

I281

Maywan Krach

From: Jmtornese@aol.com
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2015 11:38 PM
To: Placer County Environmental Coordination Services
Subject: Squaw Valley EIR - Comments

My husband and I have a home on the West Shore of Lake Tahoe and are very concerned about the size & scale of the proposed Squaw development. It is much too massive and will cause traffic congestion on hwy 89 and into Tahoe City & along the West Shore. We will have to deal with lots of traffic coming in from Hwy 80. Also, this huge development will negatively impact the environment, air quality and mountain vistas. Please downsize this development to 25% of what is being proposed.

I
I281-1

Thank you,
Judith Tomese and Jerry Winters

I281

Judith Tornese & Jerry Winters
July 17, 2015

I281-1

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.

The comment also expresses concerns regarding traffic congestion on SR 89, in Tahoe City, and along the West Shore. The project's traffic-related impacts to SR 89 are addressed in Chapter 9, "Transportation and Circulation," of the DEIR. No specific issues related to the content, analysis, or conclusions in the DEIR are raised in this comment. No further response is provided here.

Additionally, the comment expresses concerns regarding the project's impact on the environment, air quality, and mountain vistas. These issues are addressed in the DEIR. No specific issues related to the content, analysis, or conclusions in the DEIR are raised in this comment. No further response is provided here.

1282

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

This letter is in response to the “Village at Squaw Valley Specific Plan Draft EIR”

Prelude

As noted below per dictionary terms, KSL motto to: **“Save Squaw Valley” is an oxymoron, foolish, unreasonable, so out of place as to be amusing, ridiculous and a contradiction of terms!**

While I was aware there would likely be some negative impact to our environment, this EIR elaborated these issues to such a great extent in so many areas that I was not even aware of. While the EIR is a reality wakeup call to respond to nearly all those issues, I will focus on those issues most relevant personally. In doing so I am speaking for all residents of Squaw Valley and the surrounding communities, especially those whose homes are located on the main roadways, such as mine!

There are numerous areas of great concern to the temporary and permanent damages done to environment, our homes and very health. A primary concern would be the unacceptable options of road widening encroaching into our homeowners 50-60 year old established front yards, along its protected trees per **Placer County’s Designated Scenic Corridor and the Squaw Valley General Plan!** Doing so would not only permanently greatly increase the traffic and noise levels, but our very own health & life threatening with silica impregnated dust and soot levels as a result.

1282-1

Per the EIR: Acute Health Effects: **breathing and respiratory symptoms, aggravation of existing respiratory and cardiovascular diseases, premature death** !Chronic Health Effects: **alterations to the immune system, carcinogenesis.**

I have become very aware over the past several years that KSL concern or regard to the environment and local population is inconsequential versus the profits they seek from development and the majority of users from out of the area. **KSL only concern is to maximize their corporate profits!**

Whom am I ?

A bit about me, I am a full time permanent resident and homeowner in Squaw Valley located at 720 Squaw Valley Road. I have lived in this home since 1993 and been the homeowner since January of 1995. I share my home with other seasonal tenants, some 80+ over the past 20 plus years and many whom have been employed by Squaw Valley.

I am in my mid 50's and looking to the future, this is my retirement home! I have been skiing Squaw since 1972, had season passes in 77-78 and continue to be a consecutive season pass holder since 1987, the past 28 years. In other words I have had extensive experiences here, at the mountain, with neighbors and the county and am well aware of the history here.

I love where I live, feel very fortunate to be here and look forward to the quiet off seasons, and a long peaceful “quiet” retirement here! The preservation of Squaw Valley’s rural and natural occurring beautiful setting and designated “**Scenic Corridor**” absolutely must be the number one priority; not only for current residents and users, but for all future generations!

1282-1
cont.

I beg of you, lets not ruin this pristine area with commercial interest whose ultimate goal is inly to maximize their profits, then move onto the next project with little or no regard to the permanent damages done to the environment, nonstop traffic, endless road noise, air pollution, questionable use of available water resources, (especially given these drought conditions) and little if any regard to the permanent residents residing here full time!

Primary Areas of Concern:

I encourage you to restrict or deny KSL these overblown plans that are inappropriate for this area! The fact that KSL promotes themselves as “**Save Squaw Valley**” is ludicrous at best per the dictionary: ludicrous |'looədəkrəs|adjectiveso foolish, unreasonable, or out of place as to be amusing; ridiculous: and the very meaning of a “**Oxymoron**”: a figure of speech in which apparently contradictory terms appear in conjunction, An oxymoron (plural oxymora or oxymorons) is a figure of speech that juxtaposes elements that appear to be contradictory.

1282-2

I had the opportunity to “**Attend the Placer County Planning Commission Meeting**” and spoke there. **I appreciated the ability to voice my concerns and noted the full attention I received from the board, as these were relevant issues not otherwise addressed.** As a homeowner on Squaw Valley Road, my main personal concerns are in regards to the impact that will have not only to the roadway, but its very real negative impact to my home, it landscaping and its screening, privacy and noise reduction it provides along with my and all others health whom maybe exposed to these deadly unhealthy conditions. These primarily consist of greatly increased traffic, resulting non-stop noise levels and often, **extensive silica life threatening dust levels kicked up into the air,** especially with the third lane often implemented during busy ski weekends and holiday periods!!

1282-3

I noted at this meeting how throughout the winter months when the roads are sanded how the dust kicks up everyday, notably in the morning and afternoon and especially with the 3rd lane. This completely coats my home, driveways, vehicles and decks with a layer of thick silica based dust on a daily basis. If working in the yard or outdoors for any reason, I have to come inside, insure that all doors and windows are closed to keep all this dust

1282-4

outside. I have no choice but to later blow or wash this off hazardous soot and dust as often as daily!

