

I141

Maywan Krach

From: Katie Hughes <katie@dfj.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 15, 2015 2:23 PM
To: Placer County Environmental Coordination Services
Subject: Keeping Squaw True

To whom it may concern,

Just another voice of opposition to the proposed Squaw Valley Village Specific Plan. Squaw is a place that we come to escape the mega hustle-and-bustle of the city and we usually spend two weekends a month in the winter there. I cannot imagine wanting to come there over Heavenly or other ski areas if the proposed amusement park is built. We're just a tiny piece of the overall economic pie, but I know many of the other working professionals I visit with there feel the same way.

I
1141-1

Thanks for your consideration,

Katie Hughes
Talent Partner @ DFJ
[Connect with DFJ Companies](#)
C: (919) 593-2815

I141 Katie Hughes
July 15, 2015

I141-1 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.

I142

Maywan Krach

From: Bruce & Libby Hutchinson <gybe@jps.net>
Sent: Tuesday, July 14, 2015 10:47 AM
To: Placer County Environmental Coordination Services
Cc: Maywan Krach
Subject: Village at Squaw Valley Specific Plan DEIR

PO Box 3707
Olympic Valley CA 96146
July 13 2015

As a property owner in Squaw Valley for more than 46 years, I and my family have enjoyed the unique natural setting of this valley, its recreational attractions, and its special community. As second-home owners at first and now, for decades, permanent residents, we have always been keenly interested in preserving as much as possible the fragile eco-system of this small valley while recognizing the ski area as a premier winter sports venue.

I142-1

In reading the DEIR I find a number of environmental impacts incompletely addressed or their "mitigations" insufficient. For example, in the topic of "Transportation & Circulation" the analysis of several impacts of increased traffic is either missing, faulty, or incomplete:

1) Missing from the DEIR is an analysis of the impact of substantial increased traffic throughout the year, not just during the winter months. This year-long increased traffic will be due to the proposed "Mountain Adventure Center" attraction. Spokespersons for the project have indicated in their presentations to the community that they anticipate a large increase in visitors to Squaw Valley in all seasons who will be coming to the "MAC". It is very likely that this additional traffic will occur not only during the day, but also at night. It will occur in all seasons. The DEIR should consider this impact and what possible mitigation there could be for this traffic and its accompanying increased noise and light levels.

I142-2

2) There is insufficient and faulty analysis of peak hour and day traffic conditions in the winter season. The 2011-12 season was not a typical winter with typical peak traffic days. It is not an appropriate model for peak traffic conditions. Therefore the traffic analysis should utilize instead an average winter season for its model & simulation.

I142-3

3) The proposed mitigation for the impact of increased traffic on S.V. Rd between SR 89 and the Village area is not sufficient. Specifically, the mitigation described in 9-2a/b is not a new program nor is it an effective mitigation; both visitors and residents have commented over the past number of years that the "extra 3rd lane" designated with cones and monitored with traffic personnel in heavy traffic times is both dangerous & ineffective much of the time. The "lanes" are too narrow for safety (especially during normal snow conditions) and even with traffic control personnel it is difficult to drive safely on the Main Road and enter and exit to & from the side neighborhood roads.

I142-4

4) One of the main significant impacts of increased winter traffic on S.V. Rd is the dangerous air pollution caused by silica dust coming from the sanded S.V. Rd. This is a major environmental public health hazard whose impact needs to be addressed by the DEIR.

I142-5

Because of the above mentioned issues it appears to me that the proposed project certainly does not fit into the County's policy 1.G.1; the Squaw Valley Specific Plan is not a proposed development "where circulation and transportation system can accommodate such expansion or new uses."

I142-6

I recommend that the Planning Commission & the Board of Supervisors reject this DEIR. The proposed project has too many significant and unavoidable impacts that cannot be mitigated and has many impacts that cannot yet be accurately analyzed. I request that the applicant be required to submit a revised project proposal with significantly reduced density, lower building heights and far fewer significant impacts that cannot be mitigated.

I
1142-7
I

Thank you for considering these concerns and recommendations. Please send me all notices related to this project and the EIR,

