

1229

Maywan Krach

From: roggem85@gmail.com
Sent: Wednesday, July 15, 2015 6:53 AM
To: Placer County Environmental Coordination Services
Subject: Squaw development plan

To Whom It May Concern,

I'm writing as a new resident of Placer Country. My girlfriend and I are looking to buy a house in the area after renting the last four years. We all but ruled out looking in Olympic Valley as the future of that valley does not yet rest in the hands of the people who live there. While my love for the ski area and the people who work there is pure and strong, I do not wish to make the biggest purchase of our lives, the one in which we determine the future of our family, in an area where corporate interests are better regarded than the environment and community's best interest. The future viability of this community is in your hands.

|
1229-1
|

I thank you for taking the time to read this letter.

Sincerely,
Mike Rogge



Mike Rogge - Director/Producer

p—518-744-9648
e—hello@verbcabin.com
w—<http://www.verbcabin.com>

I229

Mike Rogge
July 15, 2015

I229-1

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.

I230

Maywan Krach

From: Helga Roghers <hroghers@icloud.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2015 8:55 PM
To: Placer County Environmental Coordination Services
Subject: Squaw valley development

The traffic around Lake Tahoe has been an absolute nightmare this year. Do we really want to put in more condos, people and entertainment? This lake can only remain a treasure if we treat it as such. It is our obligation to preserve the beauty of these mountains and valleys and not make it into a Circus!
Please do not allow this project to go forward!

I
I230-1
I

Thank you,
Helga Roghers
P.O.Box 898
Carnelian Bay
CA 96140

Sent from my iPad

I230

Helga Roghers
July 16, 2015

I230-1

The comment expresses concerns related to traffic and visual resources. These issues are addressed in the DEIR and in the Master Responses in this FEIR. No specific issues related to the content, analysis, or conclusions in the DEIR are raised in this comment. No further response is provided here.

The remainder of this 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.

I231

Maywan Krach

From: Erik Rogind <erik@rogind.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2015 11:54 AM
To: Placer County Environmental Coordination Services
Subject: Community Input on the proposed KSL development in Squaw Valley

Hello Placer County Community Development Resource Agency,

I am writing to comment on this proposed development.
My wife and I have had a home in Placer County for 21 years... in the Serene Lakes area on Donner Summit.
When we purchased this home one of the main factors for us was the serenity we could find on the Summit... rather than the much faster pace of life down in Truckee.
Placer County is located, after all, at one the most spectacular portions of one of the most spectacular mountain ranges in North America.
We are also avid skiers, snowboarders, and outdoor activity enthusiasts.
Squaw Valley is one of our favorite ski areas and certainly one of the worlds great ski areas (at least with pre-climate change snow quantities). My wife and I have been skiing there for 38 years. We also have had season passes there the last few years.

I231-1

I have not read the proposed plan. However please consider these general suggestions.
Our hope is that this proposed development does not diminish the quality of the great outdoors that really is the overarching theme of our county.
I hate to lose any of the beautiful Squaw Valley to development. But if develop 'we must', then I urge this agency and other cognizant county planning commissions to error on the side of a constrained project. The Squaw Creek resort is an example of a project that blends in very well with the Valley. I would hope that this new project does not contain any buildings higher than Squaw Creek and makes an attempt to blend into the beautiful valley as if Frank Lloyd Wright had designed them. I have read about a proposed indoor adventure center and would encourage this to be constrained in scope... as the real adventure center is the valley itself. You are well aware that the Truckee to Tahoe City corridor is already very crowded. So I would expect that any large project would include plans to enlarge or improve this access route. However, a road expansion in itself is impactful and hence a concern that should inform constraining this project. Finally, it sounds like the project scope, at 25 years, is virtually indefinite. Can't we make this a well defined, finite, short time duration project? We don't want to turn Squaw Valley into a perpetual construction zone.

