

---

**I169**Judy Layton  
June 30, 2015

---

- I169-1 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.
- I169-2 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.
- I169-3 The comment expresses concerns about water supply and water quality. These issues are addressed in Chapter 13 and 14 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.
- I169-4 The comment expresses concerns about wildlife, birds, native plants, light pollution, migration trails, food, habitat, drinkable water, noise, and air pollution. 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.
- I169-5 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.

I170

**Maywan Krach**

**From:** Harald Leventhal <harald@lkmi.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, June 17, 2015 1:54 PM  
**To:** Placer County Environmental Coordination Services  
**Subject:** Comments: Squaw Valley Village Specific Plan

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

Dear Maywan:

I am writing as a Dollar Point/Placer County homeowner and taxpayer for over 25 years to express my outrage at the overreaching plans proposed for the development of Squaw Valley. I have skied Squaw Valley for 43 years and it is a part of my life. I like to call it my happy place and I am far from happy with the scale and scope of the plans proposed by a bunch of "build it and flip it" developers with no stake in the community (their protestations to the contrary ring false after having examined their so called scaled down plans). I am not against responsible development that is within the capacity of both the site and region to support it. I am against out of state investors coming in a trying to turn Squaw Valley into another overdeveloped, high density resort without regard to the impact on the resort or the region. I do not have the technical skills to pick apart the DEIR so I will limit my comments to my sense of bewilderment and concern over this project:

I170-1

- 1) Traffic, Quality of Life and the Environment: traffic along SR89, in Tahoe City and Truckee is already at often intolerable levels on a typical weekend morning or afternoon. Where will all the additional cars go? There are not alternative routes to Squaw Valley or Alpine Meadows. Instead we will be facing monstrous traffic jams with more cars idling and spewing exhaust with visitors and local spending their time in traffic rather than going about their lives. This, in and of itself, should be enough for the County to drastically scale down their plans.
- 2) Sightlines and Views: do we really want to see Olympic Valley turn into a jungle of highrises? Is this the High Sierra we are stewards of? The plans need to be scaled down and not be an exercise in piling on as many stories as they can get away with. The only high rise that we should see at Squaw Valley are the majestic peaks and mountains that surround this High Sierra gem.
- 3) Construction Impact: I cannot even conceive of 25 years of construction in the Valley. The dust, the noise, the impact on parking, the impact on roads and so on. Not to mention the capacity to sell all this real estate – they will turn the valley into a year-round real estate pitch.
- 4) Water: I understand that the DEir assessment of local water supplies is based on a study that does not include records from the current drought. Really???? A water pipe from Martis Valley. Really???? The acquifer, as I understand it, is already very stressed and they are proposing development well beyond what any reasonable person would conclude is responsible.

I170-2

I170-3

I170-4

I170-5

I implore you to think about the whole region and not roll over and acquiesce to the proposed development at Squaw Valley. I beg you to focus on significantly scaling back the size, scope, height and extent of the proposed development and act on behalf of your residents and taxpayers. Let's get this one right. We only have one chance!!!

I170-6

Hal

Harald Leventhal  
162 Roundridge Road  
Dollar Point, Tahoe City

---

**I170**Harald Leventhal  
June 17, 2015

---

- I170-1 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.
- I170-2 The comment expresses concerns about traffic and air quality. 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.
- I170-3 The comment expresses concerns about sightlines and views. These issues are addressed in the DEIR, particularly Chapter 8. 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 the visual impact analysis and Section 2.1 of this FEIR for a discussion of the applicant's proposed changes to proposed building heights.
- I170-4 See the Master Response regarding the 25-year construction period.
- I170-5 See the Master Response regarding water supply.
- I170-6 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.

1171

Placer County Community Development Resource Agency, Environmental Coordination Services, 3091 County Center Drive, Suite 190, Auburn, CA 95603, Attention: Maywan Krach fax (530)745-3080 cdraecs@placer.ca.gov

re: Village at Squaw Valley Draft EIR

Dear Placer County Community Development Resource Agency,

My spouse and I own a 2 bedroom condominium at the Village at Squaw Valley at 22 Station East, purchased upon construction in 2003. The area is wonderful, the skiing and hiking world-class, and my family has many happy memories there. In the last five years I have rented the unit in addition to my own use.

1171-1

From personal experience, travel out of Squaw Valley can be completely immobilized during peak hours. Shown on page 9-14, the traffic performance for Squaw Valley intersections level-of-service rates at C or much worse during peak periods (winter Saturday, Sunday peak hours). No data was provided showing the wait time to leave from the Squaw Valley parking lots, or travel times from the Squaw Valley parking lots to SR89 during peak hours. Nor were new travel times estimated given the density of the proposed development. The widened road alternative (sec 2.3.4) should not be an alternative, but a required mitigation measure for traffic on Squaw Valley Road while at the same time the density of the development should be reduced to meet practicalities of traffic.

