepted under the CEQA guidelines pertaining to Squaw Valley's historical designation.

Hope to hear you speak about this in particular on Saturday at the Resort at Squaw Creek.

Sincerely,

Dan Hikel
Truckee, CA

I138Dan Hikel
June 25, 2015

I138-1

See response to comment I137-1 regarding State Historical Designated Site No. 724, Pioneer Ski Area. The comment also states that the “original intent of the designation was to preserve the natural beauty of Squaw Valley and prevent gross over development.” Designation as a California Historical Landmark has no correlation to preventing development.

According to the California Office of Historic Preservation, California Historical Landmarks are buildings, structures, sites, or places that have been determined to have statewide historical significance by meeting at least one of the criteria listed below:

- ▲ The first, last, only, or most significant of its type in the state or within a large geographic region (Northern, Central, or Southern California).
- ▲ Associated with an individual or group having a profound influence on the history of California.
- ▲ A prototype of, or an outstanding example of, a period, style, architectural movement or construction or is one of the more notable works or the best surviving work in a region of a pioneer architect, designer or master builder.

As described in response to comment I137-1, the reason for the historical landmark designation at Squaw Valley is the Winter Olympics of 1960, which is best expressed by the remaining 1960s Olympic-related buildings (e.g., the Olympic Valley Lodge, the Far East Center, and the Member’s Locker Room). These characteristics are most closely related to the second and third Historical Landmark criteria. The marker itself, located near the tram building, is not eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) or the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR).

As stated above, designation of a California Historical Landmark has no correlation to preventing development. As stated by the California Office of Historic Preservation, an effect of landmark designation is “Limited protection: Environmental review may be required under California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) if property is threatened by a project.” (http://www.ohp.parks.ca.gov/?page_id=21747).

CEQA review of cultural resources related to the Historical Landmark criteria (i.e., buildings associated with the 1960 Winter Olympics) has been conducted. As described in Chapter 7, “Cultural Resources,” of the DEIR, the historic significance of eligible historic buildings were evaluated using NRHP and CRHR criteria. Mention of Site No. 724 would not change this analysis because impacts to historic resources, including the 1960s Olympics-related buildings, have been adequately addressed in the DEIR under Impact 7-1 (Demolition of historically significant buildings) and mitigation measures have been provided. Even with mitigation, the loss of these historic resources was found to be significant and unavoidable.

I139

Maywan Krach

From: Dan Hikel <1artisan@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Monday, June 29, 2015 3:32 PM
To: Maywan Krach
Subject: Squaw Valley dEIR environmental benefits

Dear Maywan,

To Placer County Planning Commission and Placer County Board of Supervisors

I would like to respectfully request to add to my previous public comments on the Squaw Valley development project dEIR.

After attending the Placer County Planning Commission meeting in Kings Beach last Thursday, June 25, Mr. Hosea, Vice President of Development for Squaw Valley, made available for viewing a document stating the favorable environmental benefits of this large and environmentally adversely effecting project.

I139-1

After reading this document my comments to add about this document during this public comment period on the Squaw dEIR are as follows.

Air Quality

There is no mention of adverse effects to air quality during construction of this project requiring many thousands of heavy diesel construction and transport vehicles and the amount of greenhouse gas and carbon emissions that will be released into the environment. Though the adverse effects may be mentioned in the dEIR the mitigation measures are considered "not feasible" by the developer. This raises concern as the underlying meaning of "not feasible" means not able to, or impossible, yet mitigation is feasible and possible by greatly reducing the size, scope and duration of project.

I139-2

How can this project in any way, shape or form be beneficial to the environment when tons of carbon particulates will be spewed from heavy diesel construction and transportation equipment into the clean mountain air of the area? Diesel fuel is composed of benzene molecules among other chemical compounds and is very high on the human toxicity scale when combusted and those fumes are inhaled through normal breathing. When there is a naturally occurring weather condition called inversion, common to the mountain environment, when ground temperatures are colder than upper level temperatures a situation occurs where airborne particulates from vehicle exhaust and other airborne particulates like wood smoke from wood burning stoves, are trapped in the low level cold air and visibly resemble a 'brown-like' fog that is extremely toxic to humans. How can this be environmentally beneficial to the area in any way? Will the developers and Placer county officials make available and mandate bio-fuel powered construction equipment? This is a feasible mitigation suggestion.