As noted in Wikipedia, abbreviated:

Health effect

Silica; **inhaling finely divided crystalline silica dust** can lead to silicosis, bronchitis, or cancer, as the dust becomes lodged in the lungs and continuously irritates them, reducing lung capacities.^[27] Studies of workers with exposure to crystalline silica have shown 10-fold higher than expected rates of lupus and other systemic autoimmune diseases compared to expected rates in the general population.^[28] Prior to new rules issued in 2013, OSHA allowed 100 µg per cubic meter of air. The new regulations reduce the amount to 50 µg/m³ down from 100 µg/m³. The exposure limit for the construction industry is also set at 50 µg/m³ down from 250 µg/m³.^[29]

In the body crystalline silica particles do not dissolve over clinically relevant periods. Silica crystals inside the lungs can activate the NLRP3 inflammasome inside macrophages and dendritic cells and thereby result in processing of pro-Interleukin 1 beta into its mature form. Chronic exposure to silica may thereby account for some of its health hazards, as interleukin-1 is a highly pro-inflammatory cytokine in the immune system.^{[30][31][32]} This effect can create an occupational hazard for people working with sandblasting equipment, products that contain powdered crystalline silica and so on. Children, asthmatics of any age, allergy sufferers, and the elderly (all of whom have reduced lung capacity) can be affected in much less time. Amorphous silica, such as fumed silica is not associated with development of silicosis, but may cause irreversible lung damage in some cases.^[33]

Laws restricting silica exposure with respect to the silicosis hazard specify that they are concerned only with silica that is **dust-forming!**

In the EIR “**Air Quality**” these are described” **Table 10-1**, Pollutants Respirable particulate matter (PM10), Fine particulate matter (PM2.5)

Sources: **fugitive dust, soot, smoke, mobile and stationary sources, construction, fires** and natural windblown dust.

Acute Health Effects: **breathing and respiratory symptoms, aggravation of existing respiratory and cardiovascular diseases, premature death !**

Chronic Health Effects: **alterations to the immune system, carcinogenesis**

This report then states under “**Pariculate Matter**” Concentrations of CAPs are measured at several monitoring stations in and near the MCAB. The measurements at the Truckee Fire Station, Tahoe City Fire Station, South Lake Tahoe Airport Station, and the

1282-4
cont.

1282-5

South Lake Tahoe- Sandy Way Station are presented here and are generally representative of ambient air quality in the vicinity of the project area.

This is a false and misleading representation criteria of Air Pollutants!

None of these monitoring stations are located in Squaw Valley or a major ski resort main roadway, nor have thousands upon thousands of vehicles back up for 3 to 4 hours starting from around 7am to about 11am and once again from about 3 pm to 7pm.

I've lived for over 20 years on Squaw Valley Road and these conditions are far more prevalent than these reports indicate! **There is nothing subtle about the extensive and contagious thick dust kicked as a result and the threat to my health and very life, along with all other residents and visitors also exposed to these unhealthy and unpreventable conditions!!**

KSL overblown expansion plans will only greatly exacerbate these dangerous and deadly conditions, not only to the local population, but to all those whom visit here!

1282-5
cont.

Under the EIR Executive Summary:

I am in fiercely and vehemently opposed to widening the roadway:

2.3.4 Widened Squaw Valley Road Alternative:

As my home is located on Squaw Valley Road, this would be a major detriment to my property's safety, aesthetics, noise, pollutant levels and value! My home is located on a "S" curve or bend on the roadway, I call it crash corner because more crashes occur here than any other portion of Squaw Valley Road. You can confirm this with the Fire Department, CHP or Sherriff Department.

I have personally witnessed dozens of crashes coming from both angles of the roadway. Some of these crashed ended in my front yard landscaped areas, literally knocking mature trees over or ended up in my driveway damaging our vehicles parked there, with the last occurrence happening this past winter! The roadway is posted for 35 mph but 25 mph through these S bends. Yet the reality is that many vehicles are traveling well in excess of 40 or even 50 mph or greater through these bends, including large commercial trucks whom kick up the most dust!

Widening the road and encroaching toward my residence will only exacerbate these dangerous conditions with nearly four times the traffic flow if KSL has its way! This will not only further speed up the typical vehicle, but also encourage passing on both the left or right lane creating more a raceway setting for the vast majority of users urgent to get into or out of the valley!

1282-6

I have fought long and hard to preserve, enhance and protect my front yard landscaping and trees lining the roadway that separate, provide screening and noise reduction to my property along with enhancing the aesthetic value of not only my home but also Squaw Valley’s Designated Scenic Corridor. Further the Squaw Valley General Plan further protects this Scenic Corridors trees located on the north side of the roadway, the same as my home and all the other homes located on this roadway.

Encroaching into my private property and destroying all this landscaping and trees that provide screening and privacy that have been established for over 50 years is not an option! Doing so would further endanger and reduce the parking situation to both my tenants and I. Further as my driveway already has a relatively steep approach, which already requires a very slow approach in order to avoid bottoming out in my Honda, would only make unacceptably steeper and unapproachable, and make it even more exposed to the dangerous bend in the roadway!

With twice the lanes the noise levels would double, already often so loud at times that one cannot even carry on a conversation outdoors, (despite the EIR reports) even on my deck located 50 feet back off the roadway! This would also approximately double the amount of deadly dust noted above!