1171-2

Current access to the Medical Facility and shuttle turn-around is along Squaw Valley Road (South) and Village East Road through the parking lot. Access to this area will be restricted due new Lot 3 structures. Traffic will then have to pass by the conference center and Village at Squaw Valley parking entrance, a very heavily used area (buses, shuttles, temporary parking). No analysis was given of the impact of narrowing access to this area. The plan appears to disrupt the circulation pattern by creating a long cul de sac leading to a major drop-off point. Lot 3 should be eliminated from the plan.

1171-3

The siting of Lot 3 in close proximity to the existing structures of the Village at Squaw Valley will have a significant negative impact on the visual quality and line of sights from the main entrance to the Village at Squaw Valley and the main conference facility at the Village at Squaw Valley. Lot 3 should be eliminated from the plan.

1171-4

The siting of Lot 3 in close proximity to the existing structures of the Village at Squaw Valley and height of new structures will severely limit sunlight incident on the main entrance to the Village at Squaw Valley and the residences along the east side of Building 22E. The degree of shadowing of existing structures appears to be severe. Lot 3 should be eliminated from the plan.

1171-5

Finally, reference materials presented in the draft EIR (Chapter 3 of reference materials) do not present data for the specific Squaw Valley market. Occupancy at the Village at Squaw Valley last year was 26%. This should be considered a saturated market. Real estate values of that development have decreased 25% over the past decade.

I171-6

I am concerned that the survey information on traffic did not adequately consider peak travel times from the existing parking lot, nor calculate the expected peak travel times with the proposed density, the new circulation patterns around the Village at Squaw Valley and drop-off points, the shadowing of existing structures and vistas, and the market analysis does not look at the specifics of Squaw Valley but only other areas. These short-comings need to be rectified.

I171-7

It would seem unlikely to me that the traffic circulation, shadowing, and visual quality problem I have noted can be resolved given the proposed density, height, and close proximity of the new development to existing structures. I therefore urge the County to reject the draft environmental impact statement. A new plan would have to reduce density to 50% or less, reduce the average height to the same as Village at Squaw Valley, eliminate lot 3, and require widening of Squaw Road to four lanes.

I171-8

Please accept my appreciation for having the opportunity to comment on the draft environmental impact report.

Michael Levi  
melevi@lbl.gov

**I171** Michael Levi  
no date

I171-1 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.

I171-2 The comment states that the traffic analysis did not consider wait and travel times associated with implementation of the project. Study intersections and roadways were selected for analysis in consultation with Placer County staff and based on the project's expected travel characteristics (i.e., project location and amount of project trips) as well as facilities susceptible to being affected by the project, and comments raised in response to the NOP. In addition, a scoping meeting was held with California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) staff on February 27, 2012 to confirm study periods, locations, and analysis methods, as well as roadways that did not require study (such as the mainline for Interstate 80) because of the project size, peaking characteristics, and expected distribution. The analysis in Chapter 9 of the DEIR provides a well-reasoned good-faith effort at disclosing the environmental effects of the project and complies with Placer County and Caltrans requirements associated with traffic analyses. Travel time data for motorists exiting the Squaw Valley parking lots and traveling along Squaw Valley Road were not provided for several other reasons. First and foremost, travel time is not a threshold used by Placer County to analyze impacts to Squaw Valley Road. As is documented in the DEIR, Squaw Valley Road is evaluated by analyzing peak hour traffic volumes at key intersections along the roadway, and analyzing daily traffic volumes on a segment basis. While it is acknowledged that this data could be valuable if available, it would not have been practical to collect this data because it was not known in advance which weekend days would represent the design peak hour. In contrast, traffic data was collected throughout the 2011-2012 season.

The DEIR traffic analysis can be used, however, to assess the marginal impact of the project on travel times, as the LOS analyses present the travel times and delays on individual roadway segments and through the key intersections. Using the results of the level of service analyses presented in the DEIR<sup>1</sup>, Table I171-1 presents an analysis of travel times in key corridors during the key winter travel times. The following two key corridors were analyzed:

1. From SR 89 just north of Deerfield Drive in Truckee to Squaw Valley Road at the Christy Hill Road/Far East intersection (in both directions), and
2. From SR 28 just east of the SR 89 (Wye) intersection in Tahoe City to Squaw Valley Road at the Christy Hill Road/Far East intersection (in both directions)

For each route, the intersection delays on the route's specific movements were identified, along with the travel times along roadway segments (calculated from the roadway length divided by the change in travel time). Adding all travel times for each travel route under both existing and existing plus project conditions and subtracting the existing travel time from the existing plus project travel time yields the net impact of the project on total travel time.

