

I201

My name is Linda Morris, current owner of Alpine Rental Group (aka Tahoe Vacation Rentals) located in Alpine Meadows which serves Alpine Meadows and Olympic Valley. Two years ago my husband (a real estate broker of 30 years) and I chose to live in Northstar because of its amenities, well operated HOA, and simply Vail does a terrific job with their golf, Village and ski facilities. We love our move and with real estate prices in Northstar, Lahontan, and Martis Camp as high as they are, I would think Squaw Valley might take some notes.

I201-1

Instead the proposed Squaw Valley development seems absurd since they are not operating what they have well and making it bigger and more diversified does not fix the errors already made.

Proposed

Our community does not need or want an indoor water slide, bowling alley, or more shops and condos. However the outdoor theater and mountain biking are ideas worth pursuing. The theater brings in events everyone can enjoy. The biking provides summer activity when the snow is gone and the infrastructure already is there. The existing condos remain empty much of the year; building more lowers the demand of what currently exists. Why build more when the existing are under used? Why build more shops when the existing are not profitable?

I201-2

What exists

The ice-skating rink and all the other High Camp amenities should have been built where people can easily use it in an elevation even an elderly grandparent can enjoy watching the grandchildren skate. The shuttle service in Alpine Meadows was discontinued after KSL purchased Alpine Meadows. When I suggested starting a shuttle through Squaw since the Alpine route was so popular, I was told by the marketing director it was a liability to run them through the neighborhoods. That was the explanation. It was a liability to run a shuttle on county roads. Northstar's shuttle is fabulous and may locals and visitors love the relationship Vail has with Northstar Property Owners Association. Squaw should take note to continue what was enjoyed and expound those ideas. Giving the OK to build out the parking area to a company that shuts down what works does not seem like a good idea.

I201-3

Recourses

Having a redundant water supply is prudent. Obtaining it from an adjacent supply minimizes cost and environmental impact. If Squaw needs it, they should get it from Alpine Meadows. There are numerous springs just upslope from Snow Crest Road. Why would anyone consider Squaw Valley utilities to pump from Martis Valley? Think Mono Lake. Mono's water was diverted to Los Angeles until lake level amounts became critical. Long story short, water diversion impacts an ecosystem. Needless to say installing the infrastructure would greatly impact habitat initially and the long term could be devastating. In my surmise it would be irreversibly catastrophic to a wildlife sanctuary. Since moving to Northstar, we see migrating birds, local species diversification, hunting coyotes, bears with cubs...much more than what we observed in the 30 years on Tahoe's West Shore. Martis Valley is a

I201-4

very special habitat and I am adamantly against diverting water to supply an ill-conceived plan.

I 1201-4
cont.

Let Squaw Valley use what they have and build a few improvements like the theater and mountain biking. I do not have confidence in their business plan nor do I believe in their use of water from Martis Valley.

I 1201-5

Please, more is not always better.

Thank you for your time.

Linda lindamorris96161@gmail.com

I201Linda Morris
no date

- I201-1 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.
- I201-2 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. Also, see the Master Response regarding the MAC.
- I201-3 The comment expresses dissatisfaction with existing conditions at Squaw Valley, such as the location of the ice skating rink and other High Camp amenities as well as existing shuttle service. No specific issues related to the content, analysis, or conclusions in the DEIR are raised in this comment. No further response is provided here.
- I201-4 The comment implies that the project is seeking water supply from Martis Valley. This is not part of the proposed project. As described in the DEIR, sufficient water is available in the Olympic Valley to serve the project and other cumulative development. Also, please see the Master Response regarding water supply.
- I201-5 The comment provides concluding remarks, but no comments on the content of the DEIR.

I202

Maywan Krach

From: Alexander Fisch
Sent: Monday, July 13, 2015 3:28 PM
To: Maywan Krach
Subject: FW: Squaw Valley Proposal

Please add to the list of comments.

-----Original Message-----

From: JenniferAnne Morrison [<mailto:jenniferanne.morrison12@gmail.com>]
Sent: Monday, July 13, 2015 3:26 PM
To: Alexander Fisch
Subject: Squaw Valley Proposal

To those it may concern,

I would like to beg the officials of Placer County to please not approve the Squaw Valley Expansion Plan. I am a former resident of Olympic Valley. My mother still has a house in the valley; I had to move away for school.

Squaw is a beloved place, and part of its charm is that it is not an obscene, overwrought, ugly Disney-like resort like Aspen or Vail. It fits well with the natural scenery. It does not clash with the beauty of the environment around it.

KSL wants to make Squaw a place for Bay Area people who do not understand or appreciate the wild scenic beauty of the Granite Chief Wilderness. They do not understand or appreciate the natural wonder of the Tahoe National Forest. All they want is a latte to sip and a fancy condo to stay in.

The proposed plan will ruin the way of life for locals. These are your constituents; visitors from other parts of California are not. Please protect your constituents.

I plan on returning to live in Placer County once I have finished earning my Master's degree in Davis, and I can tell you that I will be heartbroken if Squaw changes for the worst. I will not be voting for any county official who approves this plan.

Thank you for your attention,

Jennifer Morrison

I202-1

I202

Jennifer Morrison
July 13, 2015

I202-1

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.

I203

Maywan Krach

From: doramoutaf@gmail.com on behalf of DORA MOUTAFIAN
<doramoutaf@earthlink.net>
Sent: Wednesday, July 08, 2015 10:07 AM
To: Placer County Environmental Coordination Services
Subject: 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.

I203-1
I203-2

Also, with construction comes the inevitable noise and traffic necessary to create a future Village. Yet there is the expectation that, Placer County regulations notwithstanding, 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.
Thank you.

Dora Moutafian

201 Squaw Peak Road Unit #
801

Olympic Valley, CA. 96146



--

Dora Moutafian

I203

Dora Moutafian
July 8, 2015

I203-1 See the Master Response regarding traffic issues at Squaw Valley Road and Squaw Peak Road.

