I161

Maywan Krach

From: Barbara Krebs <ballardkrebs@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 08, 2015 12:01 PM
To: Placer County Environmental Coordination Services
Cc: evanb@gpeak.com; Robert E. Krebs
Subject: Plumpjack Development-Village at Squaw Valley Specific plan

Project Manager Alex Fisch and Placer County Planning Department,

Please accept this comment on the Draft EIR for the above referenced project. (State Clearinghouse # 2012102023).

As a homeowner at the Squaw Valley Lodge I have rounded the corner of Squaw Valley Road South onto Squaw Peak Road scores of times and all-too-often encountered foot-traffic from skiers walking in the middle of the road to the Tram from their cars, delivery trucks maneuvering into the Tram loading dock and day skiers stopping at the Tram curb to load and unload. These are safety and traffic congestion issues that will only get worse with the new development and the addition of hundreds of new homeowners and skiers. But there is no mention of this impact in the dEIR. Please ensure that it is addressed at this time. I161-1

Also, with construction comes the inevitable noise and traffic necessary to create a future Village. Yet there is the expectation that, Placer County regulations not-withstanding, there will be unavoidable and excessive noise and traffic. I ask that Placer County review their regulations specific to this project and recognize that we are a vacation and resort community and not a strip mall in Roseville and thereby warrant special consideration to limit the construction noise and traffic. I161-2
Thank you.

Robert and Barbara Krebs
201 Squaw Peak Road Unit 804
Olympic Valley, CA. 96146

--
Robert and Barbara Ballard Krebs
Tel: 650 343 8354
Cell: 650 766 0925

1

I161 Robert & Barbara Ballard Krebs
July 8, 2015

I161-1 See the Master Response regarding traffic issues at Squaw Valley Road and Squaw Peak Road.

I161-2 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.

I162

111 Hazel Lane
Piedmont, CA 94611

BY EMAIL

June 22, 2015

PLACER COUNTY COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT RESOURCE AGENCY
ATTN: Maywan Krach
3091 County Center Drive
Suite 190
Auburn, CA 95603

RE: KSL Capital Partners/Squaw Valley Proposed Development

To Whom It May Concern:

As a longtime recreational user of the Tahoe National Forest, I am writing to state my violent opposition to the above-referenced proposed development in Squaw Valley. On behalf of my family who has enjoyed this unique and treasured area of California for over 100 years, I cannot condone this loud, urbanized plan which would negatively transform Squaw Valley for generations to come. I162-1

Clearly, this plan would exacerbate already difficult traffic conditions on Squaw Valley Road. This project would make a significant and unavoidable impact on Squaw Valley's scenic vistas. The proposed plan would generate noise significantly louder than Placer County standards, not only during its many years of construction but for the foreseeable future. Lastly, and most important to me, would be the severe impact of the commercial and residential units on our SEVERE California drought. Quite simply, my family and I oppose every aspect of this plan. I162-2

We urge you to vote NO on the plan, as it is clearly not in the best interest of Squaw Valley, the Tahoe National Forest or the State of California. I162-3

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Barbara B. Krusi

Barbara B. Krusi,
510-547-3282

I162 Barbara B. Krusi
June 22, 2015

I162-1 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.

I162-1 The comment expresses concern about the project's impacts related to traffic, scenic vistas, noise, and California's drought. 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.

I162-3 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.

I163

July 15, 2015

To:

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

Dear Ms. Krach,

My name is Larry Kushner, my fiancé and I own a condo at 1581 Squaw Valley Rd. in the Squaw Valley Meadows complex. We live here about 90% year round.

I previously owned another residence in the Valley for 29 years on Forest Glen Rd, near Victor Rd.

I have regularly skied at Squaw since 1969.

My background has been Real Estate Development, commercial and residential historic designation applications and renovations.

Also, I have worked on High and low income housing development, construction and renovation, and a multitude of Real Estate and Construction related activities were also part of my life. I am retired now.

I am writing to express my concerns with the DEIR and the KSL/SVREH Development Plan in General. I163-1

SCOPE

With my background, I know it is a common practice to seek the absolute maximum return on your investment in a project such as the one KSL/SVREH is seeking.

The idea of shooting for the moon and maybe getting a piece of it is common. In this case I think they are shooting far into outer space, with the scope of this project.

Do not get me wrong, I am for a somewhat sizable project and have been behind previous projects such as the Resort At Squaw Creek, the Intrawest Village, even the Pavel Stable Project, which I feel was unfairly treated by our local community members.

As do a large number of residents and second homeowners I am acquainted with, I feel that the size of this project needs to be scaled down another 35 to 50%. With heights restricted to no more than 70'. I163-2

SQUAW CREEK RESTORATION

Also, I feel that the proposal to restore Squaw Creek should become one of the first orders of business as opposed to waiting to complete a certain portion of the project.

It will show good faith to the community from them that they are committed to going forward with the project. It will also offer a beautiful centerpiece for their project that will enhance their sales. I163-3

MARKET AND SHIPPING/RECEIVING CENTER

Another issue I have with the plan for this project is the placement of the shipping and receiving center in the designated area in the East Parcel. This area is surrounded by homes in close proximity. I163-4

I had to stay in a condo, for a short time I owned behind a market, all I heard was tailgates dropping down with bangs and beep beep beep at all hours of the day and night.

I believe KSL/ SVREH owns or leases a large parcel near the bottom of Alpine Meadows Road, that, if the shipping building was placed at the west end of that parcel would provide a convenient distribution facility to both ski area locations and not cause distress to owners of homes adjacent to the current selected site or at that location either.

The market receiving should possibly be at this location also.

If left in the current planned location have a secondary sound wall built around the rear of the structure.

The plan, as I understand it, is to drop ship from larger trucks at the facility and then distribute in small trucks.

I163-4 cont.

PARKING, CIRCULATION, AND TRAFFIC NOISE

When there is good snow, which we used to have in many previous years, and will hopefully return, it was not uncommon for almost every weekend and much more during holiday periods, that cars were parking on Squaw valley Rd.