<sup>1</sup> An exception is that the DEIR does not provide Winter PM southbound travel speeds on SR 89 between Squaw Valley Road and Alpine Meadows Road. Instead, northbound speeds are presented, as exiting Alpine Meadows traffic makes this the peak direction. For this segment, LSC conducted LOS analysis using information from the DEIR. Also note, as the DEIR indicates, the proposed project, with traffic control, would not result in a significant change in travel times on Squaw Valley Road.

**Table I171-1 Impact of Village at Squaw Valley on Key Travel Times (Winter Peak-Hour Travel Time)**

Roadway Element	Movement	Dst. (mi)	Existing		Existing + Project		Difference		
			Calculated Average Speed (mph)	Delay or Travel Time (Seconds)	Calculated Average Speed (mph)	Delay or Travel Time (Secs.)	Secs.	%	
<b>Winter a.m. Peak-Hour – Truckee (SR 89 North of Deerfield Dr) to Squaw Valley (Christy Hill Road)</b>									
SR 89/Deerfield Drive	SBT			7.7		8.0	0.3		
SR 89: Deerfield Drive to West River Street	SB	0.4	31.4	45.9	30.9	46.6	0.7		
SR 89/West River Street	SBT			9.3		10.0	0.7		
SR 89: West River Street to Squaw Valley Road	SB	7.9	46.1	616.9	45.5	625.1	8.1		
SR 89 / Squaw Valley Road	SBR			4.0		5.7	1.7		
Squaw Valley Road: SR 89 to Christy Hill Road	WB	2.3	35	236.6		236.6	0.0		
<b>TOTAL</b>				<b>920.4</b>		<b>931.9</b>	<b>11.6</b>		<b>1%</b>
<b>Winter a.m. Peak-Hour – Tahoe City (SR 28 East of the Wye) to Squaw Valley (Christy Hill Road)</b>									
SR 28/SR 89	WBT			16.1		16.4	0.3		
SR 89: SR 28 to Alpine Meadows Road	NB	3.8	36.4	375.8	36.1	378.9	3.1		
SR 89/Alpine Meadows Road	NBT			0.0		0.0	0.0		
SR 89: Alpine Meadows Road to Squaw Vly Rd	NB	1.4	38	132.6	37.7	133.7	1.1		
SR 89 / Squaw Valley Road	NBL			16.2		28.3	12.1		
Squaw Valley Road: SR 89 to Christy Hill Road	WB	2.3	35	236.6		236.6	0.0		
<b>TOTAL</b>				<b>777.3</b>		<b>793.9</b>	<b>16.6</b>		<b>2%</b>
<b>Winter p.m. Peak-Hour – Squaw Valley (Christy Hill Road) to Truckee (SR 89 North of Deerfield Drive)</b>									
Squaw Valley Road: SR 89 to Christy Hill Road	EB			236.6		236.6	0.0		
SR 89 / Squaw Valley Road	EBL			54.7		72.6	17.9		
SR 89: West River Street to Squaw Valley Road	NB	7.9	43.2	658.3	42.2	673.9	15.6		
SR 89/West River Street	NBT			15.5		19.8	4.3		
SR 89: Deerfield Drive to West River Street	NB	0.4	27.4	52.6	26.5	54.3	1.8		
SR 89/Deerfield Drive	NBT			9.7		12.2	2.5		
<b>TOTAL</b>				<b>1027.4</b>		<b>1069.4</b>	<b>42.1</b>		<b>4%</b>
<b>Winter p.m. Peak-Hour – Squaw Valley (Christy Hill Road) to Tahoe City (SR 28 East of the Wye)</b>									
Squaw Valley Road: SR 89 to Christy Hill Road	EB			236.6		236.6	0.0		
SR 89 / Squaw Valley Road	EBR			8.6		10.0	1.4		
SR 89: Squaw Vly Rd to Alpine Meadows Rd	SB	1.4	37.9	133.0	37.4	134.8	1.8		
SR 89/Alpine Meadows Road	SBT			0.0		0.0	0.0		
SR 89: SR 28 to Alpine Meadows Road	SB	3.8	35.4	386.4	34.9	392.0	5.5		
SR 28/SR 89	EBT			19.8		20.0	0.2		
<b>TOTAL</b>				<b>784.4</b>		<b>793.3</b>	<b>8.9</b>		<b>1%</b>

Source: VSVSP DEIR, except for Winter PM travel time on SR 89: Squaw Valley Road to Alpine Meadows calculated by LSC in 2016.

As an example, during the morning peak skier traffic period (winter a.m. peak-hour), the total effect of the proposed project would be an 11.6-second increase in travel time from Truckee to Squaw Valley, based on the sum of roadway and intersection delays included in the LOS analysis. In the busier afternoon peak skier traffic period, the project would increase travel times from Squaw Valley to Truckee by 42.1 seconds. This corresponds to a 4 percent increase in travel time from Squaw Valley to Truckee in the afternoon, and 1 percent in the morning.