I203-2 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.

Robert Mowris, P.E.

P.O. Box 2141, Olympic Valley, CA 96146 ♦ robert@rma-energy.com

I204

Date: July 17, 2015

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

To: Attn: Maywan Krach
Placer County Community Development Resource Agency
3091 County Center Drive, Suite 190, Auburn, CA 95603
Tel: (530) 745-3081, cdraecs@placer.ca.gov

From: Robert Mowris, P.E., robert@rma-energy.com

Introduction

My name is Robert Mowris, and I have been a registered professional engineer in California for 30 years. I earned a masters degree in Civil, Architectural, and Environmental Engineering from the University of Colorado, Boulder. I earned undergraduate degrees in Mechanical Engineering and Education from the University of Wisconsin, Madison. I have been a full-time resident in Olympic Valley for 16 years with my wife and four children. We own a home in Olympic Valley and a condominium in the Village at Squaw Valley. Our engineering consulting business is involved with evaluation, measurement, and verification of energy and water efficiency programs. We have an office in Olympic Valley, California, Reno, Nevada, and Corona, California. I have published more than 60 peer-reviewed papers on energy and water efficiency and renewable energy. My family and I are runners, hikers, skiers, and backpackers. I hike or run 8 to 10 miles per day on trails in Olympic Valley along Squaw Creek and the Truckee River. Our family is familiar with the watershed, wildlife, and ecosystem. Our home in Olympic Valley is energy efficient and equipped with 16 solar electric panels (3200W) and two solar water heating panels. My professional career for the past 30 years has been focused on resource efficiency and renewable energy to reduce the impact of global warming.

I204-1

Comments are provided with respect to the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the Village at Squaw Valley Specific Plan (VSVSP).

Comments

My primary concerns regarding the DEIR are with respect to the lack of clearly-defined mitigation requirements associated with negative environmental impacts on residents, wildlife, air quality, energy use, water use, greenhouse gas emissions, traffic, and noise. I am also concerned about the proposed 25-year development and construction period.

1. Economic Impacts and 25-year Construction Period Impacts

The DEIR does not include an analysis of the economic impacts associated with adding 850 more condominiums to Squaw Valley over the proposed 25-year construction period. The reference materials provide the Economic Impact and Urban Decay Analysis (EIUDA) by Goodwin Consulting Group (GCG). Figure 5-1 of the EIUDA provides historical hotel/motel occupancy rates and the 2010-14 5-year average is 49%. Figure 5-3 of the EIUDA provides the projected lodging occupancy rates at build out of 42% indicating oversupply of rooms. Page 37 of the EIUDA provides the following conclusions.

“Since short-term rental condos typically experience much lower occupancy rates than traditional hotels, and because build-out of both scenarios would not increase the supply to a level that would lower occupancy rates to below the current 42% overall average or the 5-year hotel/motel average of 49%, build-out of both scenarios should not create long-term structural vacancies that could lead to urban decay. This does not mean that individual hotels will not be affected. Each business must be well-run and work to satisfy customer needs in order to capture a sustainable share of the hospitality market. Some trade area hotels may need to adjust their operations or make new investments in their properties. Nevertheless, there should be sufficient market demand to support all of the existing and planned hotel rooms in the trade area.”

These conclusions are not supported by findings. Existing condominium rentals are currently vacant approximately 51% of the year. The current real estate market for existing condominiums is insufficient for owners to sell condominiums for the same price as purchased in 2007 during the height of the real estate bubble. There are many weeks of the year where condominiums are vacant and village retail businesses and restaurants are closed or unable to be economically viability. Adding 850 more condominiums to the valley will reduce demand, cut rental prices, and create urban decay. Noise, dust, and traffic delays associated with the 25-year construction period will have significant impacts on real estate property values and the environment. For this reason the current project should be scaled back by 50%. Construction should only be allowed during weekdays from 7 AM to 5PM for three two-year cycles with a two year break in between each cycle. This will reduce the total estimated construction time to 10 years. The proposed 25-year construction period is too long and will create unacceptable environmental impacts.

I204-2

Recommendations Regarding Economic Impacts and 25-year Construction Period

Recommend adding another chapter to the DEIR to include an assessment of the long-term economic impact on Squaw Valley from urban decay which would cause significant environmental impacts on residents, wildlife, air quality, energy use, water use, traffic, and noise. A more thorough EIUDA should be prepared to evaluate future condominium occupancy rates and develop mitigation strategies to address urban decay and economic sustainability. The DEIR should also include mitigation measures to reduce the unacceptable environmental impacts associated with the 25-year construction period. Measures should be evaluated to ensure all available mitigation options are analyzed per CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.4 (a) (B).

2. Chapter 13 Hydrology and Water Quality

Chapter 13, Hydrology and Water Quality (page 13-80) provides the following discussion for proposed snow storage. “Under the developed conditions scenario (Exhibit 13-30), the snow storage locations and sizes will have been adjusted, and will include five snow storage locations totaling 6.7 acres. The required snow storage area according to the SVGPLUO formula is calculated to decrease from 5.6 to 3.6 acres because the plowed (cleared) area will decrease from 28.3 to 17.8 acres and in-situ storage will increase.” The DEIR states that “This would be a less-than-significant impact.”

The DEIR does not include an analysis of impacts the proposed development will have on snow storage for the existing village. Snow removed from the existing village is currently transported to the East Parcel across from SVPSD. According to the Appendix D of the VSVSP, the East Parcel is designated for development for the proposed employee/workforce housing, market, and delivery center.¹ Development of the East Parcel will eliminate snow storage for the existing village and require transportation of snow to undefined areas outside the Squaw Creek watershed. This will have a significant impact on aquifer recharge and increase greenhouse gas emissions. The annual increase in greenhouse gas emissions is missing from Chapter 16, Greenhouse Gases and Climate Change (GGCC). Table 16-2, Summary of Annual Greenhouse Gas Emissions Associated with the Specific Plan at Full Build out in 2037, does not include the impact of increased fuel and greenhouse gas emissions from transporting snow outside the Squaw Creek watershed after the existing village snow storage area is eliminated when the East Parcel is developed for employee housing. The impact of removing snow from the existing village and reducing Squaw Creek aquifer recharge is also not addressed in the Hydrology and Water Quality Chapter 13. The DEIR does not provide any specific proposals to mitigate GGCC impacts or hydrology impacts associated with elimination of snow storage at the East Parcel or moving snow to undesignated areas outside the Squaw Creek watershed.