This was way before Intrawest's Village, when the entire parking lot was available. Before 3 laning was available. It was great for us who wanted to party, because the bars stayed full until 7 to 8 pm because it took hours to get out of the parking lot, so people stayed until the traffic dissipated.

The 3 laning has helped some in moving traffic out.

I163-5

Having bus stops in both directions on SV Rd, would help, so local residents could possibly leave their cars home. But with the steep hills on most of the side roads, probably, not many people will use it because they would be climbing up and down icy streets. So maybe neighborhood routes or on call pickups could be done in the valley.

Giving incentives to park elsewhere for other visitors to alleviate traffic possibly would help relieve congestion. But congestion will inevitably be there regardless of what the DEIR says.

I think that the DEIR falls way short on understanding what happens here. A comprehensive basin wide transport system with constant timely service, especially during peak times, is probably the best solution to reduce traffic.

I am torn on the Adventure Center because in the summer there would be a steady stream of traffic all day. Not a happy scene now getting out my driveway, more traffic will be even harder.

I163-6

I have to laugh at the comment in the DEIR regarding noise and its dissipation of it by insulation and dual pane windows. My previous house on Forest Glen Rd, was a block off SV Rd, was well insulated and had really good dual pane windows, but you could still hear and feel the noise and rumble of traffic on SV RD.

I live in a similar environment at my new location in terms of windows and insulation, about 100 yds off SV Rd and I can tell you what type of vehicle, truck or smaller vehicle just went by just by the feel of the rumble, the engine noise and the swish of air I can hear. That's with the windows closed, much more

I163-7

noticeable when they are open. I guess they figure we should never open our windows. So I believe their assessment is way off base on this subject. I163-7 cont.

HISTORIC

On another issue regarding the historic nature of buildings in the Valley. There a few buildings here, such as the members locker room, and old theatre building that should be spared because of their historic significance. I163-8

OVERVIEW

Last but not least, I feel that there should be very very few, if any "UNAVOIDABLE" IMPACTS ON THIS BEAUTIFUL AND UNIQUE VALLEY.

This valley is like no other, you cannot compare Vail, Northstar, Jackson Hole or even Whistler to Squaw.

There is really not a prominent mountain at Vail or NorthStar, no beautiful meadows. Just buildings and lifts. Jackson Hole ski area also is not in the prominent mountain category and there really is no community at the mountain.

Whistler did not have the community to deal with and even than the mountain was visible from almost everywhere and there are no homes whose views were affected by height or lighting issues because they do not look down on the village in most cases. I163-9

CONCLUSION

Please do not forget The Placer County Policy that pertains to this proposed project.

Policy 1.G.1. "The County will support the expansion of existing winter ski and snow paly 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"

Please do not change your stated policy to help a commercial entity excessively profit from our beautiful valley. I163-10

I URGE YOU TO REJECT THE CURRENT PLAN AND IMPLEMENT CHANGES AS THE COMMUNITY PREFERS AND SUGGESTS, THIS WILL HAVE LESS AND PROBABLY NO, UNAVOIDABLE IMPACTS, AND THAT WILL STILL GENERATE PROFITS FOR THE DEVELOPER. I163-11

Thank you

Larry J. Kushner

snoboat1@aol.com

1581 Squaw Valley Rd #11

916-417-1840

I163 Larry J. Kushner
July 15, 2015

I163-1 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.

I163-2 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 reduced project scale and building height, see response to comment I67-6, which discusses the Reduced Density Alternative and the Reduced Building Heights Alternative. Also, see Section 2.1 of this FEIR, for a discussion of the applicant's proposed changes to the proposed building heights.

I163-3 See response to comment O14-2 regarding timing of creek restoration.

I163-4 See the Master Response regarding the East Parcel and Section 2.1 of this FEIR, which discusses the applicant's proposed changes related to the shipping and receiving facility.

I163-5 The comment expresses concern about parking and circulation. 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. Also, see the Master Response regarding traffic for additional detail about parking and circulation issues.

I163-6 See the portions of the traffic Master Response regarding transit services and parking supply. Regarding comments on the MAC, see the Master Response regarding the MAC and response to comment O8d-8.

I163-7 The DEIR addresses noise attenuation typical of dual pane windows and insulation; these features reduce noise compared to single-pane windows or homes lacking insulation. They do not eliminate noise altogether. See the Master Response regarding noise for considerations of the traffic noise analysis and additional mitigation that was added to the EIR.

I163-8 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.

I163-9 The comment states that there should be very few, if any significant and unavoidable environmental impacts. See the Master Response regarding significant and unavoidable impacts.

I163-10 See the Master Response regarding significant and unavoidable impacts, including a discussion of Placer County General Plan Policy 1.G.1.

I163-11 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.

I164

Andrew G. Lange
P O Box 2846
Olympic Valley, CA 96146
Email: langeclp@aol.com
Land line phone: 530-583-3402

July 15, 2015

Placer County Community Development Resource Agency
Environmental Coordination Services
by E-mail to: cdraecs@placer.ca.gov; and

by USPS to:
3091 County Center Drive, Suite 190
Auburn, CA 95603

Attention: Maywan Krach, Community Development Technician

Re: Village at Squaw Valley Specific Plan Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR)

Ladies and Gentlemen:

I am a resident of Squaw Valley, at 206 Trails End, Olympic Valley, CA, directly across Squaw Creek from the property referred to in the Specific Plan as the East Parcel. We have owned this property since 1997, have been a regular day skier since 1975, and purchased a second home at 209 Forest Glen, Olympic Valley in 1985 in which house my son and his family now live. My wife has lived at our home at 206 Trails End most of the year since 1997, and this home became our primary residence in 2008. I am on the board of the Squaw Valley Property Owners Association and on the board of the Squaw Valley Municipal Advisory Committee. I164-1

My concerns about the Draft EIR relate primarily to the proposed development of the East Parcel by Squaw Valley Real Estate, LLC.