I231-2

Thank you for considering our input during this bounding stage of the project. Please be good guardians of the future of our mountain based county. We, the people that have elected our county officials, do not have the unlimited monetary power to come close to competing with the unlimited budgets put forth by the corporations as they push their profit motivated visions.

Kind Regards,
Erik and Deborah Rogind

I231Erik and Deborah Rogind
July 17, 2015

I231-1 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.

I231-2 Overall, 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.

In particular, the comment expresses concerns related to building height, the indoor adventure center, access (including possible road expansion), and the time period for project construction. These issues are addressed in the DEIR and in the Master Responses in this FEIR (also see Section 2.1 of this FEIR regarding a proposed reduction in some building heights). No specific issues related to the content, analysis, or conclusions in the DEIR are raised in this comment. No further response is provided here.

The remainder of this 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.

1232

Maywan Krach

From: Elizabeth Rosner <elizrosner@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 15, 2015 10:38 AM
To: Placer County Environmental Coordination Services
Subject: re: Squaw Valley expansion project

Dear Placer County officials:

I am writing to express my strong opinion regarding proposed developments in Squaw Valley. As a longtime visitor to the region --- for its spectacular beauty, for skiing, hiking, swimming, bird-watching, star-gazing --- and as a grateful faculty member at the famed Community of Writers, I'm deeply opposed to the "Mountain Adventure Center" under consideration.

I
I232-1
I
I232-2
I
I232-3

To be honest, I've already been concerned and saddened by the rate and scope of development in the valley; it seems clear that environmental impacts are already threatening to permanently destroy the natural beauty of the area. In my frequent visits since the early 1980s, I've noted the dramatic increases in structures, cars, noise and pollution (including light pollution at night). These are MAJOR cumulative effects, and the proposed project will most certainly do far more and far worse damage.

PLEASE VOTE AGAINST this project.

Thank you for your time and consideration,
Elizabeth Rosner

--
www.elizabethrosner.com
www.facebook.com/elizabethrosnerbooks
www.twitter.com/@elizabethrosner

I232Elizabeth Rosner
July 15, 2015

- I232-1 The comment provides an opinion regarding the merits or qualities of the proposed project and does not address the content, analysis, or conclusions in the DEIR. The Placer County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors will take the commenter's opinions into consideration when making decisions regarding the project. Also, see the Master Response regarding the MAC.
- I232-2 The comment expresses concerns related to visual resources, traffic, noise, and pollution (including light pollution at night), creating cumulative effects that the project will add to. These issues are addressed in the DEIR and in the Master Responses in this FEIR. No specific issues related to the content, analysis, or conclusions in the DEIR are raised in this comment. No further response is provided here.
- I232-3 The comment is directed towards the project approval process and does not address the content, analysis, or conclusions in the DEIR. Therefore, no further response is provided here. All comment letters submitted during the DEIR public review period will be reviewed and considered by the Placer County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors before a decision on the project is rendered.

1233

Maywan Krach

From: Mike Sahlman <jmsahlman@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 16, 2015 10:27 PM
To: Placer County Environmental Coordination Services
Subject: KSL Squaw Village EIR Comments

Dear Placer County Representatives,

Please add this letter to your public comment file for the KSL Squaw Valley Village project EIR. I was extremely disappointed to see that so many significant impacts were raised during this study and that the developer has not addressed most of the concerns. I have lived in Squaw Valley my whole life over the last 32 years and have seen what good and bad impacts have on the character and history. The Resort at Squaw Creek being a major sore on the face of the valley which did not turn out to benefit nor provide additive benefits to the community other than ruining the view of almost all of the houses facing the valley. I do hope that this will be remembered by the county supervisors and staff during the ongoing entitlement process.

1233-1

My main issues are as follows to the development plan, EIR and overall character of site plan.

1. The height of the buildings should be restricted to no higher than the current village otherwise views will be blocked by monolithic structures and there will likely be major shadowing issues. Squaw Valley is a small place and these would be out of character if we are trying to create and keep the feel that we have had for so many years. It would be upsetting to see true high-rises in the valley.