The comment states that the Widened Squaw Valley Road Alternative should be a required mitigation measure rather than an alternative. This alternative is discussed in detail in Section 17.3.5 of the DEIR (see pages 17-31 through 17-35). As described therein, this alternative would result in greater impacts than the proposed project due to the additional impact area; however, it was carried forward for analysis in the DEIR because it would reduce the project's significant and unavoidable traffic impacts. It is up to the County decision makers (ultimately, the Board of Supervisors) whether or not to approve the project or an alternative.

Regarding the statement that the density of the development should be reduced to meet practicalities of traffic, see the Master Response regarding the Reduced Density Alternative.

- I171-3 As shown in Exhibit 3-9, Proposed Emergency Vehicle Access, in the DEIR, emergency vehicle access to the Medical Facility will continue to be available via Squaw Valley Road (South) and Village East Road. As also indicated on the exhibit, emergency vehicle access must comply with Squaw Valley Fire Department Emergency Vehicle Access (EVA) standards. It is unclear whether the commenter is interpreting Exhibit 3-5, Illustrative Concept Plan, and similar exhibits as an indication that Village East Road would dead end in the Lot 3 area. If so, this is not the case. As shown in Exhibit 3-7, Proposed Vehicular Circulation Plan, Village East Road continues to connect to the segment entering the existing village area. Village East Road as it passes Lot 3 will have two travel lanes, a seven foot wide bike lane/shoulder on each side, three foot wide curb and gutter on each side, and a 10 foot wide walkway on each side. This is equivalent to, or greater, than the existing width of Village East Road. Therefore, there will be no narrowing of vehicle access ways to the Medical Facility, and two vehicle access pathways will be maintained. It should be noted that the construction of the Transit Center near the creek crossing of Squaw Valley Road would reduce the shuttle bus activity in the cul-de-sac at the south end of Squaw Valley Road.
- I171-4 Visual effects are addressed in Chapter 8, "Visual Resources," of the DEIR and in the Master Response regarding the visual impact analysis. The comment that Lot 3 should be eliminated from the plan 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.
- I171-5 See the Master Response regarding the visual impact analysis for a discussion of shadow effects. The comment that Lot 3 should be eliminated from the plan 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.
- I171-6 The comment states that no data is provided for the specific Squaw Valley market. It is unclear what type of data is requested. Real estate values are an economic issue and as described in Section 15131 of the CEQA Guidelines, should not be treated as an environmental issue. Also, see the Master Response regarding occupancy assumptions.

I171-7 See the Master Response regarding traffic for details related to the traffic surveys. Extensive traffic counts, parking counts and surveys were conducted, in both peak and off-peak times. Also, see response to comment I171-2 regarding travel times.

Regarding shadowing of existing structures and vistas, see the Master Response regarding the visual impact analysis.

It is unclear what market analysis the comment refers to. An *Economic Impact and Urban Decay Analysis* was prepared for the County to evaluate the overall market in which the project would be located, as well as five submarkets and whether the project would result in blighted conditions. Results of this analysis are presented under Impact 4-5 in the DEIR.

I171-8 The comment suggests that the DEIR should be rejected in favor of a new plan that would reduce density to 50 percent or less, reduce the average height to the same as the Village at Squaw Valley, eliminate Lot 3, and require widening of Squaw Valley Road to four lanes. These issues are addressed in the responses above and in the DEIR. 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.

I172

**Maywan Krach**

---

**From:** Lawrence Le Vine <lmlv@earthlink.net>  
**Sent:** Thursday, July 16, 2015 3:29 PM  
**To:** Placer County Environmental Coordination Services  
**Cc:** Sierra Watch  
**Subject:** Squaw Valley plans

Chevis Hosea said "you will not prevent us from maximizing our profit". He said nothing about keeping the current 'vibe' in the valley or willingly working with the SV property owners. If you agree with him, the valley, as we know it, is lost forever. I have no problem with development but expected it to be along the lines of the original plans per Intrawest. The ball is in your court, will you hit a home run or strike out? LMLV

I  
1172-1

Sent from Windows Mail

---

**I172** Lawrence Le Vine  
July 16, 2015

---

I172-1 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.

I173

**Maywan Krach**

---

**From:** Bonne Lewis <bonspawprint@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, July 16, 2015 10:12 AM  
**To:** Placer County Environmental Coordination Services  
**Subject:** Squaw Valley Expansion Objection

To: Placer County Supervisors:

There's not much we can say to add to the many, many comments you have already received. We most definitely and emphatically do agree with all comments objecting to the KSL Capital Partners' proposed project for Squaw Valley.

Squaw Valley is a gem of nature that should be treasured and preserved, not squandered by expanded development of any kind.

The entire proposed project should be stopped!