The developer proposes 4 different and inconsistent uses on the East Parcel: (a) employee housing, (b) a two level parking structure for employee and overflow day skier parking, (c) a shipping and receiving station, and (d) a grocery store.

The East Parcel is immediately adjacent at the west end and the south side to long established single family home neighborhoods. At the east end, the east parcel bounds Olympic Estates, a 16 lot single family home subdivision development by Lance Poulsen recently approved by Placer County. All infrastructure is in place and no construction of houses has commenced. I164-2

1. The DEIR fails to address the following impacts of the proposed East Parcel development and available mitigation measures:

Placer County Community Development Resource Agency
July 15, 2015
Page 2

a The impacts on the adjacent single family home neighborhoods resulting from proposed employee housing.

b The impacts on the adjacent single family home neighborhoods resulting from operating a two level parking structure on the East Parcel.

c The impacts on the adjacent single family home neighborhoods resulting from operating a grocery store on the East Parcel.

d The impacts on the adjacent single family home neighborhoods resulting operating a shipping and receiving system - receiving goods delivered in large trucks and moving those goods out to the developer's operations at the west end of Squaw Valley.

e The impacts on the adjacent single family home neighborhoods resulting from constructing and maintaining a bicycle path on the north and west edges of the East Parcel.

I164-2 cont.

2. The above impacts include but are not limited to:

a Noise from the reversing warning beeps in connection with operating the shipping and receiving station and in connection with plowing the upper level of the parking structure and driveways and paths.

b Noise from the recreational activities of the employee housing residents;

I164-3

c Light pollution from the vehicle parking on the parking structure, the night lighting of the parking structure and adjacent driveways;

d The blocking of the sunlight from the south especially during the winter months by the employee housing buildings (if the currently proposed configuration does not change) which abut the north side of the East Parcel,

I164-4

e The litter from bags, containers and wrappers discarded by customers of the grocery store,

I164-5

f The additional crime and violence resulting from convenient liquor sales to employee housing residents and transients at the grocery store.

I164-6

g The effect on Squaw Valley Road traffic of the entering and exiting of the vehicular, bicycle and pedestrian traffic into and out of the East Parcel generated by each of the proposed uses, and the cumulative effect of all of them, including but not limited to:

I164-7

Placer County Community Development Resource Agency
July 15, 2015
Page 3

i employee housing residents and guests,
ii overflow day skier parking,
iii delivery and transhipping trucks from the shipping and receiving station,
iv grocery store patrons
v pedestrian and bicycling residents and guests of the employee housing (who are expected to cross Squaw Valley Road near the inter section of the Squaw Creek Road and Squaw Valley Road).

The dEIR did not adequately address East parcel traffic. The dEAIR assumes that the shipping and receiving station will decrease traffic. Maybe not. The same amount of goods still needs to be delivered to the village from the shipping and receiving station. Instead of a few larger trucks, applicant will need to use more smaller delivery trucks up and down Squaw Valley Road, each of which, small and large, will have to cross Squaw Valley Road on entering when coming from the Village area and on exiting when coming from Route 89. I164-7 cont.

3. At a minimum the following mitigation measures should be required:

a Most Effective Mitigation of Impacts from the employee housing:
i locate the employee housing facilities at the west end of Squaw Valley;
ii locate the employee housing facilities in Tahoe City
iii locate the employee housing facilities in Truckee (for example, there is currently a motel for sale on Deerfield Drive) I164-8

b Most Effective Mitigation of Shipping and Receiving Impacts:

i Locate the shipping and receiving arrangement to an appropriate location at the west end of Squaw Valley (this will produce more "large" truck traffic on Squaw Valley Road, but eliminate the many more frequent trips of smaller trucks on the same route) I164-9

ii Alternative Mitigation of the Reverse Beeping Noise: Requiring developer to have a warehouse receiving system which allows the delivery trucks to effect deliveries and transhipping without having to back up

c Most Effective Mitigation of Impacts from the Grocery Store:
i Locate the grocery store at the west end of Squaw Valley;

ii Alternative Mitigation Measure: forbidding sales of any alcoholic beverages at the proposed grocery store I164-10

d Most Effective Mitigation of the Impacts from the Proposed Employee Housing: I164-11

Placer County Community Development Resource Agency
July 15, 2015
Page 4

i Locate at the East Parcel the single family homes and condominiums which would otherwise be located as part of the development at the west end of Squaw Valley thus making room for the employee housing, parking, grocery store and shipping and receiving station at the west end of Squaw Valley. I164-11 cont.

e Other Mitigation of the Impacts from light, noise and general compromising of the mountain setting by the planting and maintaining, including a watering system and replacement of any plants which die, of an effective line of trees and other plant life along the west, north and east sides of the East Parcel, which should begin immediately upon the approval of any specific plan which includes development of any portion of the East Parcel. I164-12

The only apparent mitigation measure, quoted below, proposed by the applicant is not adequate:

The buildings would screen views for the parking area from nearby residences. The shipping/receiving building would be located in the western portion of the parcel, and would be buffered from residences to the west and north by a landscaped berm and grade change. [Village at Squaw Valley Specific Plan, Conceptual Employee/Workforce Housing Plan, Revised–July 14, 2014, Conceptual Housing Plan, p. 3, 3rd ¶] I164-13

The buildings would be more intrusive than the parking structure because of their height. The nature of the landscaping is not defined, and needs to include rows of trees which will grow to a height of at least 35 feet.

Thank you for addressing the above concerns.

Very truly yours,

S/ Andrew G. Lange

Andrew G. Lange

I164 Andrew G. Lange
July 15, 2015

I164-1 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 detailed responses to comments pertaining to the East Parcel, below.

I164-2 The comment expresses concern about the proposed development on the East Parcel, and states that the DEIR fails to address the impacts of the proposed East Parcel development on the adjacent single-family home neighborhoods. However, the commenter provides no examples of the types of impacts that are of concern. Chapters 4 through 16 of the DEIR evaluate the environmental impacts of the project (including proposed development at the East Parcel) and consider the effect on the residential land uses located close to the East Parcel. No specific issues related to the content, analysis, or conclusions in the DEIR are raised in this comment. No further response is provided here. See detailed responses below.