1233-2

2. There will be significant impacts on the roads and traffic which are already bad many days in the winter. If we have a high snow year plus the additional rooms being requested, the valley will be almost impossible to get into or out of which could cause major issues in a natural disaster scenario. How is this going to be addressed as it seems Highway 89 would need to be expanded as well as Squaw Valley Road to lessen this impact to the degree needed.

1233-3

3. How will all the additional water be provided as our water quality has severely diminished in recent years due to the aquifer being drained more and more. The water does not taste nearly as good as it did when I was growing up as a kid and there may even be additional drought years that will have further impact on everyone if this development is allowed.

1233-4

4. How will Squaw Creek be protected in the case of the smaller development? There is no money for this in their budget yet it will have a significant impact on the alpine meadow and creek ecosystem that is becoming more and more rare. We need to protect the nature of the valley and keep the ecosystem going with every protection possible.

1233-5

5. There is no specific designs for any of the buildings which is a major issue. How do we make sure that they do not value engineer all the character out of the buildings and provide just monolithic blocks that detract from the feel of the town?

1233-6

6. There are only two buildings remaining from the Olympics and KSL has designated to demo both. Should there be a heritage or historic society protection put on buildings that had such histories? Every other city or community that I have seen will do this to protect their heritage. I think this is important to remember since that is what started Squaw Valley. We are proud of the heritage as residents in the valley and do not want to see that taken away so that our kids cannot see what happened here.

1233-7

I hope this helps to provide another perspective toward this development from a longtime resident that has been fortunate to enjoy this place for so many years and hope that my children will be able to do the same in the years to come. Please help us protect the valley and provide intelligent development moving forward that protects the character and special place that is Squaw Valley.

I
1233-8

Mike Sahlman
1420 Squaw Valley Road
Olympic Valley, CA 96146
(530) 220-2627

I233Mike Sahlman
June 16, 2015

- I233-1 Overall, 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.
- In particular, the comment expresses concerns related to views, which are addressed in Chapter 8, "Visual Resources," of the DEIR and in the Master Response regarding the visual impact analysis. No specific issues related to the content, analysis, or conclusions in the DEIR are raised in this comment. No further response is provided here.
- I233-2 The comment states that the height of the buildings should be restricted to no higher than the current village. The Reduced Buildings Heights Alternative, which would reduce building heights to conform with the existing Intrawest Village (i.e., 75 feet), similar to what the comment suggests, was considered, but not evaluated further in the DEIR. The rationale for why this alternative was not evaluated further in the DEIR is described on page 17-12 of the DEIR. However, as described in Section 2.1, "Project Modifications," of this FEIR, the applicant has proposed changes to the proposed building heights in response to concerns expressed by the Squaw Valley Design Review Committee and members of the public.
- I233-3 Traffic impacts, including those along SR 89 and Squaw Valley Road, are addressed in Chapter 9, "Transportation and Circulation," of the DEIR. Also, see the Master Response regarding traffic. No specific issues related to the content, analysis, or conclusions in the DEIR are raised in this comment. No further response is provided here.
- I233-4 Water supply is addressed in Chapter 14, "Public Services and Utilities," of the DEIR (see Impact 14-1). Also, see the Master Response regarding water supply. No specific issues related to the content, analysis, or conclusions in the DEIR are raised in this comment. No further response is provided here.
- I233-5 Squaw Creek restoration is described in Section 3.4.5, "Squaw Creek Restoration," of the DEIR. The comment asks how Squaw Creek will be protected in the case of the smaller development. It is assumed that the comment is referring to the Reduced Density Alternative, which includes a more modest restoration given the lesser financial resources that would be available (see pages 17-24 through 17-31 of the DEIR). See the Master Response regarding the Reduced Density Alternative.
- I233-6 Mitigation Measure 8-2b in Chapter 8, "Visual Resources," of the DEIR (see page 8-53) requires the project applicant to obtain Design Review approval from the County, as follows:
- Prior to submittal of Improvement Plans or Building Permits, the project applicant shall obtain Design Review approval from the Placer County Design/Site Review Committee (D/SRC). All project phases must be compatible with the Plan Area Development Standards prescribed in Appendix B of the VSVSP. Review and approval by the County shall apply to such project components as: colors, materials, and textures of all structures; landscaping; signs; exterior lighting; and entry features.
- Also, see Appendix B of the VSVSP which includes the proposed development standards and design guidelines for the proposed project.