I204-3

Similar comments were previously submitted by Judy Carini.²

“Snow that is removed from the core area does not benefit our aquifer, which is fed by the snow that falls on the valley floor. KSL should be required to designate areas in the core area that are large enough to store all the snow that is removed from the Village and parking lot areas. This would allow the snow to eventually work its way into our aquifer.”

Recommendations Regarding Chapter 13

The DEIR needs to be revised to include mitigation strategies to accommodate existing village snow storage in area 3 and/or area 4 as defined in Chapter 13, exhibit 13-30, “Developed Conditions Snow Storage Storm water Quality and Treatment Concepts.” This will provide additional water for Squaw Creek and potential recharge for the aquifer and reduce or eliminate fuel used to transport snow to the East Parcel or outside the Squaw Creek watershed in order to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. The analysis should be included in Chapter 13 and Chapter 16. Mitigation measures should be evaluated to ensure all available mitigation options are analyzed per CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.4 (a) (B).

¹ VSVSP. Appendix D. Conceptual Employee/Workforce Housing Plan.

² J. Carini. July 10, 2014. Developing Squaw Valley: Another Approach. Page 15.

3. Chapter 11 Noise and Appendix D Employee/Workforce Housing

Chapter 11, Noise, provides the Placer County allowable noise levels applicable to new projects affected by or including non-transportation noise sources (see Table 11-6). The acceptable noise level is 50 dBA for “other residential” Ldn at property line of receiving use.³ Table 11-7 provides 60 dBA as the Placer County maximum allowable noise exposure for transportation noise sources. Table 11-8 provides a 45 dBA maximum noise level from 10 PM to 7 AM per the Placer County Noise Ordinance Noise Level Standards for Sensitive Receptors.

Chapter 11, section 11.7.4 provides the impact analysis of noise. Impact 11-1, construction noise impacts, indicates construction noise “impacts would be significant.” Page 11-19 provides the following information.

“Based on the information provided in Table 11-9, and accounting for typical usage factors of individual pieces of equipment and activity types, worst-case construction-related activities (daytime) could result in noise levels of up to 94 dBA Leq and 98 dBA Lmax at 50 feet from the acoustical center of the construction site. Nighttime construction activities could result in noise levels of up to 79 dB Leq and 84 dB Lmax at 50 feet from the construction site and could result in a temporary increase (i.e., during construction periods) in excess of 5 dB above current levels.”

Page 11-21 indicates efforts to mitigate construction noise
Implementation of “mitigation measures 11-1a and 11-2b would continue to produce disruptive daytime noise over an extended period. Thus, this impact would remain significant and unavoidable.”

I204-4

Page 11-24 provides exposure of existing sensitive receptors to new or additional operational project-generated stationary noise sources (Impact 11-3).

“The project would result in the development of various land uses (e.g., residential, lodging, commercial, and retail). Noise sources associated with these land uses include Heating Ventilation and Air Conditioning (HVAC) units, back-up emergency generators, vehicular and human activity in parking lots, loading dock and delivery activities at commercial/retail land uses, and activities at outdoor recreational land uses. Exact locations, building foot prints, and building orientation have not been finalized; it is unknown specifically where future stationary noise sources may be located. Therefore, considering the relatively large-scale of development and the close proximity to existing off-site sensitive receptors of proposed land use development, it is possible that new stationary noise sources would result in excessive noise levels at existing sensitive receptors and exceed applicable Placer County noise standards. This impact would be potentially significant.”

Page 11-28 provides exposure of new sensitive receptors to existing and new stationary noise sources (Impact 11-4).

“The project would result in the development of mixed-use resort type land uses including new noise-sensitive receptors (e.g., resort residential units, hotels). Existing ambient noise would not exceed Placer County land use noise standards for this type of

³ Day-Night Level (Ldn) is the energy average of A-weighted sound levels occurring over a 24-hour period with a 10-dB “penalty” applied to A-weighted sound levels occurring during nighttime hours between 10 PM and 7 AM.

development and, therefore, new sensitive receptors would not be exposed to excessive noise levels from existing sources. However, new sensitive receptors would be located in close proximity to new stationary noise sources (e.g., HVAC units, electrical generators, outdoor activity areas, parking lots, and commercial loading docks) associated with Specific Plan, which could expose these receptors to noise in excess of allowable noise levels. This impact would be potentially significant.”

Page 11-30 provides exposure of new and existing sensitive receptors to operational project-generated transportation noise sources (Impact 11-5).

“Implementation of the project could expose existing and future planned sensitive receptors to transportation noise levels that exceed the Placer County noise standard of 60 dBA Ldn at the property line of residential land uses. Therefore, this impact would be significant.”

Page 11-33 provides mitigation measure 11-5 to reduce transportation noise exposure to sensitive receptors.

“For new sensitive receptors developed as part of the proposed project and that would be located within 170 feet of the centerline of Squaw Valley Road (i.e., the distance from the centerline that is estimated, based on the noise modeling, to result in exceedance of the Placer County transportation-related exterior noise standard of 60 dBA Ldn), the following design criteria shall be adhered to: building materials and design shall be used that achieve, at a minimum, 25 dBA of exterior-to-interior noise attenuation. In all cases, interior noise levels comply with the Placer County interior noise standard of 45 dBA Ldn. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 11-5 would reduce exposure of traffic-generated noise at new sensitive receptors. However, as described below, no feasible mitigation is available for existing sensitive receptors.”