I164-3 The comment expresses concern related to the noise from the reversing warning beeps in connection with operating the shipping and receiving facility. See the Master Response regarding the East Parcel for a discussion of the applicant's proposed changes to the location of the shipping and receiving facility. The revised design of the site will allow delivery trucks to enter and exit with minimal backing up to loading docks, thereby reducing (or eliminating) activation of beepers/backup alarms.

With respect to noise from the recreational activities of the employee housing residents, see the Master Response regarding the East Parcel.

I164-4 The comment states that the DEIR did not address light pollution from vehicle parking and night lighting of the parking structure and adjacent driveways, or blocking of sunlight from the south during winter months. See the Master Response regarding the East Parcel for responses to these issues.

I164-5 The comment expresses concern about the potential for increased litter from the grocery store. As discussed in the Master Response regarding the East Parcel, litter is a social issue that is not required to be addressed under CEQA, and is covered by State law and County ordinances.

I164-6 The comment expresses concern about the additional crime and violence resulting from liquor sales to employee housing residents and transients. See response to comment I164-5 regarding social issues that are not required to be addressed under CEQA.

I164-7 The comment states that the DEIR did not address traffic impacts on Squaw Valley Road associated with the development of the East Parcel. Traffic impacts are discussed in Chapter 9, "Transportation and Circulation," in the DEIR. For a discussion of vehicle ingress and egress to the East Parcel, please see response to comment O11-6.

I164-8 The comment suggests specific locations to be considered for employee housing: the west end of Squaw Valley, Tahoe City, and Truckee. It appears that the comment is intending to recommend mitigation measures related to perceived impacts described in comments I164-3 through I164-7. These perceived impacts are generally of a social nature and are not required to be addressed under CEQA. That is, the perceived impacts noted in the comment letter, such as noise from recreational activities of the employee housing residents (comment I164-3[b]), increased litter from grocery store customers (comment I164-5), and

crime and violence from liquor sales (comment I164-6) are not environmental impacts that require mitigation measures under CEQA. (Please see responses to comments I164-3(a), I164-4, and I164-7 for responses to comments that are of an environmental nature.)

This comment recommends an alternative to the proposed project in terms of changes to land uses (i.e., employee housing locations). In order for this alternative to be a feasible alternative under CEQA, it must meet most of the project objectives as well as reduce significant environmental impacts. Reducing or eliminating employee housing on the East Parcel would require locating employee housing elsewhere to comply with Placer County Policy C-2. This would relocate rather than eliminate impacts, and could exacerbate some impacts depending on the location (e.g., location could result in additional biological resources; because longer commutes would be required, this suggestion could result in greater noise, air quality, and transportation and circulation impacts). While these project adjustments may meet most project objectives, they are not different enough in terms of their ability to reduce environmental impacts, compared to the proposed project or other alternatives, to meaningfully inform decision-making.

See the Master Response regarding the East Parcel for a discussion of proposed changes to the project and land use compatibility related to the East Parcel.

I164-9 The comment suggests relocating the shipping and receiving facility to the west end of Squaw Valley. Similar to comment I164-8, this suggestion provides an alternative land use arrangement to the proposed project. This would relocate rather than eliminate impacts, and could exacerbate some impacts depending on the location (e.g., location could result in additional air quality and transportation and circulation impacts).

See the Master Response regarding the East Parcel for a discussion of the applicant's proposed changes to the location of the shipping and receiving facility. The revised design of the site will allow delivery trucks to enter and exit with minimal backing up to loading docks, thereby reducing (or eliminating) the need for beepers/backup alarms.

I164-10 The comment suggests new mitigation measures to reduce impacts from the proposed grocery store at the East Parcel. It is unclear what environmental impacts the comment is addressing. See response to comment I164-6. Impacts that are not considered to be significant or potentially significant do not require mitigation.

It is further important to note that the proposed grocery store is located near to the employee housing units, as an amenity for workers. This would allow for ease of access that would eliminate or substantially reduce the need for automobile use to and from the East Parcel. Moving the grocery store elsewhere within the plan area would relocate, rather than reduce impacts, and may result in greater environmental effects to resources areas such as transportation and circulation as well as air quality.

I164-11 See responses to comments I164-8 through I164-10 for discussions related to relocating the proposed employee housing.

I164-12 The comment suggests new mitigation measures to reduce impacts from "light, noise, and general compromising of the mountain setting." However, the comment does not provide any specific measures that would reduce light and noise impacts. These issues are addressed in the DEIR and mitigation measures are provided where appropriate. Regarding the comment suggesting "planting and maintaining, including a watering system and replacement of any plants which die…," Mitigation measure 6-9 provides details related to minimizing effects on trees and compensating for tree removal. Also see the Master Response regarding the East Parcel, which discusses visual and noise impacts specific to the East Parcel.

I164-13 The comment quotes a section of the Conceptual Employee-Workforce Housing Plan, related to the screening of views for the parking area from nearby residences. An extensive discussion related to visual resources is provided in Chapter 8, "Visual Resources," of the DEIR, where more information is available. Also see the Master Response regarding the East Parcel, which discusses visual impacts specific to the East Parcel.

I165

Maywan Krach

From: Brady Larsen <brady.larsen.esq@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2015 4:41 PM
To: Placer County Environmental Coordination Services
Subject: Do not expand Tahoe!

Dear Placer County Community Development Resource Agency:

I am sending this e-mail on behalf of myself and many others who have memories of Tahoe. We wish to be able to share the same memories with our own children and for them to do that with theirs. The planned projects for expansion will irrevocably ruin Tahoe as we know it and have ecological impacts that will make it impossible for future generations to enjoy this natural wonder. Please consider me one of a large number of Tahoe enthusiasts who are firmly opposed to this course of action. Thank you. I165-1

Best,

Brady T. Larsen, Esq.
70 Doray Dr., Suite 16
Pleasant Hill, CA 94523
(925) 324-6662
Brady.Larsen.Esq@gmail.com

1

I165 Brady T. Larsen, Esq.
July 17, 2015

I165-1 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.