- I233-7 Regarding the two 1960s Olympic-related buildings (the Olympic Valley Lodge and the Far East Center), see response to comment I52-13.
- I233-8 The comment provides a summary of detailed comments provided above. See responses to the detailed comments above.

1234

Maywan Krach

From: joan Sarlo <joansarlo@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Wednesday, July 08, 2015 10:08 AM
To: Placer County Environmental Coordination Services
Subject: Specific Plan of proposed Squaw Valley Village

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.

I234-1

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

I234-2

Thank you.

Joan Sarlo
201 Squaw Peak Road Unit #204
Olympic Valley, CA. 96146

I234Joan Sarlo
July 8, 2015

I234-1 See the Master Response regarding traffic issues at Squaw Valley Road and Squaw Peak Road.

I234-2 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.

I235

Maywan Krach

From: Paul Sassenrath <paul.sassenrath@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 18, 2015 9:10 AM
To: Placer County Environmental Coordination Services
Subject: Squaw Valley Development

I strongly oppose the large scale development of Squaw Valley. I urge you to carefully consider development balancing reasonable growth with traffic and environmental concerns and limits.

I
I235-1

Please do not allow large scale development.

Regards,

Paul Sassenrath
Placer County Resident

I235

Paul Sassenrath
June 18, 2015

I235-1

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.

1236

Maywan Krach

From: adiostahoe@gmail.com on behalf of jamie schectman
<shecky@mountainridersalliance.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 15, 2015 9:20 AM
To: Placer County Environmental Coordination Services
Subject: Public Comment of Draft EIR

Dear Placer County Planning Commission, Placer County Board of Supervisors and other Decision Makers,

My name is Jamie Schectman and I first moved to Squaw Valley in 1987. At the time, I was an 18 year old high school graduate and thought I had found heaven on Earth. In 1990, I was part of the grand opening team at the Resort at Squaw Creek, which was the first large scale development in many decades. I will always consider Squaw Valley my home and it is where my strongest roots are grounded. Today, I write you today as a concerned citizen and have three major concerns with the proposal.

1236-1

SIZE

In my opinion, The Village at Squaw Valley's proposal is just too big. Current year round occupancy rates do not support additional growth. While I recognize that the current village needs to be transformed to remain competitive, I simply don't believe that building 1,497 more bedrooms is the answer. The old saying, "Build it and they will come" does not apply in a resort communities in 2015

1236-2

If approved, the proposed 20-25 years of construction would mean most residents over 55 would spend the rest of their lives living in a construction zone.

1236-3

CHARACTER

Squaw Valley has always been at the fore front of innovation, dating back to 1949 when it opened for skiing and then hosted the first televised Olympics in 1960. The renditions I've viewed include another cookie cutter, fake looking village that could be located at Vail, Whistler, Mont Tremblant, etc. The new village should be progressive but distinctively Squaw Valley and pay homage to our rich heritage.

1236-4

The developer has an amazing opportunity to do something special that is in line with the character and history of our area.

SHIRLEY CANYON DEVELOPMENT

The proposed fractional ownerships in Shirley Canyon are my biggest concern of the whole proposal. The developer's propaganda has suggested that they are simply beautifying a paved parking lot. But the reality is that the proposal includes the construction of condo type units at the mouth of the most unspoiled part of Squaw Valley. For many, Shirley Canyon is our very own backyard playground and a place to escape with our friends, families and dogs. Furthermore, much of the proposed construction sits right on top of the recharge aquifer, and the ever precious watershed. It would be a huge mistake to allow timeshares to be constructed.