I139-3

What are the projected carbon and greenhouse gas emission amounts due to this project? What significant adverse effects of this project going to be in said greenhouse gas emissions and carbon emissions on surrounding counties that these vehicles will need to travel through to arrive in Squaw Valley such as Nevada and El Dorado Counties? What mitigation measures are going to be used to combat this adverse effect? What monitoring equipment if any is planned to be in place and utilized to measure the level of greenhouse gases and carbon particulate emissions?

I139-4

Traffic

What is the traffic mitigation plan and contingency for emergency, first responder vehicles when needed during maximum congestion times, during peak traffic conditions at holidays during whiteout, blizzard conditions when first responder aircraft are not able to fly? Peoples lives will matter and are most at stake in this type of scenario, though chances are rare but definitely possible. Why is this scenario not being considered?

I139-5

Green Building Design

Why are the development plans of this project not incorporating the use of gray water and rain water collection facilities in the design and construction of these buildings? How can not recycling used bathing and dish-washing water on site for reuse add to an environmental benefit during prolonged drought periods such as the drought cycle currently affecting California? Why is there not a contingency for such an incorporated collection system in the design of this project? Why couldn't this gray water be transferred to

I139-6

snow making collection ponds, when snow making for on mountain purposes are a major source of consumption for a ski area to operate when natural snowfall is scarce as it has proven to be?

I 1139-6
cont.

If the developer claims this project is environmentally sensitive and has environmental benefits, then why are the proposed buildings not designed using L.E.E.D. --leadership in energy and environmental design--, a United States Green Building standard and criteria for design?

I 1139-7

Cultural Resources -- State Historical Designation

Under Cultural Resources, again there is no mention of the State Historical Designate Site of Squaw Valley as Pioneer Ski Area No. 724. Under current CEQA Appendix F this project would not meet the standard for "energy conservation", "reducing the use of fossil fuels", wise and efficient use of energy" and protection of the culturally significant Nevada and California Olympic era buildings.

I 1139-8

Are the developers purposely avoiding addressing this issue because of the significant implications under the CEQA Appendix F for the "wise and efficient use of energy" criteria cannot be met in its current scope?

The dEIR as it stands and the additional environmental benefits paper produced by the developers of the Squaw Valley project do not meet the criteria for environmentally sensitive design, air quality protection, traffic mitigation and energy conservation within the CEQA. The claim by the developer that these adverse effects are not feasibly mitigated in the dEIR is an attempt to push their plans through without considering the complete and overall negative and adverse effects that a project of this size creates on the environment.

I 1139-9

Mitigation measures for these adverse effects are quite simple, reduce the size, scope and term of this project to meet the threshold levels as required by the CEQA.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Dan Hikel

I139

Dan Hikel
June 29, 2015

I139-1

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.

I139-2

The comment states “there is no mention of adverse effects to air quality during construction of this project requiring many thousands of heavy diesel construction and transport vehicles and the amount of GHG and carbon emissions that will be released into the environment.” This comment mentions both air quality concerns and greenhouse gas emissions from project-related construction activity. These two topics are discussed separately below.

Construction-generated emissions of criteria air pollutants and precursors, including ozone precursors and particulate matter, are analyzed under Impact 10-1 of the DEIR (starting on page 10-14). This analysis determined that construction-related emissions of ozone precursors would be less than significant because maximum daily construction emissions would not exceed the mass emission thresholds recommended by PCAPCD. This analysis also explains that fugitive dust particulate matter emissions would be minimized due to implementation of the dust control measures required by PCAPCD Rule 228. Because this analysis determined that construction-generated emissions of criteria air pollutants and precursors would not be a significant impact, no mitigation was required. Nonetheless, some construction emission reduction measures are included in Mitigation Measure 10-2, which begins on page 10-17 of the DEIR, because the analysis of *operational* emissions of under Impact 10-2 determined that *operational* emissions of criteria air pollutants and precursors would exceed PCAPCD’s mass emission thresholds and some portions of the VSVSP could be operational while remaining portions are under construction. In other words, construction- and operation-related emissions could be generated simultaneously.