I166

July 17, 2015

Maywan Krach, Community Development Technician
Environmental Coordination Services
Placer County Community Development Resource Agency
3091 County Center Drive, Suite 190
Auburn, CA 95603
Sent by email to: cdraecs@placer.ca.gov

Dear Ms. Krach:

My family has owned a home in Alpine Meadows for 47 years, and I have been going there for almost 44 years. I grew up ice skating in Squaw Valley at the ice rink, home to the first "miracle on ice" where the USA beat the Russians for the 1960 gold medal in ice hockey. That historic building was allowed to fall into disrepair so it could be torn down to make way for additional parking in the 1980s. I recall the ski jump on the south-side of the valley, which was taken out to make way for runs off of Red Dog. While I recognize the need to make changes to Squaw Valley to make it a viable destination, I have serious concerns about the proposed Village at Squaw Valley Specific Plan (VSVSP) [PSPA 20110385, State Clearing House No. 2012102023] not only for the continued loss of cultural resources related to the 1960s Olympics but also for the environment. I166-1

Placer County Policy 1.G.1. states: **"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."** I don't believe the numerous significant and unavoidable environmental impacts identified in the draft EIR (DEIR) have not been adequately mitigated; therefore, the County should not approve the currently proposed project. Please see my comments below: I166-2

Transportation & Circulation:

First, I would like to express concerns about the year (2011-12) that was analyzed for this study. It is readily acknowledged that 2011-12 is considered one of the years in our current multi-year drought so analyzing it would not provide a "normal" year perspective for the number of visitors to Squaw Valley and the north Lake Tahoe region. This analysis underrepresents the amount of visitors we have during an average snow fall year. I would recommend analyzing an average ski season to get a better approximation of the number of skier visits to the region. I166-3

That said, it is clear in the DEIR that VSVSP will result in an increase in traffic and roadway congestion, particularly on Squaw Valley Road and SR 89. While the project plan does suggest some mitigation efforts, including having staff manage traffic control as well as monitoring average traffic speeds, these measures will fall short of preserving existing transportation and circulation conditions, especially for current residents. According to the draft EIR "Because there are no available mechanisms to provide an acceptable LOS on the SR 28 and SR 89 I166-4

segments in question, this impact would be significant and unavoidable." Level F conditions are not acceptable. If traffic conditions cannot be improved over existing or mitigated to acceptable levels, the identified potential impacts must not be allowed. This negative impact needs to be considered carefully before approving VSVSP. I166-4 cont.

It is noted in the DEIR that the planned traffic signal at SR 89 and Alpine Meadows Road intersection will mitigate traffic congestion at this intersection. I would like clarification as to whether or not the draft EIR addresses the cumulative effect of projects already in some planning stage with Placer County such as the Alpine Sierra Subdivision and the Stanford Chalet redevelopment in Alpine Meadows, the PlumpJack Squaw Valley Inn, the Homewood Mountain Resort Master Plan, and the Tahoe Basin Area Plan including the Tahoe City Lodge Pilot Project. All of these projects have the potential to significantly increase the number of visitors to Squaw Valley, Alpine Meadows and north Lake Tahoe impacting SR 89 and SR 28 as well as the intersection at SR 89 and Alpine Meadows. I would like to see the cumulative effect of development addressed in the DEIR. I166-5

In addition, I would like further study on the impacts of Alpine Meadows Road. During the winter, it already is difficult to turn left from the subdivisions onto Alpine Meadows Road to west to the Alpine Meadows Ski Area parking lot. It is particularly dangerous when there is snow and/or ice on the road and the cars on Alpine Meadows Road are trying to keep a constant speed given the grade of the road as it approaches the ski area. (Sometimes cars are unable to get the necessary traction to proceed up the hill once they've stopped.) With more traffic as a result of the increased visitors to the region, this will be even more difficult and dangerous to pull into the long stream of cars. This situation is only exacerbated on days when Squaw Valley has limited lifts open due to weather/avalanche conditions and Alpine Meadows has more terrain available. I166-6

Population, Employment, and Housing:

The project anticipates creating an additional 574 new FTE, resulting in a significant increase in local population which impacts traffic, water consumption, waste production and treatment, air quality, and noise pollution. To meet Placer County policy, VSVSP would need to provide housing for 386 employees. However, under the current plan, a maximum of 300 employees would be housed in units (of different bedroom and dormitory configurations). This is less than the required beds to meet Placer County General Plan policies for new employee housing. Since there is no recommendation in the draft EIR for achieving compliance with County policy, the ultimate environmental impact of employee housing cannot be assessed adequately. I would like more information about how VSVSP will meet County policies for new employee housing and have this information reviewed for inclusion in the EIR. I166-7

Visual Resources:

VSVSP will permanently obstruct or alter scenic views that we all currently enjoy within Squaw Valley. The draft EIR indicates on numerous occasions (e.g., Impacts 8-5, 18-14, 18-15, 18-16) that "there is no additional feasible mitigation measures available to reduce this cumulative impact to a less-than-significant level." Could the height of the buildings in the Village be reduced? I166-8

I would like to indicate that the "region" referred to in Impact 18-18 ("contributes to the cumulative light and glare and skyglow effects in the region") includes Alpine Meadows, along the Truckee River and likely will stretch towards Tahoe City and Truckee. As a homeowner in Alpine Meadows, we already experience skyglow effects in our valley from light pollution in Squaw Valley on cloudy nights. One of the extraordinary experiences we currently enjoy in many of our communities in the Sierra Nevada is the ability to view our galaxy with the naked eye because of the lack of light pollution. It would be a shame for future generations not have this same experience. The draft EIR needs to better address the night sky pollution impact and indicate ways to impose "dark sky" best practices. It also needs to provide additional analysis about the off-site impacts of skyglow on the surrounding communities. I166-9