My understanding that a four-lane road is not feasible from this report along with community meetings as the backup would only shift to the 89 intersections at Alpine Meadow, Tahoe City and Truckee. If a four-lane road must be built then there is no reason why it cannot be widen out towards the meadows between the existing roadway and bike path. Generally there is an extensive space primarily consisting of weeds. **DO NOT destroy every ones homes front yard whom have a home on Squaw Valley Road along with aesthetics, parking and trees located here on this designate scenic corridor for past five to six decades, that’s just morally and environmentally fundamentally wrong!!**

Summary:

While there are multiple serious and disturbing issues with this comprehensive report, I have opted to focus on the most relevant to my property and health concerns. I have no doubt there will more than sufficient input from other concerned citizens along with Sierra Watch, whom I endorse.

KSL “ Save Squaw Valley” is an oxymoron, foolish, unreasonable, so out of place as to be amusing, ridiculous and a contradiction of terms!

While I am not opposed to reasonable development, these plans for 100’ tall buildings the width of Walmart have no place in this pristine valley. 25 years of construction, large commercial trucks rolling by all day beginning at 6am only feet away from my home and bedroom is unbearable to even think about! KSL only concern is how much profit they can make with little regard to the damage to the environment and no regard to the damages, noise and pollution that the local population would have to absorb!

I282-6
cont.

I282-7

Under the Executive Summary 2.3 ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT, if development must go through then the **Reduced Density Alternative**, which would reduce the amount of development by approximately 50 percent, but in a master-planned development; would make the most sense.

1282-8

Please do not allow the Widening of Squaw Valley Road Alternative pass, this is not in Squaw Valleys best interest, especially for the homeowners located on the main roadway being a designated corridor along with all the established Placer County Policies for Scenic Corridors along with Squaw Valley General Plan seeking to protect these issues!

1282-9

If KSL is allowed full development, the negative impact to our environment, noise, pollution, health and my very life are at stake.

1282-10

PLEASE DO NOT JEOPARDIZE OUR ENVIRONMENT, THIS BEAUTIFUL VALLEY, OUR HEALTH NOR ALLOW THEM TO KILL ME!

Thank you for your time in reviewing my concerns. I would expect a response to these concerns and have becoming more present and vocal with our community. This is our home, its a beautiful valley, lets not ruin it for commercial interest!

Sincerely,

Edward Torres

PO Box 3733, Olympic Valley,

CA 96146

I282Edward Torres
no date

- I282-1 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. Detailed responses to specific comments are provided below.
- I282-2 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.
- I282-3 The comment expresses concerns about traffic, noise, and dust along Squaw Valley Road. The impact of project-generated traffic on area intersections and roadways, including Squaw Valley Road, is analyzed in Chapter 9, "Transportation and Circulation," of the DEIR.
- The project's effect on traffic noise levels, including traffic noise levels along Squaw Valley Road, is analyzed under Impact 11-5, which begins on page 11-30 of the DEIR. Also, see the Master Response regarding noise, which discusses traffic noise as well as the revisions to Mitigation Measure 11-5, which requires measures to minimize the traffic noise impact at residences located along Squaw Valley Road.
- With respect to dust, see response to comment I282-4 regarding roadside dust emissions, and response to comment I282-5 regarding existing concentrations of particulate matter in Squaw Valley.
- I282-4 The comment expresses concern about fugitive dust emissions generated by vehicles along Squaw Valley Road. See response to comment PH-73.
- The comment expresses concern that the dust generated by vehicles along Squaw Valley Road contains crystalline silica, also known as silicon dioxide, and provides text from a Wikipedia page (https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Silicon_dioxide) about the adverse health effects from exposure to crystalline silica. As stated on this Wikipedia page, the exposure limit established by the Occupational Safety and Health Administration for silica dust is 50 micrograms per cubic meter.
- More information about the application of sand to Squaw Valley Road and other roads in the County was provided by staff in the Placer County Department of Public Works (DPW) (Taber, pers. comm. 2015). Sand is never applied to the road before a storm as a pre-emptive measure. DPW sweeps roads that have been sanded after the ice melts. This limits the time that dry sand sits on the roads. DPW generally gives priority to roads that are part of school routes or ski routes for both sanding and sweeping. Busier roads get priority for sanding and sweeping than less busy roads. The sand applied to County roads must meet certain specifications. These specifications were developed primarily to limit runoff of fine sediment to protect water quality. These specifications also limit the amount of dust particles that can become entrained into the air. The specifications also require the sand to be of sufficient "hardness" to limit the degree in which it is crushed into finer grains by traveling vehicles. Most importantly, if the proposed Village at Squaw Valley Specific plan were to result in more traffic on Squaw Valley Road, DPW would not apply more sand or apply sand more frequently than it does under existing conditions. The frequency of sanding and sweeping on Squaw Valley Road would not change as a result of the project.

The County acknowledges that dust emissions related to road sanding are an annoyance under existing conditions. There is no simple method for determining whether more roadside dust would be generated due to increased traffic volumes on Squaw Valley Road as a result of the VSVSP. Generally, an increase in the number of vehicles traveling along the road would result in more frequent re-entrainment of dust into the air but larger traffic volumes could also result in slower traffic speeds, which could result in less dust being emitted into the air.

In addition, the County and its consultants searched for more information about the health effects of silica dust. The literature primarily focuses on exposure of workers to silica dust, particularly people working in mining and construction that are exposed for long periods on a daily basis, rather than residential receptors located near roadways that are subject to sanding, which, if exposed, would be exposed infrequently for short periods. In addition, different types of sands from different sources have different proportions of silica and fine particles. For example, sand classified as “play sand” has less silica and fine particles than sand used for glass making that is specifically selected for its high silica content. Therefore, studies related to mining, construction, or industrial exposure to silica, which would be expected to occur in conditions with high silica concentrations, are not applicable to infrequent low level exposures to sands likely to have a lower silica content.