I204-4
cont.

Appendix D of the DEIR discusses the “Conceptual Employee/ Workforce Housing Plan.” The Specific Plan allows for up to 264 beds in up to 21 units for employee housing on the East Parcel (see Table 3.1 of the January 2014 VSVSP). The proposed development is located at the East Parcel directly across from the SVPSD offices and Squaw Valley Academy (private boarding school). Table 11-4 in Chapter 11, Noise, indicates noise levels from 59.3 to 68.2 dB at the East Parcel. The measured noise levels currently at the East Parcel make this property unsuitable for employee housing and exceed the maximum allowable Placer County residential noise levels of 60 dBA. For comparison a quiet urban night time noise levels are 40 dB and rural night time noise levels are 20 dB. Noise from the proposed employee housing, food market, and deliver center at the East Parcel would negatively impact boarding students across the street at Squaw Valley Academy and residents living on Creeks End, Rock Garden Court, and Winding Creek Road.

Recommendations Regarding Chapter 11 and Appendix D

Chapter 11 and Appendix D of the DEIR need to be revised to properly address the significant impacts of noise pollution since none of the proposed mitigation strategies adequately address increased noise levels beyond the Placer County maximum allowable noise levels. Measures should be evaluated to ensure all available mitigation options are analyzed per CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.4 (a) (B).

4. Chapter 16 Greenhouse Gases and Climate Change

Page 16-15 provides the following information about operational greenhouse gas emissions (Impact 16-2).

“GHGs associated with operation of the Specific Plan would exceed the Tier I mass-emission threshold of 1,100 MT CO₂e/year; however, operational GHGs would not exceed the GHG efficiency-based Tier II threshold recommended by PCAPCD for 2020. Nevertheless, GHG emissions would be substantial and may be less efficient than needed to achieve GHG reduction targets that could be in place after 2020, when the project is completed. Therefore, operation of the Specific Plan has the potential to result in a substantial contribution to GHG emissions. This impact would be potentially significant.”

Page 16-17 (Table 16-3) provides a summary of annual GHG emissions associated with the No Action Taken (NAT) and full-build-out scenarios in 2020 (MT CO₂e/year). The DEIR makes the following assumption regarding GHG reductions.

“In the full-build-out scenario, consumption of both propane for space and water heating and electricity for powering appliances and lighting would be approximately 25 percent less due to implementation of the California Building Efficiency Standards (Title 24, Section 6) (Green, pers. comm. 2014b).”

On page 16-19 the discussion of significance after mitigation provides no specifically defined actions or measures to be implemented by the developer to reduce GHG emissions. “For this reason, and because the project would emit a substantial level of GHG emissions, the residual impact is potentially significant and unavoidable.”

On page 16-21, Chapter 16 indicates that “No mitigation is required.”

Recommendations Regarding Chapter 16

Increased greenhouse gas emissions will have serious global and local environmental consequence including impacts on annual snowfall, the watershed, wildlife, fire danger, and long-term economic sustainability of the proposed project. The DEIR should be revised to include clearly defined actions or measures to be implemented by the developer to mitigate GHG emissions. Energy efficiency is a proven and cost-effective resource capable of reducing building energy use (i.e., propane and electricity) by 20 to 90%. Robert Mowris has co-authored many regional and national studies on behalf of the American Council for an Energy Efficient Economy (ACEEE), Union of Concerned Scientists (UCS), and Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC) to evaluate the potential for energy and resource efficiency to reduce GHG emissions by 20 to 90%. The First Ascent HOA implemented a complete energy efficiency upgrade of their boiler system at the request of Mr. Mowris with annual propane savings of approximately 40 to 50%. Similar LED upgrades of existing inefficient lighting systems reduced energy use by more than 70 to 90%.

The policies proposed in the specific plan provide a list of generic energy efficiency improvements (i.e., energy efficiency, mechanical systems, building envelope, waste, minimization, indoor lighting/appliances, water efficient appliances), but no specific actions or measures are identified by the developer that are required in the DEIR to mitigate GHG emissions. The DEIR needs to specifically define actions or measures the developer is required to implement to reduce GHG emissions. These mitigation measures should be evaluated to

I204-5

ensure all available mitigation options are analyzed per CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.4 (a) (B).

I204-5
cont.

5. Fractional Cabins replaced with Upgraded Existing Homes

The Specific Plan includes fractional cabins on Lots 16 and 18 within the 6200 to 6300 feet elevation adjacent to the undeveloped aquifer recharge zone identified in the Water Supply Assessments (WSA) (Moran, LLNL 2013 & Williams, HydroMetrics 2013). Most recharge to the Squaw Valley aquifer comes from just above 6300 feet around the perimeter of the valley. Table 13-4 describes this "mountain front" area that feeds directly into the existing well field. These lots represent the largest remaining completely undisturbed area proposed for new impervious coverage by the development. The DEIR summarizes the impacts to groundwater recharge due to impervious coverage increases as "less than significant." This needs to be verified with scientific analysis. The DEIR does not adequately analyze these issues.

I204-6

Given the uncertain groundwater drawdown impacts of the project which require monitoring and response plans as the project proceeds to ensure impact avoidance, it is clear that the protection of the Lots 16 and 18 should have been evaluated as a potential mitigation measure to accompany the monitoring requirements. This measure should be evaluated to ensure all available mitigation options are analyzed per CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.4 (a) (B). A groundwater basin recharge map should be created for the uplands immediately above the entire village setting.

Recommendations Regarding Fraction Cabins

The plans for fractional cabins should be replaced with buying older homes in Squaw Valley as they become available for sale and upgrading them to be energy efficient and equipped with solar electric and solar water heating panels. This would provide the developer with the same number of fractional cabins and zero impact on the existing aquifer. There are many older homes in Squaw Valley with single pane windows, minimal insulation, and inefficient heating systems. Upgrading older homes and selling them as fractional ownership cabins would be more environmentally sustainable than building new cabins on undeveloped upper elevation property.