1236-5

Its one thing to develop on top of asphalt, but no sort of development in Shirley Canyon should be approved.

In closing, I'd like to thank those involved with the approval process. I understand there are many moving parts and lots of strong opinions involved. In the end, I have confidence you will do the right thing for the future of our region.

I
1236-6

Respectfully Submitted,

Jamie Schectman



CEO and Co-founder, Mountain Rider's Alliance, LLC

land [\(530\) 554-1356](tel:5305541356)

cell [\(530\) 386-6597](tel:5303866597)

I236

Jamie Schectman
July 15, 2015

- I236-1 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.
- I236-2 See the Master Response regarding occupancy assumptions.
- I236-3 See the Master Response regarding the 25-year construction period.
- I236-4 The comment expressing concern about the visual renderings of the project 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.
- I236-5 See the Master Response regarding the mountain maintenance facility.
- I236-6 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.

1237

Robert Schladale and Lois Williams
164 Sierra Sunrise Way
Auburn, CA 95603

July 16, 2015

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

Dear Sir/Madam:

We are writing to express our concern for the proposed new development by KSL Partners in Squaw Valley. Overall, the extent of the proposal is much too large in scale. Constructing any 100-foot high buildings would radically change the views of the valley and impose an urban look on a rural, mountain landscape. We believe it is the rural and mountainous landscape that draws people to Squaw Valley and to Lake Tahoe, and the kind of development in the KSL proposal would do the reverse, driving people away. The result could very well be a negative economic impact for small businesses in the Valley, and a reduction in sales tax collections for the County.

1237-1

This development would also impose significant new traffic, noise, air quality and other impacts that are documented in the EIR. Given the ongoing drought, the issues of water supply availability and sewage treatment need perhaps even more scrutiny than they've been given. The fact that construction would continue for 25 years, and is proposed to occur at night at certain times, would be devastating for people who call the Valley home. We ourselves do not have a home in the Valley, but do have a small vacation home in Carnelian Bay. We think this proposal, if approved, would set a bad precedent for development proposals elsewhere in the Tahoe area.

1237-2

We do not oppose all development in Squaw Valley or elsewhere. The Village at Squaw Valley was built at a reasonable scale, is attractive, and benefits the Valley (and the County). We think any new development should be of a similar scale.

1237-3

The proposed amusement park elements appear to reflect the fact that KSL Partners have a poor understanding of what draws people to Squaw Valley and Lake Tahoe. They seem to believe that such attractions are needed to bring more people to the area year-round, but this is a mistaken assumption. Most people who might use those amusements would still come in the summer, as they do now, because that's when families take vacations. At other times of the year, relatively few people will be willing to make the trip to Squaw Valley for the rides they plan. Even larger venues in more populated areas (e.g. Marine World in Vallejo) close in the off season. If this proposal is built, it will likely be a shuttered eyesore for much of the year.

1237-4

Overall, this proposal appears to be driven by bad judgment and lack of knowledge. Placer County would do both KSL Partners and its citizens a favor by rejecting this proposal outright.

1237-5

Thank you for your consideration.

Robert Schladale

Lois Williams

I237 Robert Schladale and Lois Williams
June 17, 2015

- I237-1 Overall, 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.
- In particular, the comment expresses concerns related to the size of the project, the height of buildings, and change in views. These issues are addressed in Chapter 8, "Visual Resources," of the DEIR and in the Master Response regarding the visual impact analysis. Also see Section 2.1 of this FEIR regarding proposed reductions in some building heights. No specific issues related to the content, analysis, or conclusions in the DEIR are raised in this comment. No further response is provided here.
- Regarding the perceived negative economic impacts for small businesses in the Valley and a reduction in sales tax collections for the County, these are not inherently environmental issues requiring CEQA analysis.
- I237-2 The comment expresses concerns related to traffic, noise, and air quality. These issues are addressed in DEIR and in the Master Responses in this FEIR. 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 water supply and the Master Response regarding the 25-year construction period.
- I237-3 No specific issues related to the content, analysis, or conclusions in the DEIR are raised in this comment. No further response is provided here.
- I237-4 See the Master Response regarding the MAC.
- I237-5 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.