The comment also expresses concern about “hazardous soot” emitted by vehicles traveling on Squaw Valley Road. The potential for project-related emissions of hazardous air pollutants, also referred to as toxic air contaminants, to expose residences to unhealthy concentrations is discussed under Impact 10-4, which begins on page 10-22 of the DEIR.

I282-5

The comment states that the concentrations of criteria air pollutants measured at the monitoring stations in Truckee, Tahoe City, and South Lake Tahoe, which are summarized in Table 10-2 on page 10-3 of the DEIR, are not representative of particulate matter concentrations in Squaw Valley. The comment points out that none of these monitoring stations are located in Squaw Valley or along a roadway that serves as the primary access route to a ski resort. Table 10-2 summarizes the ambient monitoring stations located closest to Squaw Valley. The commenter does not provide any suggestions about another, potentially better way to characterize localized air quality conditions in Squaw Valley.

The monitoring stations in Truckee, Tahoe City, and South Lake Tahoe serve the purpose of monitoring ambient concentrations of criteria air pollutants and, therefore, are intentionally not located near any particular sources of criteria air pollutants. These stations measure two separate subsets of particulate matter: respirable particulate matter with an aerodynamic diameter of 10 micrometers or less (PM_{10}) and fine particulate matter with an aerodynamic diameter of 2.5 micrometers or less ($PM_{2.5}$). PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$, among other pollutants such as ozone, are criteria air pollutants because they are used as indicators of ambient air quality conditions. Criteria air pollutants are air pollutants for which acceptable levels of exposure can be determined and for which national ambient air quality standards (NAAQS) and California ambient air quality standards (CAAQS) have been established by EPA and the California Air Resources Board, respectively. This is explained under the heading, “Criteria Air Pollutants,” on beginning on page 10-1 of the DEIR.

The PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$ concentrations measured at these monitoring stations are used to evaluate whether air quality conditions in the air basin are compliant with the CAAQS and NAAQS. The comment asserts that the DEIR is misleading the reader to think that the data from the ambient monitoring stations are specifically representative of localized pollutant concentrations in Squaw Valley; however, text on page 10-3 clearly states the locations of these monitoring stations.

The commenter also expresses concern that vehicles back up for 3 to 4 hours starting from around 7am to 11 am and once again from 3pm to 7pm.” See Chapter 9, “Transportation

and Circulation,” in the DEIR for analysis of how the proposed VSVSP would impact traffic conditions along Squaw Valley Road.

The commenter again expresses concern about fugitive dust emissions generated by vehicles along Squaw Valley Road. See response to comment PH-73.

- I282-6 The comment expresses concerns regarding the Widened Squaw Valley Road Alternative, which is described and evaluated in Chapter 17, “Alternatives,” of the DEIR (see pages 17-31 through 17-35). As described therein, this alternative would result in greater impacts than the proposed project due to the additional impact area.
- I282-7 See response to comment letter O8 for responses to the detailed comments submitted by Sierra Watch.
- 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.
- I282-8 See the Master Response regarding the Reduced Density Alternative.
- I282-9 See response to comment I282-6 regarding the Widened Squaw Valley Road Alternative.
- I282-10 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.

1283

July 15, 2015

To: Placer Co. Community Development Resource Agency
Environmental Coordination Services
3091 County Center Drive, Suite 190
Auburn, Ca 95603

Attention: Maywan Krach

Subject: Village at Squaw Valley Specific Plan

We4 have visited Squaw Valley and are opposed to the project for the following reasons:

Traffic congestion, the highway will not support more usage without significant delays

1283-1

view Environmental impact on the beauty of the area. Why do we visit the area to
Large developments?

1283-2

Water is a concern, the supply is not limitless. Tahoe is already being impacted
By current demands.

1283-3

The above reasons were also given in my letter, 2014 sent to the Placer Co.
Supervisors. Too much commercialization is detrimental to enjoyment of the area and
consideration should be given to keeping the area around the Lake as pristine as possible.
My husband was raised in the Auburn area and he and his parents spent many enjoyable
times at Tahoe. I, too, was included in these outings and so there is a history for the
family and a desire to keep the same for future generations.

1283-4

Sincerely,
Bob & Ada Towers
269 Snapdragon Lane
Lincoln, CA 95648
Ada Towers towhee2@wavecable.com

I283Bob & Ada Towers
July 15, 2015

- I283-1 The comment expresses concerns regarding traffic congestion and delays. These issues are addressed in the DEIR. No specific issues related to the content, analysis, or conclusions in the DEIR are raised in this comment. No further response is provided here.
- I283-2 The comment expresses concerns regarding the project's environmental impact on the beauty of the area. This issue is addressed in the DEIR. No specific issues related to the content, analysis, or conclusions in the DEIR are raised in this comment. No further response is provided here.
- I283-3 The comment expresses concerns regarding water supply. This issue is addressed in the DEIR. No specific issues related to the content, analysis, or conclusions in the DEIR are raised in this comment. No further response is provided here.
- I283-4 The comment provides a summary of detailed comments provided above. See responses to the detailed comments above.
- 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.

I284

Maywan Krach

From: Doug Traub <dug.t@comcast.net>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2015 11:35 AM
To: Placer County Environmental Coordination Services
Subject: Squaw Valley Development plan

Dear Placer County Planning Commission,

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

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

UnofficialAlpine.com/Mark Fisher

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

Tom Mooers, Executive Director of Sierra Watch.