Construction-generated emissions of GHG emissions are analyzed under Impact 16-1, which begins on page 16-14 of the DEIR. This analysis quantified the level of GHG emissions associated with project construction and determined that construction-generated GHG emission levels would not exceed the mass emission threshold recommended by PCAPCD. This is why the DEIR determined that construction-generated GHG emissions would be less than significant and no construction-specific GHG mitigation is included in the DEIR. Construction emissions were also included in the analysis of operational GHG emissions under Impact 16-2. This is evident by the levels of construction emissions, amortized over a projected 40-year operational life of the VSVSP, shown in Table 16-2 and Table 16-3 of the DEIR. Including construction-related GHG emissions in the analysis of operational emissions in this way is considered conservative because PCAPCD recommends a separated threshold of significance just for construction-related GHGs.

The commenter claims that the mitigation measures for air pollutant and GHG emissions in the DEIR are considered “not feasible” by the developer. The commenter does not substantiate this claim. As described above, no mitigation is needed to address construction-generated emissions of criteria air pollutants (and precursors) and GHGs because the analyses of these impacts were found to be less than significant under Impact 10-1 and Impact 16-1, respectively.

Some revisions to the estimates of the level of construction-generated criteria air pollutants (and precursors) and GHGs were made and these revisions are discussed in the Master Response regarding construction emissions; however, these revisions do not alter the less-than-significant impact determinations in the analyses of construction emissions under

Impact 10-1 and Impact 16-1. For additional details see the Master Response regarding construction emissions.

I139-3

The comment queries how the project can be beneficial to the environment from an air quality standpoint. The DEIR does not make any such statement. The construction-generated emissions of criteria air pollutants and precursors are examined under Impact 10-1, starting on page 10-14 of the DEIR, and construction-generated emissions of GHGs are analyzed under Impact 16-1, starting on page 16-14 of the DEIR. See response to comment I39-2 for more discussion about how the DEIR analyzed construction-generated emissions of criteria air pollutants (and precursors) and GHGs.

The commenter then explains the toxicity of diesel fuel. The toxicity of particulate matter contained in exhaust from diesel-powered engines, also known as diesel PM, is explained 10-4 of the DEIR. The potential for the project construction and operations to expose receptors to concentrations of toxic air contaminants (TACs) and associated health risk is analyzed under Impact 10-4 of the DEIR (starting on page 10-22).

Regarding comments on inversions, construction emissions of criteria air pollutants (and precursors), including emissions of respirable particulate matter with an aerodynamic diameter of 10 micrometers or less (PM₁₀) and fine particulate matter with an aerodynamic diameter of 2.5 micrometers or less (PM_{2.5}), are analyzed under Impact 10-1. Operational emissions of criteria air pollutants (and precursors) are analyzed under Impact 10-2. See the response to comment I39-2 for discussion of these impacts, whether mitigation was required to address these impacts, and the type of mitigation required.

Regarding the request to require bio-fuel, this is not needed to reduce significant impacts as described above (references to Impact 10-1 and Impact 16-1). See the response to comment I39-2 for discussion of these impacts, whether mitigation was required to address these impacts, and the type of mitigation required.

Regarding the comment's mention of smoke from wood-burning stoves, VSVSP Policy AQ-1 specifies that no wood-burning stoves or fireplaces shall be installed in resort-residential or lodging units. Therefore, the proposed project is not expected to contribute wood smoke to Squaw Valley.

I139-4

See Section 16, "Greenhouse Gases and Climate Change," in the DEIR. More specifically, refer to Impact 16-1 and 16-2 which provide quantitative estimates of the levels of GHGs that would be generated by construction and operation of the VSVSP. Also, it's important to understand that climate change is a global problem and, therefore, GHGs are pollutants of global concern. This concept is discussed in greater detail on page 16-1 of the DEIR. Moreover, GHGs generated by new vehicle trips that would travel to and from the project site, including trips that pass through other portions of California, are examined under Impact 16-2.

Also, see Mitigation Measure 16-2 of the DEIR (starting on page 16-19) for a comprehensive mitigation measure that addresses the GHG emissions of the proposed project. Also see the Master Response regarding the GHG analysis.

I139-5

The project's potential to increase demand for fire protection and emergency medical services is addressed in Chapter 14, "Public Services and Utilities," of the DEIR (see Impact 14-7). Also, see the Master Response regarding traffic for a discussion of emergency vehicle access.