Hydrology & Water Quality:

VSVSP will permanently increase the water needs in Squaw Valley. As the community draws more water from groundwater and up-hill resources will further deplete the hydrology of the valley. This likely will lead to Squaw Creek experiencing more below-normal flow conditions. This has numerous impacts: less-resilient aquatic systems; shortage of water for local wildlife (including for the endangered mountain yellow-legged frog); elevated water temperatures; and further degraded water quality. Squaw Creek is already considered heavily sedimented and does not meet federal water quality standards. The planned restoration actions for the creek may not adequately mitigate for these impacts, particularly if the future of hydrology of the watershed is in question. I166-10

I am concerned about Squaw Valley's anticipated water needs if the community is currently seeking to secure water and water storage in Mardis Valley. It indicates the water district is concerned about its ability to meet its need for water. One way to mitigate this problem is to reduce VSVSP. I would like to see further studies on Squaw Valley's water resources and the number of beds it can satisfy from its own resources within Squaw Valley. I166-11

I have only highlighted a few of the numerous impacts discussed in draft EIR. I hope further study of these issues will more seriously promote a less dense project to mitigate some of the issues while still allowing the applicants to meet their goals as the current VSVSP does not adequately mitigate its environmental impacts. Thank your consideration of these comments. I166-12

Sincerely,

Rachelle Latimer
2027 Bear Creek Drive, Alpine Meadows

I166 Rachelle Latimer
July 17, 2015

I166-1 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.

I166-2 See the Master Response regarding significant and unavoidable impacts, including a discussion of Placer County General Plan Policy 1.G.1.

I166-3 See the Master Response regarding traffic for a discussion of the use of 2011-2012 ski season data to represent existing winter conditions.

I166-4 The comment states that LOS F conditions for traffic along Squaw Valley Road and SR 89 are not acceptable. See the Master Response regarding traffic for a discussion of this issue. 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

I166-5 Table 18-2 (pages 18-3 through 18-5) in the DEIR provides the list of probable future projects that are in the project vicinity and that have the possibility of interacting with the proposed project to generate impacts. The comment lists several projects that are included in Table 18-2, such as the Alpine Sierra Subdivision, PlumpJack Redevelopment, and Homewood Mountain Resort Master Plan. Also, see the Master Response regarding the cumulative analysis for discussion of other projects not included in the cumulative analysis, such as the Stanford Chalet. Note that the cumulative traffic analysis in Chapter 18 of the DEIR (pages 18-17 through 18-30) comprehensively evaluates impacts of cumulative traffic in the project area and region, including the north Lake Tahoe Basin.

I166-6 The comment expresses concerns related to the operation of Alpine Meadows Road. Please see response to comment I140-2.

I166-7 The comment correctly states that the number of employee housing units required by Placer County would not be met under the proposed project. See Mitigation Measure 5-3 in the DEIR, which recommends actions to bring the project in compliance with Placer County employee housing requirements. Also, see response to comment O9-266.

I166-8 The comment asks if the height of the proposed buildings in the Village could be reduced. As described in Section 2.1 of this FEIR, the applicant has proposed changes to the proposed building heights in response to concerns expressed by the Squaw Valley Design Review Committee and members of the public.

I166-9 See the Master Response regarding the visual impact analysis for a discussion of night sky impacts and the impacts of skyglow on the Alpine Meadows area.

I166-10 The comment expresses concern related to water quality and hydrology associated with Squaw Creek. See Impact 13-6 for a discussion related to water quality associated with the reconfiguration of Squaw Creek and the Olympic Channel. For the effects on biological resources within Squaw Creek, see Chapter 6, "Biological Resources," of the DEIR. Also, see the Master Response regarding water supply.

I166-11 For issues related to water demands, including connections to Martis Valley, see the Master Response regarding water supply.

I166-12 The comment provides a summary of detailed comments provided above. See responses to the detailed comments above.

I167

Maywan Krach

From: Robin Lavery <robin@waste101.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2015 3:09 PM
To: Placer County Environmental Coordination Services
Subject: KSL proposed expansion

Dear Placer County Community Development Resource Agency,

I am reaching out to your agency to ask that the KSL expansion project approval be denied. As a local resident of Squaw Valley and the North Shore area since 1981, I feel that the proposed SV development will have too many environmental impacts on our beautiful valley. 10 story buildings, huge inside recreation building in our area? Water usage, that we don't have and a giant footprint that we don't need? That's not appropriate for Squaw Valley. Please, listen to your community in regards to expansion in Squaw Valley. Placer County's main objective should be listening to the residents/taxpayers wants and not a payoff from a giant corporate real estate developer's checkbook.
Thanking you in advance for Placer County denying the KSL expansion proposal. I167-1

Sincerely,

Robin Lavery
PO Box 2301
Olympic Valley, CA

1

I167 Robin Lavery
July 16, 2015

I167-1 The comment is directed towards the project approval process and does not address the content, analysis, or conclusions in the DEIR. Therefore, no further response is provided here. All comment letters submitted during the DEIR public review period will be reviewed and considered by the Placer County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors before a decision on the project is rendered.

I168

Evan Lawley
PO Box 11798
Zephyr Cove, NV 89448
Evan Lawley evan.lawley@gmail.com

July 17th, 2015

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

Subject: Village at Squaw Valley Specific Plan Draft EIR (DEIR)

Dear Mr. Krach:

Good day. My comments on the Village at Squaw Valley Specific Plan Draft EIR concern Chapter 5 of the report: Population, Employment, and Housing.