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

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

Sincerely,
Doug Traub
15455 Waterloo Circle, Truckee
North Shore Skier - 40 years

I284-1

 This email has been checked for viruses by Avast antivirus software.
www.avast.com

I284 Doug Traub
July 17, 2015

I284-1 This comment letter repeats the same comments provided in letter I145. See response to comment I145-1.

1285

Maywan Krach

From: travis <grandicetravis@hotmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2015 11:46 AM
To: Placer County Environmental Coordination Services
Subject: Protect Squaw Valley

Hello my name is Travis and its been 22 years since i was born at Tahoe Forest Hospital in Truckee. For as long as i can remember i have always felt the people who live here have a strong passion for the wilderness here in Lake Tahoe. From your low life local, to the tourist that visits every winter/summer, we all have a great appreciation for the nature and wildlife that surrounds us everyday in this beautiful place. About 5 or 6 years ago i began working in Squaw valley as a lift operator and still continue to today. Ever since squaw valley became a part of my everyday life, I learned so much about the community and soul that squaw possessed. The People were lively and full of heart when it came to the mountains, in a place where everyone around you shared some kind of common ground with one another because we were all there for the same reason. Over the years i learned that Squaws new owners KSL planned on a huge expansion of the village. From day one it seemed like the true community of squaw knew that there was a problem, and now today we know that there certainly is. This expansion must be STOPPED for the sake of the natural landscape and the effect it would have on the wilderness and peace of mind that squaw valley has. Being a native to the area the thought of this expansion personally scares me. From 10 story buildings to potential amusement park attractions, this whole thing just screams trouble for everything thats Lake Tahoe and Squaw Valley stand for, Embracing nature!!! Please help us protect this beautiful place we all love so much.

I
1285-1
I

Sincerely: Travis

I285Travis
July 17, 2015

I285-1

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.

1286

Maywan Krach

From: Keri Tully <keritully@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2015 8:26 AM
To: Placer County Environmental Coordination Services
Subject: EIR For Squaw Valley

To whom it may concern,

As a 40 year part-time resident of Alpine Meadows, I've watched the Tahoe basin change from a mountain wilderness area to something often akin to an overcrowded mid-sized city. Squaw Valley has changed most rapidly with the growth of the village and surrounding suburbs and commercial development.

1286-1

I am very much opposed to the proposed changes outlined in the EIR for Squaw Valley's proposed development, and particularly, the cumulative impacts of continued thoughtless growth and unchecked development that the current county supervisors are known to push through, against all recommendations from local residents.

I urge you to please reconsider allowing commercialism to further degrade a sensitive and naturally beautiful region. Once changes are approved, the environment is altered forever, which is short-sited and frankly a very sad legacy.

Cumulative Impacts to which I am opposed:

- *Impact 18-12: Cumulative effect on historical resources*
- *Impact 18-14: Substantial adverse cumulative effect on a scenic vista*
- *Impact 18-15: Substantial contribution to the cumulative degradation of the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings*
- *Impact 18-16: Substantial cumulative contribution to damage to scenic resources, including but not limited to trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a scenic highway*
- *Impact 18-18: Contribute to cumulative light and glare or skyglow effects in the region*
- *Impact 18-21: Cumulative impacts to Caltrans intersections*
- *Impact 18-22: Cumulative impacts caused by vehicular queuing at Caltrans intersections*
- *Impact 18-23: Cumulative impacts to Caltrans highways*
- *Impact 18-31: Cumulative short-term construction-generated noise*
- *Impact 18-32: Cumulative long-term ambient noise levels*
- *Impact 18-43: Cumulative greenhouse gas emissions*

1286-2

Sincerely,
Keri Tully
2362 John Scott Trail
Alpine Meadows

I286 Keri Tully
July 17, 2015

I286-1 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.

I286-2 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.

1287

July 1, 2015

Troy Turner
PO Box 3741
Olympic Valley CA 96146

SUBJECT: Village at Squaw Valley - Draft EIR Public Comment

I am writing to provide public comment on the expansion plans for the Village at Squaw Valley.

IMPACT 9-1

This seems to address only the construction phase and not the longer term issues for increased commercial and tourist traffic as a result of the development. Where is the mitigation for that?

I 1287-1

As a resident on Squaw Valley Road, twenty-five years of construction traffic as well as increased commercial village servicing traffic and tourist traffic passing right by my house will have a HUGE impact on the tranquility and visual aesthetic that I moved to the valley to experience. The impact is understated.

First, let me provide you some background. Phase 1 and 2 of the Village at Squaw Valley built by Intrawest changed the fabric of the valley. In prior non-skiing periods (7 months of the year), barely any traffic entered the valley and it was a tranquil retreat. Now the Village at Squaw Valley actively promotes the Village and drives a continue stream of year-round traffic up and down Squaw Valley Road. Additionally, real & false alarms are set off continually at the Village, so fire trucks and EMT's with sirens blazing fly down Squaw Valley Road also on a regular basis due to the Village being built. Imagine standing in your garden or driveway and having to cover your ears on a regular basis, where previously you rarely had to. Never having a quiet weekend outside without traffic, where years prior it was never an issue for the majority of the year. Additionally, people continually speed on Squaw Valley Road, smash into traffic cones in the winter, slide into our cars parked in our driveways that then need body shop repairing, and send the dust from County laid grit over our dwellings and land.

1287-2

Have you considered that the residents may prefer to see the existing roads be primary utilized for "residents only" at a community friendly 25mph speed limit, with no increased impact from the development? Should there be an alternate route to access the valley's commercial developments that impacts them, not the residents?