1238

Maywan Krach

From: Billy Schmohl <billy.schmohl@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2015 6:26 PM
To: Placer County Environmental Coordination Services
Subject: Squaw Valley development EIR

To whom it may concern,

I am writing you to express my concerns in regards to the proposed development at Squaw Valley, and the findings of the EIR.

I have skied Squaw Valley since I could walk, amassing over 30 seasons. The proposed village is very concerning, particularly the unavoidable impacts. Traffic is already impossible between Truckee and Tahoe City. The only feasible means to allow such a large scale development is seemingly to double decker Highway 89. The proposed development would cover a footprint that could have unavoidable detrimental impacts for generations to come. I spent many summer days in Shirley Canyon, and any expansion into their would break my heart and crush my soul.

1238-1

I support future development, though one that is sustainable for the long term, and enhances the culture and history of the environment. The proposed development caters to the financial elite, as does phase I of what has already been built. The existing village is a ghost town, and is much more of a resort. Tahoe has a bit of a housing crisis for those that live here, and the proposed development would create a multitude of empty bedrooms, and very few who need them could afford them.

Rather than create a resort ghost town, what about building a village that people will LIVE in? I think building a village that enhances the lives of those who live here and encourages small businesses to create establishments that people would frequent would benefit all members involved.

1238-2

This proposed development is a pinnacle example of the inequality plaguing our world. Rather than focusing on shareholders of the private equity parent company of Squaw Valley Ski Holdings, why not do what's best for the local community? Let's create a village that the local community can utilize and that will prosper for generations.

The decision is ultimately yours, and I hope you choose to support the local community in favor of private equity shareholders. Thank you for considering my opinion, and please feel free to contact me if you would like further elaboration.

1238-3

Best regards,

Billy Schmohl
(415) 785-3850

I238 Billy Schmohl
July 16, 2015

- I238-1 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.
- In particular, the comment expresses concerns related to traffic and expansion into the Shirley Canyon area. These issues are addressed in DEIR and in the Master Responses in this FEIR. No specific issues related to the content, analysis, or conclusions in the DEIR are raised in this comment. No further response is provided here.
- I238-2 See the Master Response regarding occupancy assumptions. The remainder of 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.
- I238-3 The comment is directed towards the project approval process and does not address the content, analysis, or conclusions in the DEIR. Therefore, no further response is provided here. All comment letters submitted during the DEIR public review period will be reviewed and considered by the Placer County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors before a decision on the project is rendered.

1239

Chase Schweitzer
P.O. Box 3477
Olympic Valley, CA 96146
(415) 505-7846
Chase Schweitzer c.n.schweitzer@gmail.com

July 17th, 2015

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

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

Dear Ms. Krach:

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to the draft Environmental Impact Report (dEIR) for the Village at Squaw Valley Specific Plan.

1239-1

My family owns property in Squaw Valley/Olympic Valley. Along with my brother, sister, and various friends, I have grown up in the valley and will always call it home.

I would first like to focus on noise from construction. In regard to noise from both daytime and nighttime construction, even after the mandatory implementation of suggested noise mitigation, the draft simply states on the 21st page of the section covering noise that the "... impact would remain significant and unavoidable."

1239-2

Because the Specific Plan would allow for development over an estimated 25-year buildout period, this is not only a significant and unavoidable impact from noise, this is theoretically 25-years of a significant and unavoidable impact from noise.

Currently, I am 27 years old. If construction were to begin in the spring of 2016, I would just be turning 28. That means, I would be in my mid-50's when noise from construction would theoretically stop. This is untenable for all residents living in the valley.