Elizabeth L Hutchinson
PO Box 3707
Olympic Valley CA 96146

email: gybe@jps.net

I142Elizabeth L Hutchinson
July 14, 2015

- I142-1 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 responses to comments I142-2 through I142-5 for responses to the detailed traffic comments.
- I142-2 See the portion of the traffic Master Response regarding use of the 2011-2012 ski season data to represent existing winter conditions. Also, see the Master Response regarding the MAC. It is acknowledged that the project would cause traffic levels to increase on many days throughout the year. This is true of nearly all land uses that have recurring activities. The DEIR correctly analyzes the effects of the project under peak season traffic and activity levels. The selection of these analysis periods is appropriate because they are most likely to show the project causing operations to worsen from acceptable to unacceptable levels, or further degrading of already unacceptable operations. The use of the other (non-peak) study periods would not be as likely to reach such conclusions. Also please refer to comment O8d-8 for a detailed evaluation of the MAC trip generation.
- Noise and light impacts resulting from operation of the MAC are addressed in Chapters 11, "Noise," and 8, "Visual Resources," respectively.
- I142-3 See the portion of the traffic Master Response regarding use of the 2011-2012 ski season data to represent existing winter conditions.
- I142-4 The comment suggests that Mitigation Measures 9-2a and 9-2b are already occurring and not effective. The proposed mitigation will significantly improve upon and enhance the three-lane coning program that occasionally occurs on Squaw Valley Road. Unlike the current program, this program will include a predictive model to provide advance notice of when staff resources will be needed to operate the program during both the morning and afternoon peak periods. In contrast, the current program was not operated during a single morning during the 2013-2014 ski season (for a variety of reasons) and operated only twice during the afternoon. The infrequent operation of the existing program made it infeasible to observe its effectiveness and areas of potential improvement. The project's Traffic Management Plan is to be prepared to the satisfaction of the Placer County Department of Public Works and the Engineering and Surveying Division.
- I142-5 The comment expresses concern about fugitive dust emissions generated by vehicles passing along Squaw Valley Road. See response to comment PH-73.
- The commenter specifically expresses concern that the dust generated by vehicles passing along Squaw Valley Road contains crystalline silica and the commenter states, "This is a major environmental public health hazard whose impact needs to be addressed in the DEIR." See response to comment I282-4.
- I142-6 See the Master Response regarding significant and unavoidable impacts, which includes a discussion of the Placer County General Plan Policy 1.G.1.
- I142-7 The comment is directed towards the project approval process and does not address the content, analysis, or conclusions in the DEIR. Therefore, no further response is provided here. All comment letters submitted during the DEIR public review period will be reviewed and considered by the Placer County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors before a decision on the project is rendered.

See the Master Response regarding significant and unavoidable impacts. Also, see response to comment I67-6 regarding a new alternative that would combine elements of the Reduced Density Alternative with elements of the Reduced Building Heights Alternative.

I143

Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Report for the proposed Village at Squaw Valley Specific Plan

Sent by email to: cdraecs@placer.ca.gov

Attention: Maywan Krach

July 17, 2015

My review of the Draft EIR for the VSVSP has led me to unapologetically oppose the project in its current form for a variety of reasons. Without going into extensive detail, I feel each of the following chapters point out flaws in the project that, even if substantially mitigated, would produce drastic negative and long-term effects on Olympic Valley and the surrounding natural areas and developed corridors for miles in all directions.

I143-1

Hydrology & Water Quality

This section contends that there is an ample supply of water in the valley’s groundwater basin and recharge capabilities to handle the increased population and infrastructure demands of the proposed project, yet the last year to be included in the study was 2012. In the middle of 2015, we are three years into one of the most severe droughts in recorded history in this state. **A new hydrology study should be completed** to reflect the new “normal” conditions as we experience multiple years of drought. Without it, planners and developers are making decisions based on outdated information. Even the report itself states that “It is possible that during periods of extreme drought in the future (e.g., future single and multiple dry years) there might not be available runoff to fill up the Basin.”

I143-2

Transportation & Circulation

This chapter points out multiple instances of “significant and unavoidable” impacts relating to traffic flow and congestion. It doesn’t take a transportation genius to realize that we are already in crisis mode when it comes to overcrowded arterials not only during peak times but increasingly, in general. The Draft EIR simply confirms the obvious without offering any real solutions or alternatives to the most glaring problem with any new development: how do we get people out of their cars in the first place? These transportation concerns go far beyond our region and charges of inadequacy shouldn’t just be leveled at the project in question but at society in general. Still, until we address the larger issues, I am appalled that any developer can justify even a small new development while knowing full well that we can’t handle the congestion we already have. The Draft EIR seems to fall back primarily on “traffic management” (aka people in vests halting and waving cars along) as a band-aid to deal with congestion. Here are just a few excerpts highlighting some of the significant impacts:

I143-3

“The proposed project would exacerbate already unacceptable operations on the segments of SR 89 between **Deerfield Drive and West River Street, and SR 28 east of SR 89** in Tahoe City during the summer Friday p.m. peak hour. This would be a **significant impact.**”

“The proposed project would cause an adverse vehicular queuing condition at the **SR 89/Squaw Valley Road** intersection during the winter Saturday a.m. peak hour that would not meet applicable design standards. This would be a **significant impact.**”

“No capacity-increasing improvements are proposed for the segment of SR 28 east of SR 89 according to the State Route 28 Transportation Corridor Concept Report (Caltrans 2012c). Significance after Mitigation Because there are no available

mechanisms to provide an acceptable LOS on the SR 28 and SR 89 segments in question, this impact would be significant and unavoidable.”

I143-3
cont.