I204-7

The DEIR should be revised to include analysis of replacing the fractional cabins with upgraded existing homes to include state-of-the-art energy efficiency measures with solar electric and solar water heating panels. This mitigation measure should be evaluated to ensure all available mitigation options are analyzed per CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.4 (a) (B).

Thank you for your consideration.

Respectfully,



Robert J. Mowris, P.E.

I204Robert J. Mowris, P.E.
July 17, 2015

I204-1

The comment is an introductory statement and does not address the content, analysis, or conclusions in the DEIR. Therefore, a response is not provided here.

The comment also provides a summary of detailed comments provided below. See responses to the detailed comments below.

I204-2

The comment disagrees with assumptions made related to occupancy rates. See the Master Response regarding occupancy assumptions. The potential for urban decay is addressed in the DEIR under Impact 4-5 (Economic or social changes resulting in physical environmental changes). The commenter offers observations regarding relative use of condominiums at the existing Squaw Valley Village, but no evidence to support the contention that the project would cause blight in the village.

See the Master Response regarding the 25-year construction period. Regarding the comment that the project should be scaled back by 50 percent, see the Master Response regarding the Reduced Density Alternative.

I204-3

The comment addresses issues related to snow storage, stating that the DEIR should be revised to include mitigation strategies to accommodate existing village snow storage. This issue is addressed in Impact 13-7 and Mitigation Measure 13-7. Operational greenhouse gas emissions, including those related to snow removal, are discussed under Impact 16-2 in the DEIR.

Also, see response to comment I52-10 regarding offsite snow storage and the Master Response regarding water supply for a discussion of aquifer recharge.

I204-4

The commenter summarizes the conclusions of the DEIR noise analysis and states that existing noise levels at the East Parcel are excessive and therefore the East Parcel is unsuitable for the proposed employee housing. The DEIR includes Mitigation Measure 11-4b that would ensure interior noise standards are met for all new development. Further, additional mitigation has been included in the FEIR to reduce exterior noise from Squaw Valley Road. See the Master Response regarding noise for further details.

I204-5

The comment provides a summary of the DEIR's analysis and mitigation of operational GHG emissions under Impact 16-2, which appears on pages 16-15 through 16-19. The commenter then states, "On page 16-21, Chapter 16 indicates that "No mitigation is required." The statement that "No mitigation is required" refers to the analysis of impacts of climate change on the project analyzed under Impact 16-3.

The commenter also points out that Mitigation Measure 16-2, which requires the implementation of an ongoing operational greenhouse gas review and reduction program, "provides no specifically defined actions or measures to be implemented by the developer to reduce GHG emissions." As explained on page 3-33 of the DEIR, "the Specific Plan would be developed over an estimated 25-year buildout period." Explanation for not including detailed, defined requirements in Mitigation Measure 16-2 is provided on page 16-19 under the heading, "Significance after Mitigation." Here the DEIR explains, "it is not known whether the proposed project would achieve threshold targets identified for the years after 2020, because such targets do not yet exist and it would be speculative to assume what they might be and/or what regulations will be in place to help achieve them." And further, "important

factors are not currently known: the GHG emissions target in effect at the time that subdivisions are submitted after 2020; the effectiveness of regulatory actions already adopted as part of the implementation of the Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006; and the potential for application of new regulations and their effectiveness. Further, the cost and feasibility of certain policies that would be mandated as mitigation are not known.” It is also not know if and when new GHG reduction measures will be required by law.

The comment then recommends various publications which offer ideas for reducing GHG emissions, by reducing building energy use, including sources the commenter has co-authored on behalf of the American Council for an Energy Efficient Economy, Union of Concerned Scientists, and Natural Resources Defense Council. The County acknowledges that measures identified in these and other publications can be considered when individual projects are processed by the County after 2020, if necessary to meet performance standards pursuant to Mitigation Measure 16-2. See also the Master Response regarding the GHG analysis.

I204-6 See the Master Response regarding the water supply for a discussion of groundwater recharge and aquifer recharge.

I204-7 The commenter suggests that the proposed fractional cabins on Lots 16 and 18 should be replaced with buying older homes in Squaw Valley as they become available for sale, and upgrading them to be energy efficient and equipped with solar electric and solar water heating panels. This would not meet most of the project objectives. Please see Chapter 17, “Alternatives,” in the DEIR.

I205

Maywan Krach

From: Muschott, Alan <alan.muschott@franklintempleton.com>
Sent: Friday, June 05, 2015 4:06 PM
To: Placer County Environmental Coordination Services
Subject: Squaw Valley Draft EIR and Specific Plan - Pedestrian Crossing at Squaw Valley Road/Far East Road/Christy Hill Road intersection.

I am a part-time resident of Olympic Valley residing in the Christy Hill Condominiums at 1609 Christy Hill Road. I regularly walk to and from the existing village at Squaw Valley, crossing Squaw Valley Road to do so. Christy Hill Road is perhaps the most convenient place for pedestrians to cross Squaw Valley Road for all of the pedestrian traffic coming from the residences on the North side of Olympic Valley (the location of the majority of the single family homes in Olympic Valley). I have found that crossing Squaw Valley Road as a pedestrian at Christy Hill Road/Far East Road is a somewhat dangerous endeavor in the best of times, and is much more risky during ski season and at night. Traffic tends to move very quickly down Squaw Valley Road and there is no marked crosswalk or any other traffic control at that intersection.