Respectfully submitted,  
Bonne & David Lewis

I173-1

---

**I173****Bonne Lewis**  
**July 16, 2015**

---

I173-1

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.

**1174**

Linda Lipnosky  
P.O. Box 111  
Kings Beach, CA  
96143

Maya Krach  
Placer County Community Development  
Resource Agency  
3091 County Center Drive, Suite 190  
Auburn, California 95603

Dear Madam:

Deny this development application of KSL  
Capital Partners. Too much damage has  
been done already.

1174-1

Sincerely,  
Linda Lipnosky

---

**I174** Linda Lipnosky  
no date

---

I174-1 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.

I175

**Maywan Krach**

**From:** Susan Lisagor <sblisagor@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, July 17, 2015 2:34 PM  
**To:** Placer County Environmental Coordination Services  
**Subject:** Public Comment re Village at Squaw Valley Specific Plan Draft Environmental Impact Report

To Whom it May Concern:

I am writing to request that the Placer County Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors reject the proposed Village at Squaw Valley Specific Plan Final EIR as presented to them by the planning staff. It is my contention that the DEIR for this project results in too many significant and unavoidable impacts that do not outweigh the benefits the project would bring to Squaw Valley and Placer County. Though I believe the impacts to cultural resources, visual resources, transportation and circulation, noise and greenhouse gas emissions are all too great given the scope of the project, I will limit my discussion to transportation and circulation, and visual resources.

I175-1

I am a retired staffer for US Senator Harry Reid and have a working knowledge of the EIR process, having worked as the rural outreach representative in his Reno district office for several years. I have also been a Squaw Valley homeowner since 1977 and lived full time in the valley for fifteen years over this time span.

Like I was 40 years ago, people are drawn to Squaw Valley because of the stunning and majestic landscape of the valley meadow and the mountains which frame it. Ten story structures compromise those views; the power of its attraction will disappear, and with it, the tourism dollars. I maintain that the height of the buildings needs to be reduced to the height of existing structures to maintain the character and visual quality of the resort. Lower building elevations will also reduce the shadow effect. The DEIR states that there is no sun on the village during certain winter months so it doesn't matter how tall the new structures are, they will not change how much sun hits existing village structures. This is not accurate and needs to be reviewed. The applicant should revise the building elevation to maintain what sun is now striking the village buildings, so as not to lose solar energy and to preserve the vistas. The contention that only the homeowners will be affected by visual changes because they are the only ones who remember what it used to look like is patently incorrect. Half the winter day traffic in Squaw is from pass holders who have long term relationships with the ski area. Again, this is an error in the EIR which needs to be corrected.

I175-2

As to transportation and circulation ( going forward, I will use the term traffic), the DEIR uses incorrect data in its evaluation. The traffic should be reanalyzed, using a traffic simulation for an average winter ski season, as the analysis was not done for an average winter season. The DEIR uses a maximum population estimated at peak of 11-12 thousand, but this doesn't take into account other already approved projects which would bring the peak population up to 17 thousand. Again, this traffic study needs to be redone with accurate data collection.

I175-3

Faulty traffic and population number data makes the whole EIR suspect. If these numbers are wrong, then noise and greenhouse gas emissions are incorrectly figured as they are tied to population increases.

Finally, I request that Policy 1.G.1 be adhered to. That means the significant impacts, cited here and acknowledged in the DEIR, must be adequately mitigated. The proposed mitigations for traffic and visual resources are not adequate to overcome the impacts and therefore the county cannot approve this expansion as proposed. The traffic plan is skimpy, not offering a good public transportation system around the entire valley

I175-4

community and beyond to Truckee and the Lake. At minimum, there should be free buses circulating throughout all roads in the valley, operating from morning till 10 pm, scheduled every 10 minutes, as well as on call. The valley ingress/egress road is not improved in any significant way to prevent 2-3 hour traffic jams with cars idling along it. And there just is no way to mitigate a 10 story building blocking views and sunlight. Even the Resort at Squaw Valley, a structure more suited for an airport hotel than Squaw's meadow, was moved back into the side of the hill to mitigate its visual impact. That cannot be accomplished in the village.

I175-4  
cont.

In conclusion, I want to make it clear that I want to see a robust village in Squaw Valley. I think the parking lot is an eyesore and would benefit from a complete buildout of the village, but this has to be achieved in a way which respects the character of the landscape and gives access not just to village hotel guests but to day skiers and homeowners. I maintain this can be achieved by building structures with parking garages on the lowest level, and heights in keeping with the existing village. It may be in the interest of a real estate developer like KSL to get the most rooms the space can hold, but it is not in the interest of residents, tourists, and the county which stewards the land. We must consider all factors, including the green house gases which settle and concentrate on valley floors, expected to quadruple with a project of the proposed size. By halving the size of this project, I contend this can be a successful development. The project also seeks permission to extend construction over a 25 year period, which is an unreasonable time frame, and I request this be reduced to 10 years. The impact on tourism (to cite an instance, the scenic pleasure experienced by families bicycling on the valley bike path) is just too great to extend over an entire generation.