Population, Employment & Housing

While the Draft EIR frequently lists the job creation numbers that would come along with the development, it doesn't indicate whether these jobs will pay a living wage. It also incorrectly assumes that many of the jobs will be full time, when in fact we all know that with the exception of construction (which is an almost entirely male-dominated industry), resort employers rarely offer full-time or year-round employment. Seasonal, minimum wage, part-time jobs are the norm. This way, employers maximize profit and shun the responsibility of offering any benefits to their workforce. Through this tactic, they also deftly avoid factoring in employee housing regulations and payment of in-lieu fees. The majority of the jobs this project will generate in both the short and long term will be minimum wage, part-time jobs. These jobs will not generate enough income for an individual to pay rent and eat, let alone afford basic technology, car insurance and fuel, winter clothing or health care expenses for themselves. While these considerations are not legally required to be addressed in a document such as this, I wish these concepts could become part of the discussion. The health of our region will never be fully optimized until we begin to address living wages and the moral responsibility of employers to adequately sustain their workers.

I143-4

In addition to this, the employee housing plan is also glaringly inadequate. While young, single, J1 workers might be happy to live in a dormitory-style building, this type of housing would not suit the majority of resort employees the plan should include. The J1 workers represent a fraction of overall employees. This development would significantly add to the dearth of affordable housing in our region and the mitigations in the plan fall far short of what's needed to address the problem. What we will be left with are high-end, cookie cutter timeshares and condos that sit empty most of the time while our full time working residents cram into overpriced, ramshackle cabins with inadequate insulation and uncaring landlords.

I143-5

Cultural Resources

I am strongly opposed to the demolition of the Nevada Spectators' Center (Far East Center) and the Athletes' Center (now the Olympic Valley Lodge). The report states: "the loss of these two buildings would result in a significant and unavoidable impact because the historic resources would no longer exist." Both of these structures were specifically constructed for the 1960 Olympics and are eligible for the National Register of Historic Places and California Register of Historic Resources designation.

The EIR states in reference to Far East: "Despite retaining a lower degree of integrity in terms of design and setting the building maintains enough integrity to be clearly connected to the 1960 Olympic Games. The building is recommended eligible for listing in the NRHP and CRHR under Criterion 1/A for its association with the 1960 Olympic Games and Criterion 3/C as an example of Mid-Century Modern architecture."

I143-6

For those reasons alone it should remain. But also on a sentimental note, most of us who have worked and skied at Squaw have fond memories of heading to the Cantina after work or a day on the mountain. Sitting on the sun-drenched deck bantering with friends while gazing at KT is one of the great, simple remaining pleasures that makes Squaw special to us. Taking this away might make sense economically to a developer, but it makes no sense to the community. In fact, it's one tangible thing that seems senseless and cruel...like adding salt to a wound.

There is talk throughout the EIR about how what has now become the accepted mountain architectural style throughout the region will be adhered to for this development. This "style" with its exposed rock facades and protruding beams has become overused to the point of being bland. There is no character or creativity in this architecture as evidenced by the

I143-7

photo simulation below of the proposed "community market." We need to preserve every architecturally unique and heterogeneous element we can before we begin to look like an upscale office park!



I143-7
cont.

Speaking of architecturally unique, I also found no discussion at all in the Draft EIR about the proposed project's impact on another valuable resource...the hamlet of Tahoe City, whose economic heart and soul have already been gutted by the development of the Village at Squaw Valley.

I143-8

Greenhouse Gases & Climate Change

The Draft EIR discusses greenhouse gases and climate change in a roundabout way due to inexact information about the timeline of the development plan, nebulous emissions data and fluid statewide regulations. Still, the EIR determines that "the project has the potential to result in a substantial contribution to GHG emissions. Mitigation has been recommended to reduce this impact; however,

I143-9

because of several unknowns (e.g., the GHG emissions target in effect after 2020, the effectiveness of adopted regulatory actions, and the potential for new regulations) this impact would remain potentially significant and unavoidable."

I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the Draft EIR and thank the staff for their hard work and continued diligence on this important project.

Beth Ingalls

Truckee resident since 1995
Former Squaw & Alpine Meadows employee
Former Truckee Town Councilmember & Mayor