After careful review of the DEIR, I've come to the conclusion that the information provided in Chapter 5 is inadequate for 2 main reasons: 1) If current housing needs are not met through company resources, especially for year-round residents and employees, then it's also unclear at best how the proposed changes will meet the needs of employees and their families; and, 2) the DEIR outlines a plan for a maximum of 300-employee residences (specifically beds within "dormitory-style housing") which is insufficient to meet the project's regulatory requirements—a specific plan is not outlined to mitigate CEQA requirements to the extent required—at the end of the chapter a paragraph alludes to a future unspecified Squaw Valley plan to meet the shortfall or to pay the county in-lieu of Squaw Valley's responsibility to meet the requirements. I168-1

In Section 5.1.1, the current housing situation in Olympic Valley is discussed, and the lack of attainable housing for low-income employees (which is the vast majority of employees who work for the company) is expressly stated. Weekenders and vacation rental companies have consolidated housing in the valley, leaving low-income employees and other residents without year-round affordable options in Olympic Valley, or within the corridor of Squaw Valley. The housing is simply unaffordable for single low-income residents, and raising a family is not possible on intermittent wages the ski resort provides. Buying a house is not even a consideration by anyone I know who works for the resort.

As stated in Village at Squaw Valley Specific Plan DEIR (April 2015) Section 3.5 (http://www.placer.ca.gov/~/media/cdr/ECS/EIR/VSVSP/DraftSpecificPlan/Combined%20April%202015%20SP_Highlights%20Pgs1-141.pdf): I168-2

> Squaw Valley provides a range of residential and lodging types, but as a mountain resort oriented community, much of the housing is not affordable to many resort employees,

> particularly seasonal employees. This creates not only a hardship for those working at the resort facilities, but may have adverse environmental consequences if employees have to drive long distances between work and home.

I've lived in Tahoe for 6-years and have worked for local ski resorts during that time. Affordable housing has been a real struggle to find for me. The last 15-months, I've lived homeless, camping in the Tahoe National Forest at the base of Alpine Meadows to meet some level of my housing requirements while working nearby. This is specifically because housing is scarce at this time, and housing units are ridiculously expensive or require 1-year leases and massive deposits to move in, especially if one has a pet. As a year-round resident, I have certain needs for housing, which have not been addressed by my employer in any way that I've found. Living in a barracks-style hostel like outlined in the DEIR does not meet my needs, or anyone I know that lives here year-round. I168-2 cont.

The DEIR outlines a plan to have a maximum of 8-16 employees in 6-studio apartments, 20-employees in 3-"dorms" (barracks), and 16-employees in 9-bedrooms dorms, for a total of 252-300 employees housed. First, this does not meet the demand of the growth in FTE employees outlined in the DEIR. Second, no one I know who is a year-round resident would want to live in this barracks-style housing, or crammed into a studio with another person. The plan is entirely insufficient for the growth expected. The additional housing plan that the project is required to supply (the 86-phantom or missing employee beds from this project) was not discussed except to outline the county and CEQA requirements and an illusion of a plan to meet these regulatory requirements, which in my opinion reads like Squaw Valley intends to pay the county to escape this employee-employer promise. Third, current housing is insufficient because of the housing type, and its an issue a lot of people in the area are familiar with, so it is disturbing that Squaw Valley proposed to meet regulatory requirement with a barracks-style plan.

Policy 1-M.1 (Job-Housing Balance) states that, I168-3

> …new growth must be concentrated so… individual communities become more diverse, complete, and balanced.

A complete and balanced community would not be loads of strictly seasonal employees crammed into a "dorm" for 6 to 8-months a year. A complete and balanced community includes families. Our employees have children they provide for. Outside of the Village at Squaw Valley, locals who live in Olympic Valley have children, our visitors bring their children, so why then is this demographic neglected in Squaw Valley's plan to meet CEQA requirements for employee housing? Also, as the plan for the east parcel indicates, privacy will be at a minimum in this new employee housing. Privacy is a right to everyone, including our international seasonal employees. Fitting 2-employees in a studio apartment to meet these regulatory requirements is, in my opinion, an insult to how Squaw Valley sees its employees and their basic rights and dignity.

It is therefore my opinion that the employee housing plan must show housing for all 386-FTE employees that this project proposes to dislodge and hire (99 employees currently housed + new 287 FTE employees expected from growth). A diversity of housing should be outlined to include I168-4

multiple-bedroom units, pet-friendly units, family-friendly units, and needs for the seasonal J1-visa international employees and other strictly high-season employees (those hired during the busiest times and highest demands on the resort and local retail, i.e. "holiday help"). Sawmill Heights provides a reasonable example for this (though limitations exist in using Sawmill housing as a sole model). At Sawmill Heights you rent and apartment where you can raise children (with pets) and work the available low-wage intermittent-schedule jobs ski resorts provide in our area.

Apartments at Sawmill Heights range from studios to 4-bedroom units with single occupancy per-bedroom. That is an important distinction because Squaw Valley's DEIR outlines mostly double-occupancy per bedroom or studio, and dorm-style units. The plan is entirely inadequate to meet the needs of my fellow employees and their families (and pets) and should be updated to reflect the environmental and social impact on all 386-FTE employees that require mitigation, and for a sizable portion of that mitigation to include family and pet-friendly housing options.

The Village at Squaw Valley's Specific Plan DEIR perpetuates a real and significant problem in Olympic Valley and nearby. Housing is in short supply, especially for families and year-round residents, even more so if you have a pet. The Draft EIR does not meet requirements to help diversify and balance the community; the plan is more of the same, cramped dorm-style housing to meet the demands of the strictly seasonal employee and temporary resident, not full-time or year-round residents. Future environmental and cultural impacts of the missing 86-employees not outlined in this plan must be included to show the public where these employees will live and what kind of community that would then resemble. Employees are too often short-changed in Squaw Valley's current employee-employer relationship. Budget cut-backs, insufficient hours (the promise of a 40-hour work week when hired not kept), regulatory short-changing on overtime (we cannot earn overtime until 48-hours are worked in the week), lay offs and the lack of notice for getting cut for the day or season, and less-than adequate training opportunities and advancement training is par for Squaw Valley—perpetuating a deepening housing crisis is like dropping the floor out from under employees that already struggle with KSL/Squaw Valley as employers. While these aren't topics that are addressed in this DEIR, they are serious contributing factors to the financial insecurities of our locals and result in Squaw Valley relying more-heavily on J1 Visa foreign workers to meet the shortfall of local workers. These circumstances create a positive feedback loop of more of the same, and housing needs stand as the crumbling foundation for locals who are having their livelihoods slowly chipped away. This is why I argue so strongly that the needs of the 86 employees not given a specific plan for housing within this document be addressed, because they are real people who will need housing. I168-4 cont.