I175-5

I appeal to you as stewards of this county land and its natural resources, that you reject the proposed project because of its significant and unavoidable impacts and require the applicant to submit an alternative with 50% or fewer bedrooms, lower heights, and revised project features. I understand that this alternative proposal will not address all the project proponents' objectives, but I truly believe that finding a balance between development and acceptable, mitigated impacts should drive this decision and the process going forward. I ask that you gather accurate and relevant data when making your final decision on any future proposed projects. Please consider the long term impacts of your decision on the county's valuable scenic resource.

I175-6

Thank you for taking the time to review and address my concerns. Please keep me in the loop by emailing me all future notices related to the project and the EIR.

Sincerely,

Susan Lisagor  
[sblisagor@gmail.com](mailto:sblisagor@gmail.com)  
775-250-4223  
202 Forest Glen Road  
Olympic Valley, CA 96146

---

**I175** Susan Lisagor  
July 17, 2015

---

- I175-1 The comment suggests that the project not be approved due to the number of significant and unavoidable impacts. See the Master Response regarding significant and unavoidable impacts. 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 also contains an introductory statement and does not address the content, analysis, or conclusions in the DEIR. Therefore, a response is not provided here
- I175-2 Regarding building height, see response to comment I67-6, which discusses the Reduced Building Heights Alternative that was considered, but not evaluated further in the DEIR. Also, see Section 2.1 of this FEIR, for a discussion of the applicant's proposed changes to the proposed building heights.
- Regarding lower building heights resulting in reduced shadow effects, see the Master Response regarding the visual impact analysis, which also addresses viewer groups.
- I175-3 See the Master Response regarding traffic for a discussion of the use of 2011-2012 ski season data to represent existing winter conditions. This comment also makes reference to other approved projects that could increase total skier attendance levels above the 11,367 skiers reported for the 5<sup>th</sup> busiest day of the 2011-2012 season. The cumulative analysis in Section 18.1 of the DEIR evaluated the effects of various reasonably foreseeable land uses. The effect of these future projects was an increase in background traffic on both Squaw Valley Road and SR 89. It is possible that more skiers could use the mountain on a given day when these approved projects are considered. However, because the resort's parking supply can't accommodate this level of skiers, the trip generation of the resort is capped by its parking supply. For the reasons described above and in the Master Response, the DEIR traffic analysis is adequate and no changes to the DEIR are necessary. As such, the DEIR analyses of noise and GHG emissions are similarly adequate and no changes to the DEIR are necessary.
- I175-4 See the Master Response regarding significant and unavoidable impacts, including a discussion of Placer County General Plan Policy 1.G.1.
- Regarding the comment that the traffic plan should offer a good transportation system around the entire Valley community and beyond to Truckee and the Lake, see the Master Response regarding traffic.
- Regarding the comment that no mitigation is available to reduce impacts from a 10-story building blocking views and sunlight, see Chapter 8, "Visual Resources," of the DEIR for impact conclusions and mitigation measures related to views and sunlight. Also, see the Master Response regarding the visual impact analysis and Section 2.1 of this FEIR, for a discussion of the applicant's proposed changes to the proposed building heights.
- I175-5 Regarding building heights, see response to comment I175-2. Regarding the statement that greenhouse gases are expected to "quadruple with a project of the proposed size," see response to comment I140-3. Regarding the statement that the project should be halved in

size, see the Master Response regarding the Reduced Density Alternative. Also, see the Master Response regarding the 25-year construction period.

Nonetheless, 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.

I175-6

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.

I176

**Maywan Krach**

**From:** Robert Loarie <rloarie@comcast.net>  
**Sent:** Thursday, July 09, 2015 5:23 PM  
**To:** Placer County Environmental Coordination Services  
**Cc:** Squaw Valley Lodge - Evan Benjaminson  
**Subject:** Village at Squaw Valley Specific Plan

To: 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 (two units) for more than fifteen years, I have rounded the corner of Squaw Valley Road South where it intersects with Squaw Peak Road scores of times and have nearly always encountered congestion including 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. I am concerned that there is no mention of this impact in the dEIR and believe strongly that it should be disclosed and addressed with appropriate mitigation measures before the dEIR is accepted. We have heard "assurances" from Squaw Valley Real Estate that this will be a "Low Impact Development", but as you well know, assurances are no substitute for specific, written, agreed-upon measures to deal with significant project impacts

I176-1

Also, with construction comes the inevitable noise and traffic necessary to create such a major new development. I am also quite concerned Placer County regulations notwithstanding, there will be unavoidable and excessive noise and traffic. With this in mind, I further request that Placer County review their regulations specifically as they apply to this project and recognize that we are a vacation and resort community that values peace and tranquility, as well as natural beauty. I am sure that there are specific limitations that could and should be imposed to limit the construction noise and traffic, at least during reasonable times of day, days of the week and periods that in any case would normally have high traffic and congestion such as holiday and weekend periods.