I143Beth Ingalls
July 17, 2015

- I143-1 The comment provides a summary of detailed comments provided below. See responses to the detailed comments below.
- I143-2 See the Master Response regarding water supply. As described therein, the updated 2015 WSA incorporated data from 2012 through 2014, which includes several of the recent drought years (2015 data are not yet available because the 2015 water year did not end until September 30, 2015, after the July 2015 WSA Update was prepared).
- I143-3 The comment expresses concerns related to the project's significant and unavoidable traffic impacts. These impacts are identified in the DEIR as well why these impacts would be considered significant and unavoidable. Also, see the portion of the traffic Master Response regarding effectiveness of Mitigation Measure 9-1a (Traffic Management on Squaw Valley Road).
- I143-4 Concerns related to jobs that provide a living wage are noted. The wage structure for potential future employees is not known and is not an environmental issue. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 5-3 would make the project consistent with Policy C-2 in the County's General Plan that requires employee housing to be provided for 50 percent of the full-time equivalent employees in one of the following ways: construction of on-site employee housing; construction of off-site employee housing; dedication of land for needed units; and/or payment of an in-lieu fee.
- The comment correctly states that socioeconomic issues are not subject to CEQA; however, all comments on the project are considered during the decision-making process.
- I143-5 Concerns related to the types of housing for resort employees is noted. See response to comment I143-4 for a discussion related to employee housing requirements under the Placer County General Plan. Cumulative impacts associated with employment, population, and housing are discussed in Chapter 18 of the DEIR. As stated, "The VSVSP would provide housing for up to an additional 201 project employees on the East Parcel, and would meet County requirements that the project provide for housing to accommodate 50 percent of the annual full-time equivalent project employees. For these reasons, therefore, any contribution to a cumulative impact would be less than significant." This comment relates to socioeconomic issues, which are not subject to CEQA; however, all comments on the project are considered during the decision-making process.
- I143-6 See response to comment I52-13 regarding the two 1960s Olympic-related buildings (the Olympic Valley Lodge and the Far East Center).
- I143-7 The comment provides an opinion regarding the merits or qualities of the proposed project and does not address the content, analysis, or conclusions in the DEIR. The Placer County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors will take the commenter's opinions into consideration when making decisions regarding the project.
- I143-8 The comment states that the DEIR does not discuss the project's impacts to Tahoe City. The comment, however, does not specify what impacts the project could have related to Tahoe City. Therefore, a response cannot be provided. Also, see the Master Response regarding TRPA thresholds.
- I143-9 The comment summarizes the conclusion of the DEIR regarding greenhouse gas impacts, including the unknown future regulatory structure past 2020. The comment is a summary of the DEIR and does not address any issues associated with the adequacy of the DEIR.

I144

Maywan Krach

From: Jamie Iredell <jamieiredell@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 15, 2015 1:21 PM
To: Placer County Environmental Coordination Services
Subject: Proposed Squaw Valley Village Specific Plan

Attention: Maywan Krach,

I'm writing to contribute a comment from the public about the proposed Squaw Valley Village Specific Plan.

I grew up in Squaw Valley, and continue to visit home as much as possible. My grandfather began building his home on Winding Creek Road in 1962, just after the Winter Olympics.

I was there in 1983, that year of big snows. We lost power during Christmas that year, and sat bundled up under blankets around the fire to stay warm. We were able to take our turkey to River Ranch at Alpine Meadows (which had generators) in order to cook our Christmas dinner.

My grandfather taught me how to shoot in the hills above Winding Creek, back when those hills were still far from any home. Those hills are now, of course, developed.

I learned to ski (both downhill and cross country) at Squaw Valley. I fished and rafted in the Truckee River, and I played on the banks of Squaw Creek. All in all, I had an idyllic childhood.

But there times when that idyl was broken by the boom of dynamite concomitant with construction. It's difficult for me to even explain how disappointed I was when the Resort at Squaw Creek was being built. The valley's meadow was once unspoiled alpine terrain. It was not uncommon to see deer walking through the grass or the snowdrifts. Now, of course, you'll never see a deer in the "meadow," as that's been transformed into a golf course.

While I found the development of the Squaw Valley Village to be inevitable, it came with no less disappointment.

I can lament the Squaw of my childhood and live in my nostalgia, but what I cannot heed is the lack of foresight for a balance of human development with the natural environment that has always made Squaw Valley a special place. The proposed additions to the Squaw Valley Village will upset that balance. Not only will the additional buildings and parking lots make for sore sights when looking west into the valley, they will continue to infringe upon potential habitats for numerous Sierra Nevada flora and fauna. True, the proposal speaks of building on land that's already been paved over (and why that land has not been allowed to

I144-1

I144-2

revert to its natural state I don't know), but continuing to develop it will further distance biota from taking hold. The scope of the construction will dramatically effect the valley's ecology, from the pollution produced by the digging of foundations (thus uprooting ground cover that keeps silt from running off with snowmelt into Squaw Creek, which could have disastrous effects on the creek's health), to the air pollution produced by the machinery required for such an endeavor, to the huge amount of noise that will upset both human and nonhuman inhabitants of the valley. Furthermore, the spike of human visitors this proposal will inevitably engender will bring more traffic and air pollution to the valley.

1144-2
cont.

I don't want Squaw Valley to become Vail. Squaw Valley and Lake Tahoe are unique destinations in North America because they're *not* like Vail. Because of organizations like Keep Tahoe Blue, the region has done far better than competing outdoor regions (such as Vail) at maintaining a balance between the natural environment and human development.

1144-3

I wish that, when I was a child, adults could have foreseen how the resort at Squaw Creek and the development of Squaw Valley Village would have changed the nature of this special place, and not in a good way. I hope, for our children, that we will be the adults to harbor such foresight today.

Thank you,

Jamie Iredell

I144 Jamie Iredell
July 15, 2015

I144-1 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.

I144-2 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.

The comment expresses concern regarding the project's potential to upset the balance of human development with the natural environment, specifically in terms of its impacts related to views, habitats, Squaw Creek, air pollution, noise, and traffic. 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.