I139-6

The comment questions components of the proposed project and does not address the content, analysis, or conclusions in the DEIR. Note that no significant and unavoidable

impacts to water supply were identified in the DEIR analysis that use of gray water or collection of rain water would mitigate. See also response to comment I5-5 regarding the use of gray water.

I139-7 The comment asks why the proposed buildings are not designed using LEED criteria, which is one program that can be used to document and demonstrate that a project incorporates energy efficiency and other “green building” concepts. However, it is possible to attain energy efficiency without embarking on the LEED certification process. No specific issues related to the content, analysis, or conclusions in the DEIR are raised in this comment. No further response is provided here.

I139-8 The commenter submitted several other letters concerning site No. 724 Pioneer ski area. See responses to comment letters I137 and I138.

I139-9 The comment provides a summary of detailed comments provided above, stating that the project does not meet the criteria for environmentally sensitive design, air quality protection, traffic mitigation and energy conservation within CEQA. See responses to comments I139-2 through I139-8, above. Also, see the Master Response regarding significant and unavoidable impacts.

Mitigation measures are provided throughout the DEIR to reduce, where feasible, the project’s significant and potentially significant impacts. Regarding to suggestion to reduce the size and scope of the project, see the Master Response regarding the Reduced Density Alternative.

I140

Maywan Krach

From: Steve Hoch <shoch58@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 15, 2015 10:04 AM
To: Placer County Environmental Coordination Services
Subject: Feedback On Squaw DEIR

15 July 2015

Ms. Maywan Krach
Placer County Community Development Resource Agency
Environmental Coordination Services
3091 County Center Drive, Suite 190
Auburn, Ca 95603
cdraecs@placer.ca.gov

Re: Village at Squaw Valley Specific Plan – Draft Environmental Impact Report

Dear Ms. Krach

Thanks for the opportunity to respond to the dEIR that Placer County has submitted to the populace.

I have been a full time resident of Alpine Meadows since 2007 and skiing at Alpine and Squaw since 1972. My background is in business and I was the Executive Director of the Downtown Tahoe City Association.

I140-1

The draft Environmental Impact Report is materially deficient in analyzing the damage that may occur to Alpine Meadows and the N. Tahoe as a result of the KSL development plan.

Traffic - Specifically while the dEIR purports to analyze traffic at the intersection of Highway 89 and Alpine Meadows Road and places the traffic problems as SIGNIFICANT and UNAVOIDABLE and grades the LOS as a F the dEIR fails to analyze the traffic problems that KSL's plan will cause within Alpine Meadows. And, with the addition of a base to base gondola people going to ski at Squaw Valley coming from the Tahoe City area will now avoid the Squaw Valley Road gridlock and drive up Alpine Meadows Road to access Squaw Valley. Circulation of traffic within Alpine Meadows must also be analyzed.

I140-2

This impact must be addresses by in the EIR process.

Greenhouse Gases – The dEIR says that greenhouse gases will increase by over four (4) time their current level. How will greenhouse gases increase in Alpine Meadows and will the Squaw Valley greenhouse gases encroach into Alpine Meadows. What will be the impact of the increase in greenhouse gases in Alpine Meadows?

I140-3

Greenhouse gas increases in Alpine Meadows must be studied and addresses including hydrocarbons, NOx, and PM10.

Light Pollution – The dEIR says that light pollution within Squaw Valley will be SIGNIFICANT and UNAVOIDABLE. How will this light pollution impact the night sky for Alpine Meadows resident and visitors? The effect of light pollution on Alpine Meadows must be studied and addressed.

I140-4

Noise Pollution – The dEIR states that noise in Squaw Valley will be in excess of Placer County regulations. How will that noise effect Alpine Meadows? The effect of noise pollution in Squaw Valley must be studied and addressed as part of this process.

I
I140-5

Cumulative Effects – The cumulative effects of these SIGNIFICANT and UNAVOIDABLE impacts must be addressed within Alpine Meadows.

I
I140-6

Sincerely,



Electronically sent, no signature
Steven Hoch

I140Steven Hoch
July 15, 2015

I140-1

The comment is an introductory statement and does not address the content, analysis, or conclusions in the DEIR. Therefore, a response is not provided here. The comment also provides a summary of detailed comments provided below regarding impacts at Alpine Meadows and North Tahoe. See responses to the detailed comments below.