1239-3

I use the term "theoretically" because there is still no guarantee that this project will actually be finished in 25 years. Whether it is from issues that slow down the construction process, or the possible sale of the property to another developer with a different construction timeline, there is absolutely no guarantee beyond an estimation of when this project will end.

Especially in regard of the fact that once the applicant for the development has secured all entitlements for the project, they can walk away from the project whenever they want, but the entitlements will still pass to the next owner of the development. Because these entitlements can pass between multiple

property owners, construction and noise from construction could theoretically continue for much longer than 25-years.

I239-3
cont.

I am then imploring that the ramifications, the unavoidable and significant impacts, be considered if the project does in fact go over the estimated 25-years of construction in any final EIR.

Because noise from construction is already considered significant and unavoidable even after mitigation, and the fact that there is no guarantee that noise from construction would be finished within the estimated 25-years, a reduced density alternative must be considered in the final EIR.

When considering the estimated duration of the project, a reduced density alternative will mitigate noise from construction better than any suggestions made in the dEIR. To understand it better: If the impacts of noise from construction are already significant and unavoidable, then a reduced density alternative that cuts down the duration of the project will mitigate noise over the long term, and thus better mitigate the significant and unavoidable impacts of construction noise upon residents in Squaw Valley/Olympic Valley.

I239-4

Please consider how the livelihood and well-being of residents living in Squaw Valley/Olympic Valley will greatly benefit from a reduced density alternative in any final EIR.

Having stated that, I will now like to move on to issues surrounding Greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions.

Greenhouse gasses are forecasted to increase to 45,403 tons of CO2/year at full build-out, the majority caused by vehicle trips, electricity, and propane.

Moonshine Ink reports that this is an almost four-fold increase from current levels.

On Thursday, June 25, 2015, in Kings Beach, the representative for the applicant, Mr. Chevis Hosea, asked if the planning commission would be able to help out with producing some normal precipitation years, something Squaw Valley Ski Holdings is in desperate need of. If the applicant is indeed wanting of "normal precipitation" in the future, it is counter-intuitive that they would be proposing a project that will further contribute to climate change in the future.

I239-5

The dEIR itself states that because the project will emit a substantial level of GHG emissions, this impact is significant and unavoidable.

I request that the Placer County Planning Commission and the Placer County Board of Supervisors consider a reduced density alternative to mitigate the impacts of GHG emissions being produced in Squaw Valley/Olympic Valley.

Thank you for your time,

Electronically sent, no signature
Chase Schweitzer

I239Chase Schweitzer
July 17, 2015

- I239-1 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.
- I239-2 See the Master Response regarding the 25-year construction period.
- I239-3 The comment expresses concerns related to the lack of a guarantee that the project will be finished in 25 years. First, see the Master Response regarding the 25-year construction period. As described therein and in multiple places in the DEIR, project construction would be developed over an estimated 25-year buildout period, with the sequence and pace of construction driven by the market. This does not mean the project would be under constant construction over this period; rather, it would be constructed in response to market demand, and the applicant estimates (based on market studies and economic cycles) that build out would be completed in 25 years.
- The comment is correct in that there is no guarantee that project construction would be completed in 25 years. Based on actual future market conditions, buildout could take longer or shorter. The magnitude of impacts, however, would be as stated in the DEIR. If, for example, buildout takes longer than 25 years because of market conditions, then there will also be longer “quiet periods” between the completion of one phase and the initiation of the next phase. These quiet periods could last several years if market conditions so dictate, during which time construction impacts would not occur.
- CEQA acknowledges that a drafting an EIR necessarily involves some degree of forecasting and that lead agencies must use their best efforts to find out and disclose all that it reasonably can (State CEQA Guidelines Section 15144). Accordingly, the County reviewed the applicant’s anticipated construction schedule and determined it to be reasonable. Therefore, the analysis in the DEIR is based on reasonable assumptions and the best available information.
- The comment then asks that the significant and unavoidable impacts of more than 25 years of project construction be considered in the FEIR. See above response regarding the 25-year construction period and the reasonableness of the DEIR analysis. The mitigation measures identified in the DEIR would continue to be implemented, and construction activities would continue to be subject to the same laws and regulations regarding environmental review, wetlands, erosion, noise, etc. If environmental conditions change from what is evaluated in the EIR due to the passage of time, then subsequent approvals could be subject to additional CEQA documentation.
- I239-4 See the Master Response regarding the Reduced Density Alternative.
- I239-5 The comment states that the proposed project is estimated to generate approximately 45,403 metric tons of carbon dioxide-equivalent per year and, according to Moonshine Ink, this would be an almost four-fold increase from current levels. Please refer to the response to comment I40-3 regarding the idea that GHG emissions would increase four fold.
- The comment on GHG expresses an opinion on the merits of the project and does not comment on the content of the DEIR.