I144-3 The comment provides an opinion regarding the merits or qualities of the proposed project and does not address the content, analysis, or conclusions in the DEIR. The Placer County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors will take the commenter's opinions into consideration when making decisions regarding the project.

I145

Maywan Krach

From: Birney Jensen <bajensendds@earthlink.net>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2015 8:55 AM
To: Placer County Environmental Coordination Services
Subject: Environmental Impact Report for the Village at Squaw Valley project

Dear Placer County Planning Commission,

I am opposed to the current development plans for Squaw Valley.

Regarding the draft Environmental Impact Report for the Village at Squaw Valley project, I would like to echo the following commentary:

UnofficialAlpine.com/Mark Fisher

Although we fully agree that some redevelopment at Squaw is necessary, we also believe that the current plan is not the one that is right for Squaw Valley or the many other communities around North Lake Tahoe. The EIR identified more than 20 "significant and unavoidable" impacts just considering environmental issues within the project area. It does not even address the many other impacts it will have on the traffic flow and economy around the area.

Tom Mooers, Executive Director of Sierra Watch.

Because, in the end, that's what really matters — to Squaw, to Tahoe, and beyond.

Ten, 20, 120 years from now, no one's going to care what he said or she said or I said. But they will care about the land-use decisions we make and the legacy we leave behind.

Sincerely,
Birney A. Jensen
Placer County Property Owner/Tahoe City
North Shore Skier - 50 years

I1451

I145

Birney A. Jensen
July 17, 2015

I145-1

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. Also, see the Master Response regarding significant and unavoidable impacts.

The comment also states that the DEIR does not address the many other impacts the project will have on the traffic flow and economy around the area. The project's traffic-related impacts are addressed in Chapter 9, "Transportation and Circulation," of the DEIR. With respect to the economy, see Impact 4-5 (economic or social changes resulting in physical environmental changes).

I146

Placer County Planning Commission

I Name is Charles Jones. My wife, Mary, and I have been property owners in Olympic Valley since 1958. We were second home owners for years but now live in Olympic Valley. We are located at 1733 Christy Lane directly across from the project. We have been reviewing the Draft EIR. We want you to consider the following:

I146-1

We are aware of Placer County Policy 1.G.1. "The county will support the expansion of existing winter ski and snow play areas and development of new areas where circulation and transportation system capacity can accommodate such expansions or new uses and where environmental impacts can be adequately mitigated."

I146-2

As we are reviewing the dEIR and keep seeing UNAVOIDABLE IMPACTS we think about this policy. These impacts cannot be adequately mitigated.

Please consider Traffic: Analysis year was 2011-12. That winter there was no snow from Nov. 8 thru Jan 16. Meaning Christmas-New Year, Thanksgiving, and MLK were lacking in sufficient snow and should not count. The traffic analysis should be totally redone, requiring a traffic simulation for an average winter ski season. The analysis is faulty and the impacts are significantly understated and are much worse than reported. Charging for parking day skiers to encourage carpooling and reducing the cost of season passes would only add to the number of day skiers needing to park.

I146-3

mlzjones@comcast.net

I146 Charles Jones
no date

I146-1 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.

I146-2 See the Master Response regarding significant and unavoidable impacts, which includes a discussion of the Placer County General Plan Policy 1.G.1.

I146-3 See the portion of the traffic Master Response regarding use of the 2011-2012 ski season data and adequacy of the parking supply.

1147

Maywan Krach

From: Elizabeth Wood <colfaxliz20@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2015 1:36 PM
To: Placer County Environmental Coordination Services
Subject: Squaw Valley EIR

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to express my concerns regarding the proposed development in Squaw Valley. I have followed the proposal for months now and have grown increasingly appalled that it is even being considered.

| 1147-1

Although I do agree that the village in Squaw could use some updating and expansion, I feel very strongly that this proposal is not the right fit. Not only does it include a lot of unnecessary additions, but the environmental and economical impacts during construction would be damaging to the valley and surrounding areas including Truckee and North Lake Tahoe. The traffic flow alone would be enough to keep locals and tourists alike from traveling between Truckee and Tahoe City via Hwy 89.

| 1147-2

I have spent the better part of 20 years enjoying the beauty of Squaw Valley and would very much hate to watch it be destroyed before my eyes. Please consider these concerns and I suspect the concerns you've received from many others and DO NOT approve this proposal.

| 1147-3

Thank you,
Elizabeth Jones

Tahoe resident, Squaw Valley employee, concerned Placer County citizen.

I147 Elizabeth Jones
July 17, 2015

I147-1 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.

I147-2 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.

With respect to the project's environmental and economic impacts during construction, see the Master Response regarding the 25-year construction period. With respect to construction effects in Truckee and North Lake Tahoe, see the Master Response regarding TRPA thresholds. Also, see the portion of the traffic Master Response regarding SR 89 traffic between Truckee and Tahoe City.

I147-3 The comment is directed towards the project approval process and does not address the content, analysis, or conclusions in the DEIR. Therefore, no further response is provided here. All comment letters submitted during the DEIR public review period will be reviewed and considered by the Placer County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors before a decision on the project is rendered.