I140-2

The traffic analysis included the SR 89/Alpine Meadows Road intersection due to the expected use of SR 89 to travel to/from the project and Tahoe Basin. It was not necessary to analyze facilities along Alpine Meadows Road because the project would add few trips (two vehicles during each of the Winter Saturday AM and Winter Sunday PM peak hours) to this segment. Although the project would add 11 trips during the Summer Friday PM peak hour, overall levels of traffic are much lower during this period (i.e., 72 percent less than the Winter Sunday PM peak hour). Please also note that the traffic signal at SR 28/Alpine Meadows Road (Mitigation Measure 9-3) has been installed and is now operating. With the signal in place, this intersection would operate acceptably under both project and cumulative conditions.

Also, see the Master Response regarding the cumulative analysis.

I140-3

The comment states that the DEIR says that “greenhouse gases will increase by over four (4) time[s] their current level.” This is not explicitly stated in the DEIR. It is assumed that the commenter is referring to the following two statements:

- ▲ Page 16-3 of the DEIR states, “The Squaw Valley and Alpine Meadows ski resorts (both operated by Squaw Valley USA) generated between 9,722 and 13,765 metric tons of CO₂ (equivalent) annually in the years 2010-2013.” These values were provided in the Environmental & Community Report 2014 produced by the Squaw Valley Ski Resort in 2014.
- ▲ Table 16-3 on page 16-16 of the DEIR shows the estimate that operation of the proposed VSVSP at full buildout in 2037 would generate an estimated 45,403 metric tons of carbon dioxide-equivalent per year (MT CO_{2e}/year).

The level of GHG emissions presented in the report by the Squaw Valley Ski Resort (on page 16-3) was for ski operations in both Squaw Valley and at Alpine Meadows. According to the Environmental & Community Report 2014, the value accounts only for the GHG emissions associated with consumption of electricity, diesel, gasoline, and propane at the two resorts. It does not include GHGs associated with many of the operational sources listed in Table 16-3, including vehicle trips to and from the resorts, water consumption, wastewater treatment, solid waste generation, and any loss in carbon sequestration potential. Thus, the values from these two sources cannot be directly compared.

The comment asks how GHGs will increase at Alpine Meadows. The VSVSP would not result in any change to the level of GHGs emitted at Alpine Meadows.

The comment asks whether the GHGs generated in Squaw Valley will “encroach into Alpine Meadows.” As explained on page 16-1 of the DEIR, GHGs are inherently pollutants of global concern. The contribution GHGs have to global climate change is a function of the mass of GHGs in the entire Earth’s atmosphere.

The comment asks what the impact will be of the increase in greenhouse gases in Alpine Meadows. GHGs are a global phenomenon, to which the proposed project (and all development in the world) would incrementally contribute. The VSVSP would not result in an increase in GHG emissions in Alpine Meadows. The effects climate change would have on conditions in Alpine Meadows are also a global phenomenon, and are the same as effects on Squaw Valley and the Sierra Nevada. It is important to note that the project would not alter climate change at Squaw Valley or Alpine Meadows; rather, it would contribute GHGs that would ultimately mix with GHGs created throughout the world to result in global climate change. The project's contribution would not be of a magnitude that would alter climate change effects, but it would incrementally contribute GHGs to this cumulative effect. The contributions of the project, however, cannot be tracked to any localized effects.

The comment states that "Greenhouse gas increases in Alpine Meadows must be studied and address[ed] including hydrocarbons, NO_x, and PM₁₀." First, NO_x and PM₁₀ are not GHGs. Project-related emissions of NO_x, which is an ozone precursor, and PM₁₀ are discussed under Impacts 10-1 and 10-2. Emissions of these pollutants associated with construction and operation of the VSVSP would not have any direct effects on conditions in Alpine Meadows. See the discussion of NO_x, which is an ozone precursor, and PM₁₀ in Section 10, "Air Quality" of the DEIR.

- I140-4 See the Master Response regarding the visual impact analysis, which includes a discussion of light pollution.
- I140-5 See the Master Response regarding noise.
- I140-6 See responses to comments I140-2 through I140-5. As described above, the project would not result in significant impacts to the Alpine Meadows area. Therefore, these impacts would not combine to create cumulatively significant impacts in this area. Also, see the Master Response regarding the cumulative analysis.