In reviewing the Draft EIR and Specific Plan, I don't see any provisions for pedestrians trying to cross Squaw Valley Road from the north side of the road to the development being proposed. In the Draft EIR, Section 9.1.1 sets forth the intersection of Squaw Valley Road/Far East Road/Christy Hill Road as part of the "study area". The study concluded that peak traffic currently exceeds 1,000 cars/hour on Squaw Valley Road (Tables 9-2 and 9-3). Traffic on Squaw Valley Road is expected to increase by 6-10% during winter peak hours and by 131% during summer peak hours (Draft EIR p. 9-55). The plan anticipates a "significant Impact" at that intersection caused by increased traffic (Draft EIR table 9-21). While the plan attempts to address vehicle traffic by sending vehicles from the neighborhood on the north side of Squaw Valley Road to Eric Road or Wayne Road (Mitigation Measure 9-2b), it does not address the disruption to traffic caused by pedestrians crossing at Christy Hill Road/Far East Road, nor does it set forth any measures to ensure the safety of those pedestrians. The Draft EIR states there will be a less than significant impact on pedestrians (Impact 9-6). However, I believe the Draft EIR is incorrect in this statement as it fails to address the impact to pedestrians trying to enter or leave the development plan area at Christy Hill Road/Far East Road. Additionally, in the Specific Plan sections 4.2, Goal OS-1 sets forth a goal to "Emphasize an all-season pedestrian environment within the village" and 4.3 states the intent to "create a high quality pedestrian mountain environment which encourages walking...". However, I believe the plan fails to meet those goals if it doesn't create a safe way for pedestrians to get into the development area in the first place. I believe the safety of pedestrians crossing Squaw Valley Road at Christy Hill Road/Far East Road must be addressed through traffic control measures that may include lighted and marked pedestrian crosswalks, stop signs or stop lights for pedestrians, an over or under pass, or some other method.

I205-1

Thank you for considering this very important safety issue.

Sincerely,

Alan Muschott

Notice: All email and instant messages (including attachments) sent to or from Franklin Templeton Investments (FTI) personnel may be retained, monitored and/or reviewed by FTI and its agents, or authorized law enforcement personnel, without further notice or consent.

I205Alan Muschott
June 5, 2015

I205-1

The comment expresses concern that degraded traffic conditions associated with Christy Hill Road and Far East Road would result in safety concerns for pedestrians. As discussed under Impact 9-6, the proposed project would include crosswalks at appropriate intervals to ensure pedestrians can safely traverse across the entire plan area. Appropriate lighting and safety signage, such as yield signs, stop signs, pedestrian crossing signs and pedestrian warning beacons, would be installed in conjunction with the crosswalks. The specific location for crosswalks and other pedestrian safety features would be determined during detailed design phases of the project. Also, see Section 2.1, "Project Modifications," of this FEIR for a description of crosswalks that would be installed outside of the Specific Plan area along Squaw Valley Road.

I206

Maywan Krach

From: Ed Natrass <enatrass@att.net>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2015 3:40 PM
To: Placer County Environmental Coordination Services
Cc: Helga Roghers
Subject: Squaw Valley Desecration

Please deny the Squaw Valley expansion. I am 73 and will probably not be around to see the completion of such a travesty, but would like my children and grandchildren to enjoy a beautiful valley, not a Sierra Disneyland. In the 70s we prevented a four lane highway around the Lake and a bridge across Emerald Bay. Developers, regardless of what they say, only want to make as much money as possible. Our legacy to future generations depends on your denying this project.

Ed Natrass
POB 892
Carmelian Bay, CA 96140

I206-1

I206Ed Nattrass
July 16, 2015

I206-1

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.

I207

July 15, 2015

Placer County Community Development Resource Agency
Environmental Coordination Services
3092 County Center Dr. Suite 190
Auburn, CA 95603
Attn: Maywan Krach

RE: Comment on Village at Squaw Valley Specific Plan DEIR

Mesdames/Messieurs:

I have owned a home in Olympic Valley for over 23 years. I am familiar with the process involved and have participated on many Draft and EIR documents during my tenure as a Board member of the Environmental Quality Control Board for the city of Seal Beach, as a an elected official serving tenure as a School Trustee for the Los Alamitos Unified School District.

I207-1

While I support a more vigorous village, I am very worried about the excessive mass and urbanization of this proposal. Some of my concerns about this DEIR are noted below.

1. Shadowing study conclusion is flawed. It says:

"Impact 8-4: Create additional shadowing on existing structures or outdoor public gathering areas during a substantial portion of the day. The increased density of structures and increased height of structures would have the potential to increase shadows on public outdoor gathering areas, especially in the winter when the sun is at a low angle. However, because the shadow effect from the mountain to the south of the project site already covers much of the project site in the winter, the seasonal changes to shadowing conditions on adjacent public gathering places would not be worsened by the project. The project's impacts on adjacent properties due to shadowing would, therefore, be less than significant."

I207-2

Yet DEIR Exhibit 8-21 shows the current and proposed village in full sunshine at noon on December 21. In fact Google Earth for December 21 shows the entire village (current and proposed) in full sunshine at noon. The shadowing study conclusions must be changed and recirculated so the public is properly informed. The mountain to the south of the project does not cover much of the project site in winter.

Also Google Earth for December 21 shows the village (current and proposed) in full sunshine from 10 am to 4 pm. The study must show the impacts so the public and decision makers can decide what is a significant impact. All times of the day must be evaluated especially in winter. The study does not present enough information for a clear understanding of the shadow impacts. At least show 10 am and 11am December 21. Showing 9am on December 21 is of no value.

Also please confirm the amount of shadowing by the proposed parking structures onto the creek to confirm impacts on current vegetation and animals (as creek restoration will not happen for years) and proposed vegetation and expected animals. What is the required setback for the large parking structure from the creek? A large parking structure right next to a public creek will have impacts on the creek setting. What are they?

|

2. The proposed tram linking Squaw and Alpine has been fully and repeatedly publicly announced. Most recently, on July 2, 2015 Squaw stated:

"You, and thousands like you, have expressed interest in staying up-to-date on the proposed base-to-base gondola connection between Squaw Valley and Alpine Meadows. As such, you are among the first to know that Squaw Valley | Alpine Meadows will soon submit plans to Placer County and the US Forest Service in order to begin the public review and approval process."

| 1207-3

The impacts of the announced project must be evaluated in the cumulative section. What are the impacts of this project?