1148

Louis B. Jones
P.O. Box 2101
Olympic Valley, Calif. 96146

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

RE: THE SQUAW DEVELOPMENT DRAFT EIR

Dear Officers of the Planning Board:

The purpose of this letter is to address an issue that was not covered fully in the King's Beach meeting or in the DEIR.

I think I represent a category of visitors and businesspersons in the valley that will be naturally underrepresented in the Board's deliberations, but who are extremely important to the valley's economic health. So I hope my lone voice, in one letter, will count for more of a multitude. My wife and I run a program in Squaw Valley every summer, which has been in operation for 45 years, and which brings about \$400,000 to \$600,000 annually to the valley, in the form of two or three hundred visitors, who stay entirely within the valley for a two- or three-week period. (It's a small non-profit that operates on an educational model. These are preponderantly affluent out-of-towners who visit, from all around the country.) So therefore, in this way, I think we're a typical small, useful part of the economy. Any local economy is made of a whole crazy-quilt of folks like us.

1148-1

The cultural resource "beauty" is an intangible asset I want to talk about. Squaw Valley's kind of beauty – which belongs to all of us as Americans and as Californians, as a kind of birthright – is a capital resource. It's an economic good, with incalculable multiplier effects in the economy. The fact is, maybe an econometrician *could* assign a number (i.e., a fixed dollar-value, realizable over decades or centuries) to the wealth derivable from well-stewarded scenic beauty. To do so – to reduce this place to dollars – wouldn't be to

1148-2

“trivialize” it. There are sound fundamental *aesthetic* reasons why Squaw Valley is what it is. And why people have been coming to Squaw for a thousand years. Stockton and Bakersfield and San Pedro, say, by comparison, are places that have wholly different sets of natural resources, which incline those places to an agricultural economy or a resource-extraction economy, or shipping, etc. Here, the configuration of the land is – like water or petroleum or copper deposits – a kind of capital “commodity,” one that is potentially inexhaustible, but also can be permanently, irrecoverably despoiled.

1148-2
cont.

Now, personally, my organization is not “anti-development,” and we have laissez-faire hopes for the growth and development of the valley over the many years to come. We view the entry of a KSL (and before them, an Intrawest) with optimism, as we see ourselves acquiring a kind of new partner. But I worry that KSL’s business plan doesn’t get the point of this place. The fragile bowl-shaped ecosystem’s peace and quiet – and its invitation to real adventure, not simulated, indoor adventure – are what make this place what it is. From what I see of their prospectus, KSL employs a model of resort development that will overload this place for the wrong markets. Plenty of families with children can have simulated adventures at Wild Island in Sparks, or at Sunsplash in Roseville. The DEIR’s photoshopped representations of the new Squaw look urban, with the addition of hundreds of new condominiums of an inexpensive design. Presently, KSL’s challenge is to attract visitors – to a resort already under-booked. Therefore, presumably the construction of recreational facilities is to help make a year-round family destination of the valley. Situating a muggy, walled-in “adventure experience” in one of the world’s very best *outdoor* adventure areas is an example of the irony in this miscalculation.

1148-3

KSL must be aware that they are already having trouble keeping occupancy rates up in the condominiums they do have; but a spectacular lure could well be a game-changer here. KSL has a long-term plan, and they seem to be able to predict with certainty that California’s demographic, over the next century, will have the capacity to support such attractions as they envision. But it seems a tawdry use of a valley that is, already, an unearthly beauty.

So I want to urge this odd consideration on the Board: if the revenue over decades from an asset like Squaw’s natural beauty were reckoned, it would surely run into the trillions of dollars. The corporate strategy of KSL is to “internalize assets” (the opposite of “externalizing costs”). That is, KSL is reaping, very quickly, the economic value that has been accumulating here for a few billion years, which rightly belongs not just to the residents and stewards here, who for generations have been taking care of the valley, and who have rights as property owners, but also to every American and Californian who ever comes visiting.

1148-4

What seems called for: not total rejection of KSL’s plan – not at all! -- but further very serious reductions in its scale. And if possible, further design review, so they’re disallowed from cheaping out on the construction standards. So we won’t end up with a lot of windowless stucco boxes, say, and a lot of aluminum-sliding fenestration.

1148-5

I know you've got many sides to consider in this complicated issue. I wish the Board all possible alacrity and – (why not?) even a little divine guidance – in such a hard decision. This decision is hard because of its salience in the Sierra neighborhood, and because of its tremendous long-term historical consequentiality. Your signal will go on echoing for a long time, far and wide in the Sierra Nevada. And it bears on the kind of values we'll all have as Northern Californians, from here on out.