I176-2

Thank you.

Robert J. Loarie  
201 Squaw Peak Road Unit #612 and Unit #622 Olympic Valley, CA. 96146

---

**I176** Robert J. Loarie  
July 9, 2015

---

I176-1 See the Master Response regarding traffic issues at Squaw Valley Road and Squaw Peak Road.

I176-2 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.

1177
------

**Maywan Krach**

---

**From:** Jenny Loda <jloda@biologicaldiversity.org>  
**Sent:** Friday, July 17, 2015 7:30 AM  
**To:** Placer County Environmental Coordination Services  
**Cc:** aeberle@endangereearth.org  
**Subject:** Comments on Village at Squaw Valley DEIR  
**Attachments:** Cntr for Bio Div Squaw Valley DEIR Comment.pdf

Please accept the attached comments submitted on behalf of the Center for Biological Diversity. In addition to the comments in the attached .pdf file we have sent a disc via fedex that contains references cited in our comments, as well as another copy of the attached comments. Please do not hesitate to let me know if you have any difficulties with these files or if you have any other questions or concerns. 1177-1

Thank you,  
Jenny Loda  
Amphibian and Reptile Staff Attorney  
Center for Biological Diversity  
1212 Broadway, Ste 800  
Oakland, CA 94612  
(510) 844-7100 x 336  
[JLoda@biologicaldiversity.org](mailto:JLoda@biologicaldiversity.org)  
<http://www.BiologicalDiversity.org>

---

**I177**

Jenny Loda  
July 17, 2015

---

Note: this letter (I177) was inadvertently included in the “individuals” category and comments were numbered accordingly. To avoid renumbering, the letter was left here with a cross-reference to the CBD letter (letter O1).

I177-1            This comment letter (letter I177) serves as the transmittal for the comment letter prepared by the Center for Biological Diversity (letter O1). See responses to comment letter O1 for detailed responses.

I178

**Maywan Krach**

**From:** Timothy Lord <tjlord10@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, June 25, 2015 12:12 PM  
**To:** Placer County Environmental Coordination Services; Brennan Lagasse  
**Subject:** Attn: Maywan Krach - Village at Squaw Valley DEIR  
**Attachments:** Final Paper

To Whom it May Concern,

The Preservation of Community Character at Squaw

Squaw Valley is and has been a Mecca of skiing and riding since its beginnings in 1949. From the start, Squaw’s beautiful peaks have served as a training ground for countless Olympians as well as a welcoming space for the pioneers of our sport to evolve and thrive. Squaw Valley is also called home by many dedicated people and families who love and respect their backyard playground. More than anything, this community has created a culture that is unique and valuable. It’s this community character that is being jeopardized by the development plans proposed by KSL. Within their proposal of up to 850 hotel, condo, and time-share units and a 90,000 square-foot mountain adventure camp, KSL also proposes to demolish historically significant buildings. Further this development will have “significant or potentially significant effects associated with... biological resources, cultural resources, visual resources, and air quality...” as is outlined in the most recent environmental impact report . With an understanding of KSL’s development, it is evident that the community and culture of squaw do not align with such proposal.

I178-1

The preservation of community character is an integral part in the success and survival of Squaw Valley. Factors such as “architectural style, buffers, scale... accessibility, authenticity, or whether something is distinguishable or not” contribute to this notion. This applies to both local and tourist alike who cumulatively form the lifeblood of Squaw. The characteristics that define Squaw Valley specifically can be described as “historic”, “unique”, “genuine”, and have a strong focus on the environment and being outdoors. These qualities are manifested in the general aura of the resort as well as the people. Along with Squaw’s unrivaled terrain, it’s

the atmosphere that is the major draw. With the proposed expansion, the community character that generates this atmosphere will be hindered.

Many facets of KSL’s proposal lie in direct opposition to the principles that form Squaw’s community character. Central to this opposition is the notion of “authenticity”. Squaw has embraced this notion since it’s early days. The mountain has a reputation as a real skiers mountain and prides it self on being distinguishable. If KSL’s development is passed, it is fair to say this “authenticity” will fade. Squaw’s village will likely emulate Vail’s, a contrived European village. The environmental effects are also paramount in this opposition. Squaw Valley, both the people and the resort, are dependent on the environment to maintain a livelihood. This fosters a natural respect for the land and a desire to act appropriately. This feeling is not embodied by the KSL’s development, whose plans will have significant impact the environment. This includes potential issues with the watershed that would be tapped in order to supply the mountain adventure zone. The mountain adventure zone is also problematic in that it promotes an indoor culture. Squaw and the Lake Tahoe area are historically known for the outdoor activities they provide. Whether it’s skiing, mountain biking, or swimming in the lake, our home is the outdoors. This aspect of Tahoe and Squaw Valley is unique and important in maintaining the individuality of the area. The community also sits on the chopping block with the proposal of this plan. Mainly focused on increasing real estate and attracting tourist, the plan does little to support the people that define and give color to Squaw. This breaks the trend of Squaw valuing their community, which has traditionally facilitated a healthy relationship between the mountain and the people that call it home. This bond is vital to the preservation of community character in Squaw Valley and is jeopardized by the current KSL proposal.