3. Visual: The new village completely abandons the current open village view of the tram mountain. Isn't this a significant negative visual impact? Is it a negative circulation impact?

| 1207-4

4. The transition from old village to new village is not clearly described. The public areas are not at the same elevation. Does one walk up and down stairs? How will bikes process from old village to new village? How will handicapped individuals process this transition? Any outdoor stairs will be dangerous in winter. How will this danger be mitigated? How will these stairs be plowed? These poor transitions from existing to new Village areas are inconsistent with the goals of the SVGPLUO and Design Guidelines calling for cohesiveness with the existing village and pedestrian orientation and, as a result, would result in significant land use impacts. The pedestrian safety issues would result in a significant hazard, a CEQA issue.

| 1207-5

5. The proposed traffic mitigations are unproven and speculative. What happens if the mitigations do not work? What are fall back mitigations? The new village should be allowed in phases with meaningful requirements (water or traffic or noise) and mitigation success demonstrated before the next stage is allowed to go forward. For example, have traffic mitigations worked? Traffic mitigation must be real.

| 1207-6

6. The Squaw Valley Specific Plan and County policies call out a need for public spaces yet there is no meaningful provision for this such spaces. This should be called a significant negative impact. Certainly since many of the small spaces that are called public will be in shade in the winter. This cannot be considered a valuable public space. What is the required public space for this project and how are those requirements met? A small shaded space should not qualify.

| 1207-7

7. The DEIR states that visual impacts are for two groups - regular visitors and infrequent visitors. Furthermore, that regular visitors are a small group and so don't matter much. As shown elsewhere, the 30,000 season pass holders in fact make up by far the majority of the visitors. How can their visual experience be deemed unimportant?

| 1207-8

Plus, consider a significant site, say the Colliseum in Rome or the Eiffel Tower. Then place a 108 foot building in front of it. Would anyone say the visual experience of the regular viewers doesn't matter?

| 1207-9

The visual experience from the too large proposed buildings must be considered significant and immitigable for all viewers.

I 1207-9
cont.

8. The DEIR clearly calls out an existing noise level that exceeds county standards in many Squaw Valley area places, certainly including Squaw Valley Road. And the proposed project will make the noise worse. If an area is non attainment for a noise standard, increasing the noise is clearly not acceptable and must be called significant and immitigable.

I 1207-10

I look forward to seeing these impacts and concerns addressed in a comprehensive and meaningful format.

Respectfully,



Lorraine Navarro
226 Hidden Lake Loop
Olympic Valley, CA 96146

I207Lorraine Navarro
May 16, 2015

- I207-1 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.
- I207-2 See the Master Response regarding the visual impact analysis for a discussion of the shadow study. Regarding Squaw Creek, as shown in Exhibit F of the DEIR, parts of Squaw Creek are shaded by the mountains during the early morning/late afternoon winter solstice. The eastern-most building on the project site (Building 6 in Exhibit 3-5) will cast shadows that encroach onto a small area of the creek at these same times, as well as at noon on the winter solstice (and around the solstice time). However, this is a very small part of the creek, and is similar to shadows from the mountain. There is no reason to believe that this small increment of additional shading would affect vegetation at the creek any differently than shadows from the mountains.
- I207-3 See the Master Response regarding the cumulative analysis.
- I207-4 Visual impacts of the project are addressed in Section 8 of the DEIR. Also please see the Master Response regarding the visual impact analysis. See response to comment I156-3 regarding circulation at the tram.
- I207-5 See response to comment I156-4.
- I207-6 The comment states that the proposed traffic mitigation measures are unproven and speculative, but does not provide specific reasons. Therefore, a response cannot be provided. However, see response to comment O8d-14 which addresses adequacy of the DEIR's traffic mitigation measures.
- I207-7 The comment indicates that the VSVSP and Placer County have policies that require provision of public space, but provides no reference to specific policies or requirements. Therefore, no specific response can be provided.
- See the Master Response regarding the visual impact analysis for a discussion of shading and shadow within the main Village area.
- I207-8 See the Master Response regarding the visual impact analysis for clarification regarding the use of viewer groups in the DEIR analysis.
- I207-9 See the Master Response regarding the visual impact analysis for clarification regarding the use of viewer groups in the DEIR analysis.
- I207-10 See response to comment I156-6.

I208

Maywan Krach

From: Joanne Neft <jkneft@earthlink.net>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2015 2:35 PM
To: Placer County Environmental Coordination Services
Subject: Village at Squaw Valley Specific Plan Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR)

Placer County Community Development
Resource Agency
Attn: Maywan Krach

Good Day:

Joanne Neft here. For 20 years I lived on the North Shore Lake Tahoe; during that time I owned a lumber yard/hardware store, travel agency, and put together the first bed and breakfast in Placer County. My children attended local schools from nursery school through high school. Hundred of hours were spent in the back country and skiing in the Squaw Valley area. I served as Chairperson of Placer County Planning Commission when the Resort of Squaw Creek was approved. As well, I was an early manager of the Olympic Village Inn at Squaw Valley. Squaw Valley holds a very special place in my memories.

I
I208-1
I

I feel strongly that Squaw Valley is already over developed and see absolutely no reason to approve the proposed project; in fact, I ask you to deny it.

I
I208-2
I

Where does the DEIR contain data for the enormous amount of traffic that will be generated – specifically the summer traffic? Oftentimes it takes 45-50 minutes from I-80 into Tahoe City; I suggest with the build out of this project it will take 1 ½ - 2 hours to make the same trip, and any amount of road upgrades are virtually impossible due to single lane travel and the proximity to the Truckee River. How will these long lines of traffic affect the corridor's air pollution? It will take longer to drive from Truckee into Squaw or Tahoe City than it does to drive from Auburn to Truckee.

I
I208-3
I

While we're talking about the river, where will this project find enough water to service the project? Are project proponents not reading the news around climate change or the forecasting of winters without snow?

I
I208-4
I

From my point of view this project is NOT consistent with Placer County's General Plan.