1148-6

Best regards,



Louis B. Jones

I148 Louis B. Jones
no date

- I148-1 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.
- I148-2 No specific issues related to the content, analysis, or conclusions in the DEIR are raised in this comment. No further response is provided here.
- I148-3 The comment provides an opinion regarding the merits or qualities of the proposed project and does not address the content, analysis, or conclusions in the DEIR. The Placer County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors will take the commenter's opinions into consideration when making decisions regarding the project. Also, see the Master Response regarding the MAC.
- I148-4 See the Master Response regarding occupancy assumptions.
- No specific issues related to the content, analysis, or conclusions in the DEIR are raised in this comment. No further response is provided here.
- I148-5 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.
- I148-6 No specific issues related to the content, analysis, or conclusions in the DEIR are raised in this comment. No further response is provided here.

I149

Maywan Krach

From: robert joseph <rjoseph@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 15, 2015 5:40 PM
To: Placer County Environmental Coordination Services
Subject: Comments on the Village at Squaw Valley Specific Plan Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR)

Hello Placer County Community Development Resource Agency,

My name is Robert Joseph. I am a homeowner at 1560 Squaw valley road #10. I have spent a great deal of the past 16 years in the Lake Tahoe area, and the past 8 in Squaw Valley itself. I have a degree in Chemical Engineering from Cornell University, and have been a practicing engineer since 2002.

I149-1

Additionally, I have been a skier for 38 years and have seen many ski area development projects, and i have some concerns about the VSVSP and the related dEIR.

With regard to the VSVSP itself, i believe that the proposal fails to satisfy its stated goals #1, 11, and 12.

- Goal #1 proposes development "without adversely impacting the unique aesthetic and environmental assets of Squaw Valley" in accordance with the SVGPLUO. The overall scale of the project is, in my opinion, not in keeping with this goal. The proposed building heights and the nighttime light pollution are in direct conflict with the characteristics we would wish to preserve. Clear skies and clear views are integral to Squaw's identity as a mountain community that celebrates the outdoors and the natural setting. Bright lights and large hotels are not.

I149-2

- Goal #11 proposes to provide a realistic plan for handling transit under load from increased population and visitors. No such plan has been offered. There is only one road in and out, and no realistic proposal for effective public transportation.

I149-3

- Goal #12 proposes to ensure that the plan is responsive to future market conditions. The VSVSP is very ambitious in its proposal to add nearly 1500 bedrooms. Squaw already struggles to fill the rooms available in the current village. If the developers' projections for a flood of new visitors fall short, our community will be left with an excess of infrastructure and facilities, whose legacy will be storefronts that local merchants struggle to pay rent on or abandon, depressed real estate values across the valley, and a large permanent maintenance burden that will not magically fund itself in perpetuity. The developers have little incentive to be realistic in their projections for future tourism levels - they need only sell these new units at above construction cost, and they have made their profits. They need not care what comes after. This has proven to be the most common outcome in ski area development schemes across the country.

I149-4

With regard to the dEIR, i believe the analysis is flawed in two ways:

- The contention that "The natural terrain dominates the view, and as a consequence, the structures in the near foreground are not visually prominent" is simply false. The existence of numerous structures as large as those proposed by VSVSP, while perhaps not "blocking" views, certainly impacts the character of the valley. Such structures defeat the goal of not "adversely impacting the unique aesthetic and environmental assets of Squaw Valley". I believe most people would accept as common sense that a valley filled with tall hotels and condominiums is not in keeping with an outdoors-loving mountain community.
- The traffic study was conducted on a day that was far below the peak utilization of past years. More cars in the valley equals more congestion, more soot on the roadside, more noise in the valley, and further degrades the quality of the mountain setting that draws people to Squaw Valley.

I149-5

I149-6

I am supportive of reasonable development in the valley. I very much approve of attempts to rehabilitate Squaw Creek, and am in favor of reducing the visible acreage of the parking lots. I believe there are some simple mechanisms to address concerns around parking access for day visitors from the larger Tahoe community, such as resident parking passes or lift ticket price offsets.

I149-7

As I am only one individual, i'll refrain from making many specific proposals of my own. Rather, i will support the alternatives proposed by Friends of Squaw Valley, subject to the requirement that such alternatives include rehabilitation of Squaw Creek and surrounding green space

I applaud the dEIR's findings of significant and unavoidable impacts from the proposed VSVSP. I agree with the bulk of the findings - many of which support the points i've made above. I hope that the county will regard these impacts as outweighing the benefits of the VSVSP in it's current form.

I149-8

Thank you for considering my comments,
 robert joseph
 1560 Squaw Valley Rd #10
 PO Box 2957, Olympic Valley CA 96146-2957
 415.516.0548

I149Robert Joseph
July 15, 2015

- I149-1 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.
- I149-2 See the Master Response regarding the visual impact analysis for a discussion of building heights and nighttime light pollution. Also, see Section 2.1, "Project Modifications," of this FEIR for a discussion of the applicant's proposed changes to the proposed building heights in response to concerns expressed by the Squaw Valley Design Review Committee and members of the public.
- I149-3 See the portion of the traffic Master Response regarding transit service expansion.
- I149-4 See the Master Response regarding occupancy assumptions.
- I149-5 See the Master Response regarding the visual impact analysis.
- I149-6 See the portion of the traffic Master Response regarding use of the 2011-2012 ski season data.
- I149-7 No specific issues related to the content, analysis, or conclusions in the DEIR are raised in this comment. No further response is provided here.
- I149-8 See the Master Response regarding significant and unavoidable impacts.