1178-1  
cont.

With an understanding of Squaw’s community character and importance, it is possible to find common ground and move forward with some form of development. The community does acknowledge the necessity of attracting tourist to fuel the economy but the way in which it is done needs to accommodate the culture. Moving forward, I propose that the development proposal should reflect the interests and character of the community. The incorporation of the triple bottom line would do well to employ this notion. Encouraging a focus on economic, environment, and social aspects of Squaw would provide a holistic guideline to making decisions. In

1178-2

a sense, the characteristics that the community of Squaw values should be used as a filter in the decision making process. Further, in making these decisions it's critical that the community is allowed to stay involved and engaged in the issues that are impacting them. An example of this application can be applied to the current proposals 90,000 square-foot mountain adventure zone. As this portion of the proposal does not align with the environmental and outdoor culture of the Squaw community, it should be adapted to such needs. This might take the form of lessening the square footage of the project or changing the proposed indoor activities to outdoor activities. There must be accommodation from both parties to find what is truly appropriate for the long-term survival of Squaw. Finding this middle ground is often difficult but important in ensuring stability in social, economic, and environmental realms. This relationship would be viable and advantageous for both KSL and the Squaw Valley. However, until this relationship is formed, going forward with the development proposed by KSL would be detrimental to the overall health of Squaw Valley.

1178-2  
cont.

Thanks for your consideration,

Timothy Lord

---

**I178** Timothy Lord  
June 25, 2015

---

I178-1 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.

I178-2 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.

I179

**Maywan Krach**

**From:** Karen Loro <netlesk@me.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, June 17, 2015 12:21 PM  
**To:** Placer County Environmental Coordination Services  
**Subject:** KSL Capital Partners Squaw Valley Plan

I am writing today to comment on the KSL Squaw Valley Village Specific Plan :

In reading thru the Draft EIR , it is clear that the proposed Development would have Dramatic and Significant Impacts to Squaw Valley .

This Development looks to have many more Negative effects than may be apparent , from increased water usage in an already drought stressed environment, to degradation of Water quality , to Environmental Impact including traffic , which is Already Challenging , degradation of air quality ,increase in noise pollution ,increase in light pollution , among other factors.

In addition , enjoying Winter sports on the mountain would not be enhanced with the addition of more traffic , people , and impacts that would extend to small details such as trash removal .

What brings me to Squaw Valley as a tourist is not More Development .... It is seeking being in Nature , gazing at dark skies ,quiet trails in the back-country , enjoying views , clear , clean water , all of which would be permanently compromised by this project.

I encourage a denial of this proposal and a re-submission of a reasonable proposal.

Karen Loro  
18221 Nubian Way  
Nevada city ,Ca 95959

I179-1

I179-2

I179-3

I179-4

---

**I179**Karen Loro  
June 17, 2015

---

- I179-1 The comment expresses concern about the project's negative effects, including increased water usage in an already drought stressed environment, degradation of water quality, traffic, degradation of air quality, increase in noise pollution, increase in light pollution, etc. 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.
- I179-2 The comment expresses concern that enjoying winter sports on the mountain would not be enhanced with the addition of more traffic, people, and impacts such as trash removal. 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.
- I179-3 The comment expresses concerns that the project would compromise experiences associated with Squaw Valley, such as dark skies, quiet trails, views, and clean water. 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.
- I179-4 The comment is directed towards the project approval process and does not address the content, analysis, or conclusions in the DEIR. Therefore, no further response is provided here. All comment letters submitted during the DEIR public review period will be reviewed and considered by the Placer County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors before a decision on the project is rendered.

I180

**Maywan Krach**

---

**From:** Park Loughlin <ploughlin@blackdogtech.us>  
**Sent:** Saturday, June 27, 2015 6:57 PM  
**To:** Placer County Environmental Coordination Services  
**Subject:** Squaw Valley

Please, Do not let KLS destroy Squaw Valley. The concept is overwhelmingly inappropriate. Just the traffic conditions would be mind boggling. P.Loughlin, san Francisco

I I180-1

---

**I180**

Park Loughlin  
June 27, 2015

---

I180-1

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.