I
I208-5
I

Thank you,

Joanne Neft
262 Aeolia Drive
Auburn, CA 95603

I208Joanne Neft
July 16, 2015

- I208-1 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.
- I208-2 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.
- I208-3 The comment expresses concern related to traffic and air quality. These issues are addressed in the DEIR in Chapters 9, "Transportation and Circulation," and 10, "Air Quality." Also, see the Master Response regarding traffic.
- I208-4 The comment expresses concerns related to water supply and climate change. These issues are addressed in the DEIR in Chapters 14, "Public Services and Utilities," and 16, "Greenhouse Gas and Climate Change."
- I208-5 Project consistency with the Placer County General Plan is addressed in the DEIR in Chapter 4, "Land Use and Forest Resources." 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.

1209

Dear Placer County Board of Supervisors,

I am writing this letter in regards to the proposed Squaw Valley development plan from KSL Holdings. Since I first saw the plan I have been deeply concerned about its impact on regional infrastructure and the environment, as well as personally saddened by it's magnitude and the probable effect it will have on the region. I grew up skiing Alpine Meadows and now ski Squaw as well. Both mountains hold a special place in my heart. I have been lucky enough to call them my home away from home for the last seven years spending the majority of my winter weekends at my ski share and the resorts.

1209-1

I have seen the magnitude of the new construction proposed by KSL and I'm deeply concerned about the impact on local infrastructure. The traffic on highway 80 and 89 alone is reason enough to deny this plan. Weekends are spent sitting in traffic just to get over the pass on 80, only to sit in even more traffic Saturday mornings to get down 89. What will happen when double, triple or quadruple the amount of people are trying to make it up the same roads to access the activities at this proposed mega resort? The infrastructure cannot support the type of development KSL has planned.

1209-2

In addition, I believe this to be an environmentally unethical proposal. The drought that has hit California the last four years has already had a devastating effect on the state and the ski industry. Colorado based KSL seems to have missed the point that we must look at ways to conserve our water resources. Building an indoor water park and supporting a massive entertainment, apartment and condominium complex is extremely irresponsible and would have a devastating environmental impact.

1209-3

Personally, I am saddened by the proposal. The types of amenities and entertainment that the plan offers are not those that are of interest to locals or tourists to the Tahoe area. Indoor water parks and other faux outdoor adventure attractions should be left to those areas where outdoor adventure is inaccessible. Tahoe is an area of unmatched natural beauty and to see it developed in such a way and on such a grand scale would be tragic.

1209-4

KSL's reasoning in the draft proposal as to why this development plan is not impactful is embarrassingly fraught with untruths. I ask you as a concerned citizen of the state of California and a lover of the Tahoe region and Squaw Valley to deny this development application and ask KSL to submit a reasonable proposal.

1209-5

I thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Caitlin Nimmo
Caitlin.nimmo@gmail.com
858.232.1048

I209Caitlin Nimmo
no date

- I209-1 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.
- I209-2 The comment expresses concerns related to impacts on the local infrastructure, specifically related to traffic on I-80 and SR 89. This issue is addressed in the DEIR and in the Master Response regarding traffic.
- I209-3 See the Master Response regarding water supply for a discussion of the drought, and the Master Response regarding the MAC for details about water use.
- I209-4 The comment provides an opinion regarding the merits or qualities of the proposed project and does not address the content, analysis, or conclusions in the DEIR. The Placer County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors will take the commenter's opinions into consideration when making decisions regarding the project.
- I209-5 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.

I210

Maywan Krach

From: Ruth Nolan <runolan@aol.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 15, 2015 11:46 AM
To: Placer County Environmental Coordination Services
Subject: Proposed Project in Squaw Valley

July 15, 2015
Dear Placer County Officials:

I've been made aware of a large-scale, long-term application for development of a resort and recreational facility in Squaw Valley, CA. I would like to register my emphatic opposition to this project, and would like to ask your governing bodies to reject this application.

I have extensively hiked and backpacked through the Sierras for more than thirty years, as well as fighting wildland fires in the Sierras during my seasons spent working for USFS and BLM crews, so I have a deep and invested sense of the visually, ecologically, and historically valuable and crucial - starting with the Native American people of the area - resources of the Squaw Valley area and interconnected high country areas.

I was shocked, during my visit to Squaw Valley this past week, by the dramatic escalation of development to the immediate Squaw Valley and surrounding areas.

Of particular notice was not only the increased demand, by newer developments such as the Village at Squaw Valley and the tramway, of people in the the valley this past week, but also the NOISE levels created by visitors, which continue throughout the evening. How does this affect the wildlife in the area? In addition, the newer developments and construction, such as the tramway, already inhibit the area's stunning viewsheds. What impacts will increased, large-scale development have on the area's natural resources, which already seem strained to their limit?

I have serious concerns, as a native Californian who is deeply invested in the protection of our state's remaining sacred and precious geographic areas - through writing, education, and other forms of advocacy - that this proposed development for Squaw Valley will further erode the area's remaining natural resources in ways that damage the area beyond repair. it's clear, from my last visit there, even during a time of relatively low human usage, that the numbers of buildings, developments, and activity are at the maximum ceiling of what this sacred and fragile, rather small, area can reasonably support.

Please vote NO to this large-scale, long-term development for Squaw Valley.

Thank you, and very sincerely,

Ruth M Nolan, M.F.A., M.A.
Professor of English at College of the Desert
editor of "No Place for a Puritan: the literature of California's Deserts" (Heyday Books, 2009)

I210-1

I210-2

I210-3

I210-4

I210

Ruth Nolan
July 15, 2015

- I210-1 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.
- I210-2 The comment expresses concerns about noise, noise effects on wildlife, and effects on viewsheds. These issues are addressed in the DEIR and in the Master Responses in this FEIR.
- I210-3 The comment expresses concerns about impacts to natural resources. No specific issues related to the content, analysis, or conclusions in the DEIR are raised in this comment. No further response is provided here.
- I210-4 See response to comment I210-1.