I150

Maywan Krach

From: David Kahn <dkahn@lto.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 14, 2015 4:51 PM
To: Placer County Environmental Coordination Services
Subject: Squaw Valley Project Comment

Placer County Community Development Resource Agency, Environmental Coordination Services

Attn.: Maywan Krach

July 14, 2015

I am writing to express my concerns with KSL’s proposed expansion of Squaw Valley Ski Resort. Several aspects of the proposal need further attention:

- The project’s huge environmental impact extends well beyond its footprint. Full-time residents will feel adverse effects that outweigh the benefits. The project sacrifices generations of scenic beauty for short-term profit.
- Proposed density will produce an eyesore in a picturesque setting. Where in the proposal is the sense of preserving this wild setting and experience?
- Our local resorts should exist in harmony with the communities around them. The proposed scale of commercial expansion will instead take business from locally-owned operations and promote the decline of our community – based retail primarily for the benefit of one corporation.
- The water park feature is absolutely inappropriate for our area; akin to building a ski hill at Sea World in San Diego. It is glaringly out of step with local character and furthers the image of a self-enclosed resort that takes much and gives little to the local community.
- Likewise, the proposed Squaw – Alpine gondola connector exploits / destroys pristine wilderness for the benefit of one corporation.
- Our area’s traffic is bad and getting worse. The proposed development is incapable of properly mitigating its traffic impacts.

I150-1

I150-2

I150-3

I150-4

I150-5

KSL’s expansion focuses almost exclusively on non-skiing aspects of the resort. This shows the disconnect between the company and the users of its product. Most of us simply want the ski experience to improve. As a 56-year resident and a former sport shop owner in the area, I can attest that we need a resort that is an integral part of our communities, not a corporate pipe dream that does not fit in. Please consider these concerns when evaluating the project. Thank you.

I150-6

David Kahn

I150David Kahn
July 14, 2015

- I150-1 The project's visual impacts are addressed in Chapter 8, "Visual Resources," of the DEIR. Also, see the Master Response regarding the visual impact analysis.
- I150-2 The project's socioeconomic impacts, though not inherently a CEQA issue, are addressed in the DEIR under Impact 4-5 (economic or social changes resulting in physical environmental changes).
- I150-3 See the Master Response regarding the MAC, which addresses the MAC's compatibility with surrounding uses and the Olympic Valley.
- I150-4 See the Master Response regarding the cumulative analysis.
- I150-5 The comment states that the proposed development is incapable of properly mitigating its traffic impacts. The comment does not provide specific reasons specifying why the DEIR's traffic mitigation is perceived to be inadequate. Therefore, a response cannot be provided. However, see the Master Response regarding traffic for additional discussion of the project's traffic impacts and mitigation measures.
- I150-6 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.

1151

**ROGER KAHN
POST OFFICE BOX 1305
TAHOE CITY, CA 96145**

July 17, 2015

Ms. Maywan Krach
Placer County Planning Services Technician
3091 County Center Drive
Auburn, CA 95603

RE: Draft Environmental Impact Report: Village at Squaw Valley Specific Plan

Dear Ms. Krach;

I am a 55 year resident of Tahoe City, owned and operated retail ski and sport shops in North Lake Tahoe and Truckee for 30 years, and currently own 5 commercial buildings in the area. I have been integrally involved in the North Lake Tahoe community in leadership capacities for much of that time. I am also a long time Squaw Valley skier having skied there for 60 years.

1151-1

The Draft Environmental Impact Report for the Village at Squaw Valley Specific Plan (DEIR) points out a number of issues in the proposed development that are significant and unavoidable (I assume that to mean there is no amount of mitigation that can be done to have these issues not have a negative impact on the environment) particularly with respect to cultural and historical values, scenic degradation, height issues and transportation impacts. That being said, it would appear, on its face, that there is no justification for allowing the project to move forward in its current form unless we are willing to accept huge environmental degradation.

1151-2

At the same time, like a huge majority of residents and visitors to Squaw Valley, I understand the need to increase the lodging options, improve the services and develop the community of Squaw Valley so I am willing to accept some development. In reading the DEIR, I believe it is in the community's best interest that the build out of Squaw Valley be done as a planned development with a vision for a satisfactory end result that makes compromises both the developer(s) and the existing community can accept.

1151-3

I am concerned about the size of the commercial development at the ski area. Having lived here for all these years, owning a tourist related business, currently owning commercial real estate and having numerous discussions with tenants who lease in Northstar and Squaw, they often share with me that their business is extremely cyclical. They cannot ring their cash registers fast enough during busy winter periods but often see few customers for much of the rest of the year. While the project proponents make their case for a busy counter season, the attraction of Lake Tahoe in the summertime makes it difficult to fill the rooms and provide these businesses enough customers to survive. The

1151-4