If the primary beneficiaries of the expansion are the commercial enterprises for the Resort at Squaw Creek, the Village at Squaw Valley and Plumpjacks at Squaw Valley, then I would propose that they shoulder the burden of the construction, commercial and tourist traffic that they desire. The valley will clearly need a second alternate Evacuation Path for this level of people. One that does not have the single-point-of-failure of the existing bridge over Squaw Creek. Therefore, I propose as mitigation a continuation of Squaw Creek Road along the south-side of the valley floor, at the base of the mountain, to the Village at the Red Dog Maintenance site.

1287-3

The County can then convert Squaw Valley Road, past Squaw Creek Road, into a resident friendly zone. Sidewalks could be built along the edge of the road so encourage walking, as an alternative to the bike path. Gutters could better address the grit and drainage issues, as well as environmental runoff into the

meadow and residences. Speed humps could even be added to further discourage tourist and commercial Village traffic on this section of Squaw Valley Road. Why are streets in the County's other towns provided footpaths, gutters and slow traffic, yet Olympic Valley residents are forced to endure speeding trucks & 4WD's whizzing by our homes and impacting the valley, for some else's capital gain?

I287-3
cont.

If these commercial enterprise really want this commercial, construction and tourist traffic for not only 25 years for development, but also for decades beyond that, then let's see them welcome receiving it on their land and vista, as mitigation for what they are causing. With the peak-to-peak gondola and village expansion, Squaw Valley will clearly receive more traffic annually.

Additionally, the conceptual renderings show that the Village will be blocked from road noise by a huge parking structure and set-back of accommodations. The residents on Squaw Valley Road will have no such opportunity to block the traffic noise created by the Village. The Village will not be adversely affected, but will affect all others in the valley without mitigation, unless the traffic is relocated.

I287-4

IMPACT 9-2

Measure 9-2b does not address the impact to all residents exiting and entering their driveways on Squaw Valley Road. It acknowledges that residents from all other houses above have trouble finding a gap in the traffic to turn on to or across Squaw Valley Road, but the same is true for any resident entering or exiting a driveway of a house on Squaw Valley Road.

I287-5

A solution would be for all Traffic Control Personnel to watch for residents trying to exit the houses along the road, as well as from Russell/Wayne/Eric Roads, and create pauses in the traffic flow so the home-owners can also exit. All residents should be provided the same mitigation.

IMPACT 9-6

The statement is not true. Since the addition of the Intrawest Village we regularly see people jogging and walking on Squaw Valley Road in summer and winter, where none existed previously. Even with the bike path and snow clearing in winter, people still do this. With more people at the Village in the future this WILL increase.

I am surprised that there has not been a winter fatality due to this, coupled with the current speeding issues on that road. It is obviously an extremely dangerous, slippery surface with snow on it and cars can not see people around the curves, due to high snow banks at times. Soon someone will slip and end up under a vehicle in winter.

I287-6

A mitigation would be to build and maintain a sidewalk on either side of Squaw Valley Road so people can safely walk around the town. The bike path is actively used by cyclists, inline skaters, roller skaters, skateboarders, summer cross country skaters, etc and is not safe for pedestrians and strollers. Encouraging foot traffic via proper sidewalks will also reduce greenhouse gases by people choosing to walk rather than drive.

IMPACTS 11-14 & 18-32

The Draft EIR Executive Summary refers to “cumulative light and glare” and “cumulative long-term ambient noise levels”. These may just read as words on a page to someone in an office deciding on this project, so I wanted to provide you a first-hand understanding and example of what that REALLY means.

I287-7

Years ago the County approved the Resort at Squaw Creek. I have lived on Squaw Valley Road directly opposite the Resort at Squaw Creek for sixteen (16) years now. It impacts my life in an ADVERSE way every day.

LIGHT: Each night when I go to bed a bright light below the pool area at the Resort at Squaw Creek shines straight across the meadow and directly into our bedroom window. It lights up my entire bed and if I raise my head off the pillow and face outside, it hits me in the eyes. As a result, I have to sleep with curtains across, even though my preference is to have them open so I can see the stars and rise with the sun. Where the Resort at Squaw Creek development not there, there would be no such issue. Imagine living in a beautiful mountain location and having a commercial light shining into your room from out in what would otherwise be a mountainside!

I287-8

NOISE: In the afternoons and evenings my wife and I like to enjoy the tranquil space we have created in our garden OR on quiet summer evenings, when the house is hot, we’d prefer to sleep with our windows open. Unfortunately, we are unable to do either of these things in our wonderful mountain setting as we hear a constant ambient noise from the condensers at the Resort at Squaw Creek. It is extremely annoying to hear, especially when the rest of the valley is naturally peaceful. This continual drone is the bane of our existence. Imagine living in a beautiful mountain location and having a completely unnatural commercial noise filling the air constantly ... without any relief, ever! Your project approvals create such things.

I287-9

The Village expansion will be around a corner/hillside from my location, so may not have these effects on me, but I have multiple friends living within the vicinity whose opinion I would respect if they were against the project. So please listen to them and recall these real-life examples or how a new structure (let alone an entire village) impacts the people, creatures and ambiance of a picturesque valley for eternity.

I287-10

Also realize, it has zero impact on the developer’s management team and private equity investors, who choose to not live in the valley and be effected in any way.

IMPACT 14-6

I find the conclusion drawn hard to believe. Surely the increased volume due to events such as Tough Mudder, Wanderlust, Ironman and any number of other events and festivals that the Village at Squaw Valley will endeavor to secure year-round will have a marked long-term impact on recreational usage within the valley. We have clearly seen a dramatic increase in hiking trail and bike trail usage in the valley as a direct result of the Village at Squaw Valley. Even as recently as June 18, 2015 the Viillage at Squaw Valley released a video encouraging increased bike park usage. Certainly with 92 acres built out and a dramatic increase in marketing, this will increase. What baseline and projected usage figures, by month, have you gathered to conclude this?