The comment also requests that the County consider a reduced density alternative to mitigate the project's GHG emissions. Again, the analysis of operational GHG emissions under Impact 16-2 focuses on the GHG efficiency in which the project would operate. Please also see the Master Response regarding the Reduced Density Alternative.

I240

Chase Schweitzer
P.O. Box 3477
Olympic Valley, CA 96146
(415) 505-7846

July 17th, 2015

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

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

Dear Ms. Krach:

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to the draft Environmental Impact Report (dEIR) for the Village at Squaw Valley Specific Plan.

My family owns property in Squaw Valley/Olympic Valley. Along with my brother, sister, and various friends, I have grown up in the valley and will always call it home.

I240-1

The property that my parents own, and I currently live in, is adjacent to Lot 19 of the proposed development.

The dEIR claims five 30,000 gallon propane tanks will be located in lot 19. Staff for the applicant of the development now state that an additional tank will be installed on Lot 19, meaning 180,000 gallons of propane will be stored in Shirley Canyon at any given time. This seems dangerous for me and other residents and friends living adjacent to Lot 19.

Suffice it to say, the dEIR does not consider the dangers of storing so much propane in one area, this must be addressed.

I240-2

Please detail and analyze how other communities in the Sierra-Nevada are dealing with environmental hazards, fire hazards, seismic hazards, criminal/terrorist hazards, and any other hazards when utilizing a propane systems of this size.

What are the disaster preparedness plans of other communities with propane systems of this size? What is the applicant proposing for any disaster preparedness? Please compare the two.

Because of the volatile times we live in, any acts of sabotage, of a malicious nature, criminal, or associated with terrorism must be considered in any future preparedness plans. When dealing with a

propane storage and operating system of this size, **precautions and security must be put in place** to protect the lives of residents living so close to the lot.

The dEIR does not consider the dangers associated with malicious intent, criminal intent, or acts of terrorism upon a facility of this size. This must be addressed in order for residents living near Lot 19 to sleep better at night.

The final EIR must recognize the dangers of so much propane being stored in Lot 19, including those associated with terrorism, and recommend mitigation measures in order to secure the safety of nearby residents.

A reduced density alternative, with a development utilizing less propane after full buildout, will mitigate the dangers currently posed with the development of Lot 19 and keep residents safer in case of any emergency there.

Please consider a reduced density alternative should an emergency occur, not only when considering Lot 19, but for residents in any part of the development and the valley as a whole.

I240-2
cont.

Thank you for your time,

Electronically sent, no signature
Chase Schweitzer

I240Chase Schweitzer
July 17, 2015

I240-1

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.

I240-2

CEQA requires analysis of the potential for the project to result in the release of potentially hazardous materials into the environment. See the Master Response regarding the mountain maintenance facility for a discussion of safety concerns because of proposed uses of Lot 19 and Section 2.1 of this FEIR for the revised proposal for propane storage. The Master Response regarding the Reduced Density Alternative provides discussion of the feasibility of implementing this alternative.