In my years of local experience, I haven't met any operations employees at Alpine Meadows or Squaw Valley that live in employee housing. This is specifically because of reasons I discussed earlier in my comments. My experience working for Northstar and living at Sawmill Heights has shown me that while it is quite the trip to a grocery store, and public transit gets dropped during the shoulder seasons along the CA-267 corridor, it still helps house low-income employees (especially with families and pets) where no reasonable alternatives might exist. This same problem is happening right now in Olympic Valley and only seems not only perpetuated, but aggravated by this plan.

Because the analysis of employment and housing was inadequate and flawed in this DEIR, Squaw Valley should conduct a new analysis and recirculate the DEIR taking into account the needs of local, year-round residents. This analysis should look at the provision of more private accommodations where employees and residents can feel more safe and secure than is possible in dorm-style living with unfamiliar roommates, and it should show how Squaw Valley plans to encourage diversity in its employee housing population including age—and all this should be done for at least all 386-employees this project displaces or brings on following build-out. These are real people we are discussing and planning to employ and house with real needs like privacy and a secure and stable living environment to reach their true potential and live peaceful and fun lives. I168-5

I168 Evan Lawley
July 17, 2015

I168-1 The comment correctly states that the project would not meet Placer County requirements associated with employee housing. See response to comment O9-266.

I168-2 The comment correctly re-iterates issues associated with affordable housing proposed as part of the project that are described in Chapter 5 of the DEIR, and generally addresses needs associated with housing for employees. Economic issues, such as issues related to wages and the housing market, are not considered to be environmental impacts requiring analysis under CEQA. Employee housing impacts related to the project are addressed in terms of the loss of units proposed by the project and consistency with Placer County General Plan Policy C-2, which mandates construction of employee housing for projects in the Sierra. See Impact 5-3 in the DEIR for additional information. As stated on page 5-13 of the DEIR:

> Anticipated floor plans for the employee housing would consist of 3-story buildings providing studios and dormitories. Proposed layouts for these buildings include: nine bedroom dormitory units that would accommodate 16 employees each (approximately 2,000 square feet), three dormitory units that would each accommodate 20 employees (approximately 2,500 square feet), and six studio units that would accommodate between eight and 16 employees (approximately 300 square feet). The new employee housing units could accommodate from 252 to 300 employees, with the range based on how many couples share the planned studio units.

Concerns related to the style of housing are noted and will be considered by the Placer County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisor when making decisions regarding the project.

I168-3 See response to comment I168-2 regarding the employee housing units proposed as part of the project, including proposed layouts. Regarding the statement that the project would not meet the demand for employee housing, see response to comment I168-1.

The comment regarding the desirability to live or not live in the proposed employee housing units 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.

I168-4 See responses to comments I168-2 and I168-3 for information related to the types of housing that would be made available as part of the project. See response to comment O9-266 for a discussion related to the project's ability to meet Placer County requirements for employee housing.

The comment regarding employee housing available at Sawmill Heights 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 challenges associated with a lack of overall affordable housing for employees, including employees with families and pets, is noted. The Placer County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors will take the commenter's opinions into consideration when making decisions regarding the project.

I168-5 The comment states that employment and housing is not adequately addressed in the DEIR. While this is an important issue, this is primarily a social and not an environmental issue. The comments are associated with opinions regarding the merits or qualities of the proposed project and do 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 responses to comments I168-1 through I168-4.

I169

Judy Layton
P.O, Box 39
Kings Beach, CA 96143

T 530 546-8400

June 30, 2015

Placer County Community Development Resource Agency
Attention: Maywan Krach
3091 County Center Derive, Suite 190
Auburn, Ca.. 95603

To: Maywan Krach.

This letter is written in response to K.S.L. Capital Partners Development proposal presented at the planning commission hearing June 25th. Myself and my friends are not residents of Squaw Valley , but are residents of Tahoe City and Kings Beach of 25 + years. I169-1

All comments made by the public were valid concerns about the K.S.L. valley development that is absolutely too huge. This is a beautiful fragile valley environment which will be destroyed. This monster project will affect the whole area: Tahoe City, Truckee, Highway 89 and Interstate 80 east, Kings Beach and the West Shore of Tahoe. You seem to forget the impact of such a large commercial development...it ruins retail everywhere. Already Tahoe City and Kings Beach are having problems with the developments in Squaw Valley and Northstar. These destination resorts destroy not help economically and the tax payer pays The traffic on our roads during the development with construction people commuting for 25 years Then you have to consider all the support traffic for the existing and new businesses, homes, condos, timeshares. conference meetings, and lastly special events and skiing. I169-2

There is now a problem with water that won't be solved by drilling more wells. Pollution is a serious matter. Water quality and supply. I169-3

You don't touch the topic of wildlife, birds. native plants . Do you just destroy it all and pave it over? The light pollution, migration trails, food, habitat, drinkable water, noise, air pollution are huge subjects that should not be ignored . This would be tragic . Right now you are creating islands of habitat for the animals trapping them in by fast moving traffic on highways surrounding the areas. The wildlife needs preserved corridors for safety and sustainability. I169-4

You need to protect the area keeping it beautiful and a unique place to visit and enjoy. We all lose if you approve of the gigantic development . You think it will create jobs, taxes "growth' but these are false goals. Please listen to the comments and concerns of the public especially the people who live in Squaw Valley. Do not approve any more development ; this would be a fatal decision. Squaw Valley does not deserve this destruction , we all loose. I169-5

Thank you for your consideration, Judy Layton

Judith Layton commercial / business and resident property owner. Resident of Tahoe City and Kings Beach of 61 years if that helps validate my opinions and valid concerns for our total area with the KSL development proposal for Squaw Valley.