I287-11

IMPACTS IN GENERAL

When you see an impact listed in the report, really stop to imagine the full extent of what those words are truly referring to and how harmonious the existing, un-impacted location already is. Instead of thinking “that will exist, let me read what they’ll do to lessen it”, why don’t you think “that shouldn’t exist, we shouldn’t allow that impact to occur in this valley”? Instead of writing a mitigation, why isn’t “not allowed to occur” written instead?

1287-12

Also, many impacts seem to only refer to the construction phase, versus their ongoing existence due to the creation of an expanded village. Where are the long-term impacts being either mitigation or not allowed to be caused? Can you more clearly group and identify all the long-term impacts that will evolve due to this project?

Remember, you don’t have to just mitigate these impacts, you can choose NOT to let such impacts even exist in the first place ... and thus not affect people and a scenic space for generations to come.

CONCLUSION

It’s my understanding the majority of the residents & local community (including myself) would like the ski resort and town to move forward, while eliminating the giant asphalt eye-sore at the end of the valley, but its affects should to be harmonious with the aesthetic of the beautiful valley and character for the community.

1287-13

An outside corporation should not simple build and own a town they design ... in our County. There should be much greater design and layout input and collaboration from the townsfolk and County elected representatives, versus simply commenting on an outside corporation’s plans for our valley & village.

There are many beautiful, idyllic and quaint mountain towns in the world. We should strive for Olympic Valley, in Placer County, to be one of them. Every stakeholder should have a sense of involvement and pride in the outcome. Let’s take the time and gather the input to get this right.

I287 Troy Turner
July 1, 2015

I287-1 The comment misinterprets Impact 9-1, which does not address construction traffic. The project's operational traffic impacts are addressed in Impacts 9-1 through 9-7; construction impacts are addressed in Impact 9-8. Mitigation Measures 9-1a, 9-1b, 9-2a, 9-2b, 9-2c, 9-2d, 9-3, 9-4, 9-5, and 9-7 are recommended to reduce/avoid the project's operational traffic impacts; Mitigation Measure 9-8 is recommended to reduce/avoid the project's construction traffic impact.

I287-2 See the Master Response regarding the 25-year construction period. The comment also expresses concerns related to traffic and visual impacts. These issues are addressed in the DEIR. No specific issues related to the content, analysis, or conclusions in the DEIR are raised in this comment. No further response is provided here.

The remainder of the comment describes impacts to the Valley that resulted from construction of phases 1 and 2 of the Intrawest Project. Concerns such as traffic, noise, public safety, and air quality/dust are described. These issues are addressed in the DEIR. No specific issues related to the content, analysis, or conclusions in the DEIR are raised in this comment. No further response is provided here.

I287-3 The majority 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. The comment also addresses preferences for alteration of the layout and use of Squaw Valley Road. This is beyond the scope of the proposed project.

Emergency access to the plan area is addressed in Chapter 15, "Hazardous Materials and Hazards," of the DEIR (see Impact 15-4 on page 15-19).

The comment suggests that Squaw Creek Road should be extended to the Village as an alternative route, such that traffic from the project would no longer affect residential areas along Squaw Valley Road. The concept of extending Squaw Creek Road to the Village would be a major project that would require extensive study. It would require extension of Squaw Creek Road either through areas currently used for the base of ski runs, through the existing Squaw Creek golf course, through meadows and wetlands, or some combination of these various features. This would result in substantial environmental impacts to a variety of resources. Further, the project applicant does not control the property that the roadway extension would traverse, and the property (Resort at Squaw Creek) is not available for sale. Thus, this type of alternative access is likely infeasible. Moreover, while largely an economic effect, if visitors no longer were able to use Squaw Valley Road, several of the businesses along the road would likely be affected, potentially leading to blighted conditions.

Finally, it should be noted that, even when project-generated traffic volumes are included, a comparison of traffic volumes with full buildout of the VSVSP as presented in the DEIR to 1990 traffic counts in the *Report to Placer County Regarding Squaw Valley Traffic Impacts for the Resort at Squaw Creek (Omni-Means 1990)* indicates that traffic volumes are forecast to be 32 percent lower than they were in 1990 in the eastbound a.m. peak-hour condition, and 11 percent lower in the westbound p.m. peak-hour condition. This indicates little need for construction of a separate, new access road.

- See the Master Response regarding the cumulative analysis.
- I287-4 See the Master Response regarding noise, particularly with respect to additional mitigation that would reduce traffic noise.
- I287-5 The comment suggests that traffic management as part of Mitigation Measure 9-2b should consider stopping traffic to allow residents living on Squaw Valley Road to enter/exit. This concept has potential merit. However, its effectiveness may be limited to only those residents in proximity to the “managed intersection,” in which traffic control personnel can see vehicles entering/exiting a driveway.
- The project applicant would conduct traffic management along Squaw Valley Road between SR 89 and the Village area as a condition of Mitigation Measure 9-1a. A traffic management plan would be prepared to the satisfaction of the Placer County Department of Public Works and the Engineering and Surveying Division prior to recordation of the first Small Lot Final Map, and would include prediction of days when traffic management is needed, traffic management programs and implementation, and a monitoring mechanism that demonstrates implementation when needed (see DEIR page 9-56). The specific locations and operations for side road intersection traffic control will be detailed in the traffic management plan.
- I287-6 It is unclear which statement related to DEIR Impact 9-6 (Impacts to bicycle and pedestrian facilities) the commenter states is not true. Therefore, a response cannot be provided.
- The commenter suggests that mitigation should include sidewalks on either side of Squaw Valley Road so people can safely walk around the town. As noted on page 9-65 of the DEIR, the project would construct additional bicycle and pedestrian facilities within the Village to accommodate these modes of travel. However, the comment apparently pertains to adding sidewalks to Squaw Valley Road east of the Village. As noted previously, it is unlikely that the addition of sidewalks would be considered feasible due to lack of available right-of-way (i.e., private properties abutting the road), the Class I multi-use path on the south side, and other sensitive environmental features are located on both sides of the roadway. Nevertheless, this suggestion is being forwarded to the Placer County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors for their consideration when making decisions regarding the project.
- The comment is correct in that “encouraging foot traffic via proper sidewalks will also reduce greenhouse gases by people choosing to walk rather than drive.” This is described in the DEIR in Chapter 16, “Greenhouse Gases and Climate Change.”
- I287-7 The comment provides a summary of detailed comments provided below regarding light and noise. See responses to comments I287-8 through I287-10.
- I287-8 The comment describes an existing condition related to light impacts at the commenter’s property resulting from the Resort at Squaw Creek. Visual impacts resulting from the proposed project area addressed in the DEIR. See also 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.
- I287-9 The comment describes an existing condition related to noise impacts at the commenter’s property resulting from the Resort at Squaw Creek. Noise impacts resulting from the proposed project area addressed in the DEIR. See also the Master Response regarding noise. No specific issues related to the content, analysis, or conclusions in the DEIR are raised in this comment. No further response is provided here.
- I287-10 See responses to comments I287-8 and I287-9 regarding light and noise impacts.

1287-11 The comment states that the conclusion of DEIR Impact 14-6 (Increased demand for parks and recreational facilities) is hard to believe because “the increased volume due to events such as Tough Mudder, Wanderlust, Ironman and any number of other events and festivals that the Village at Squaw Valley will endeavor to secure year-round will have a marked long-term impact on recreational usage within the valley.” The DEIR, under Impact 14-6 as well as the project description, describes the new and expanded public recreational facilities that would be created with project implementation. Impact 14-6 further describes the project’s compliance with County General Plan Policy 5.A.3, which requires new development to provide a minimum of 5 acres of improved parkland and 5 acres of passive recreation area or open spaced for every 1,000 new residents. On page 14-42, the DEIR states:

Along with the provision of active and passive parkland, the project applicant would also participate in a Community Facilities District, County Service Area Zone of Benefit, or other funding mechanism if available to provide fair share ongoing maintenance and operation of public recreation amenities.

Because the project would create new and expanded public recreational facilities, comply with County General Plan Policy 5.A.3, and provide fair share ongoing maintenance and operation of public recreation amenities, this impact was found to be less than significant (see page 14-43 in the DEIR). Also, see response to comment letter F2 regarding impacts to trails.

Regarding large one time or annual events such as Tough Mudder, Wanderlust, and Ironman, the proposed project does not include a proposal for increased frequency for these types of events. Although the proposed project may provide smaller venues that may be used to support such events (e.g., the snow beach and plazas and courtyards), it is not intended to generate additional opportunities for such events.

1287-12 CEQA requires that project impacts are evaluated against baseline conditions, which are the physical environmental conditions that exist at the time the NOP is released (in this case, October 2012). See Section 1.3, “Definition of Baseline,” in the DEIR for further details. Mitigation is required for project impacts that are determined to be significant or potentially significant. Accordingly, the DEIR recommends mitigation measures for these types of impacts. If there is no feasible mitigation available to reduce an impact to a less-than-significant level, the impact is found to be significant and unavoidable. See Section 18.2, “Significant Environmental Effects which cannot be Avoided,” in the DEIR for further details. Also, see the Master Response regarding significant and unavoidable impacts.

The second part of the comment states that “many impacts seem to only refer to the construction phase, versus their ongoing existence” throughout project operation. This statement is incorrect. The DEIR evaluates both construction and operation of the project, using various approaches depending on the environmental resource. For example, the following air quality impacts specify in the title whether or not the impact pertains to project construction or operation:

- ▲ Impact 10-1: Short-term, construction-generated emissions of ROG, NO_x, PM₁₀, and PM_{2.5}.
- ▲ Impact 10-2: Long-term, operation-related (regional) emissions of criteria air pollutants and precursors.

In other places in the DEIR, one impact discussion evaluates both the construction- and operation-related impacts of the proposed project using subheaders, where appropriate, to differentiate the discussions. For example, Impact 8-1 (Adverse effect on a scenic vista)

describes the effect the project would have during construction as well as long-term operation.

The last part of 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.

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

I287-13

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.

1288

Maywan Krach

From: aetweedy@comcast.net
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2015 1:05 PM
To: Placer County Environmental Coordination Services
Subject: Squaw Valley

To Whom It May Concern:

As a longstanding summer visitor to Squaw Valley, I want to voice my opposition to the proposed project. This project would completely change the character of the Valley. It is a site of tremendous natural beauty and is renowned for its tranquility. The Valley as it is, which is beloved by so many, would be destroyed by this project. Destroying natural beauty to construct indoor amusement parks is a terrible approach to planning.

1288-1

Sincerely,
Ann Tweedy

I288Ann Tweedy
July 17, 2015

I288-1

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. For information on the project's potential effects on the visual character of the Valley, refer to the Master Response regarding the visual impact analysis.