

1289

Maywan Krach

From: Rex Upp <dirtr82@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2015 3:19 PM
To: Placer County Environmental Coordination Services
Subject: Village at Squaw Valley Specific Plan

Dear Alex Fisch, Project Manager, and Placer County Planning Department,

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments on the Draft EIR for Village at Squaw Valley Specific Plan.

I have been a property owner (Squaw Valley Lodge) and frequent visitor to Olympic Valley for over 30 years. I purchased this year-round vacation condo because, in my opinion, Squaw Valley has no "off-season."

- We come here to get away from city and urban activities, noise, crowds, and distractions.
- We come here to enjoy the multitude of outdoor and natural recreation activities Squaw Valley and the high Sierras have to offer.

1289-1

The proposed development will change this forever!

Construction of the current Village was a welcome addition. It changed the valley from a large parking lot and ski resort to a quaint alpine village. But the proposed development has too many unsatisfactory elements. I'll list just a few:

- A 100+ foot tall indoor amusement park, supposedly focused on "outdoor adventures." This belongs in Sacramento for people who can't, or choose not to, drive to the Sierras for real outdoor adventures. It should not be in the Valley!
- The multiple proposed 100+ feet tall buildings will forever change the Alpine village ambience of the valley and the views of the surrounding mountains. Only those able to afford the upper floors will have their views enhanced. But even their views will be dominated by roof tops rather than the Sierra Mountains.
- Traffic: the plan doesn't include any measures to mitigate the greatly increased traffic on Highway 89. Perhaps they should consider bringing in a high-speed tram from a new parking lot in the valley east of Truckee.
- Within the valley, provisions should be included to mitigate the dangerous intersection where Squaw Valley Road South meets Squaw Peak Road. How long before a pedestrian is struck and seriously injured?
- Also, with the increased traffic in the valley, it's only a matter of time before a car rounding the corner of Squaw Valley Road at Chamonix Place goes off the road and into Squaw Creek. Something needs to be done here.
- Reportedly construction will take over 25 years - even at night. I urge the County to look closely at their noise ordinances and reduce the allowed construction time appropriately.

1289-2

1289-3

1289-4

1289-5

1289-6

1289-7

Thank you for your consideration,

Rex Upp

I289Rex Upp
July 17, 2015

- I289-1 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.
- I289-2 See the Master Response regarding the MAC.
- I289-3 See the Master Response regarding the visual impact analysis. Also, see Section 2.1, “Project Modifications,” of this FEIR, which describes the applicant’s proposed modifications to the project in response to concerns expressed by the Squaw Valley Design Review Committee and members of the public. Many of the modifications involve changes in building designs resulting in greater space between buildings or reduced building heights.
- I289-4 The comment states that “the plan doesn’t include any measures to mitigate the greatly increased traffic on Highway 89.” This is incorrect. Mitigation Measures 9-3, 9-4, and 9-5 in the DEIR would reduce traffic impacts along SR 89, but not to a less-than-significant level. See the Master Response regarding significant and unavoidable impacts and the Master Response regarding traffic. Regarding the commenter’s suggestion to consider a high-speed tram from a new parking lot in the valley east of Truckee, see the portion of the traffic Master Response addressing transit services.
- I289-5 See the Master Response regarding traffic issues at Squaw Valley Road and Squaw Peak Road.
- I289-6 The comment provides no evidence that there are currently unsafe road conditions in the Squaw Valley Road/Chamonix Place area. Any roadway near a waterway provides the potential for a car to leave the roadway and enter the waterway. However, there is no evidence that a particular hazard is associated with roadways adjacent to Squaw Creek under current conditions, or would occur with project implementation. All roadways must comply with County standards regarding safety pertaining to width, configuration, signage, visibility, barriers, and other matters.
- I289-7 See the Master Response regarding the 25-year construction period and the Master Response regarding noise.

I290

Maywan Krach

From: stenogr4@aol.com
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2015 3:38 PM
To: Placer County Environmental Coordination Services
Subject: Squaw Valley comments/input

To whom it may concern,

My name is Pamela Jane Utter and am currently a resident of New York City. I have been a Court Stenographer for 27 years and have been an employee of the United States Courts for 15 years.

I290-1

From January to April of 2012 I was a resident of Squaw Valley, and due to personal and professional responsibilities, I was unable to continue to maintain Squaw Valley as my home at that time. In the hopefully near future I am looking to retire to the Tahoe City/Squaw Valley area. With my affection for and desire to become a resident of Squaw Valley and really the gift of nature, I urge you to give serious thought in considering the true need for KSL's proposed changes in Squaw Valley and thus greatly altering the beauty and lure of the Valley itself.

I290-2

From what I understand to be the present residential and retail vacancy rates in Squaw Valley there is certainly no need for any development let alone a high-rise, not to mention the unfortunate visual aesthetic such development will create in the Valley. Any sort of high-rise construction doesn't belong in the Valley let alone blocking the view of the mountains. The Mountains are nature's high-rise and blocking them with man-made construction would be a great tragedy, and to my New York mind, doesn't fit. Being a New Yorker living near high-rises and working in and near them, they strangely seem to fit in New York City... although it's not always pleasant. Have you ever visited New York City? When the sun sets and you're near even one if not many high rises the lighting is diminished, the energy has a feeling of light trying to get to places it knows it should but can't because it is being blocked. This is, I fear, what will happen with light and the view with development of what I perceive as unneeded construction in Squaw Valley. It's the opposite of what is traditionally known at light pollution and is just as unfortunate that it's happening and no one can stop it once it's built. Even now being a homeowner in New York City, when I purchased my home I purposefully bought with an eye to the permanency of buildings and preservation of buildings, what air rights may exist so that I knew that the building across the block can't be razed and have a high-rise constructed in its place.

I290-3

Also, the environmental impact from the construction process itself will create more harm than any good that can come from constructing/developing buildings and "entertainment" real estate which is only for fiscal profit and benefit and not for the good of nature's

gift. Why would you let anything happen to the natural resource that cannot be replaced or repaired once it is ruined or simply gone. That's just plain and simple anywhere and our planet is really feeling the burden of that... let's be a part of change and not let it happen in Squaw Valley!!! Please don't even take a chance with the environment as it exists in Squaw Valley now. NO DEVELOPMENT!!! Please keep Squaw Valley somewhere where people WILL want to escape cities, not go to vacation in one in the middle of nature!!! I personally don't want a city in the mountains and in my years of riding mountains haven't met someone who does.

I290-3
cont.

Thank you for your time and consideration given to my thoughts.

Sincerely,

Pamela Jane Utter

I290

Pamela Jane Utter
July 17, 2015

- I290-1 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.
- I290-2 See the Master Response regarding occupancy assumptions and the Master Response regarding the visual impact analysis.
- I290-3 The comment expresses concern about the environmental impact of construction. These impacts (e.g., air quality, noise, traffic, etc.) are addressed throughout the DEIR.
- 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.

I291

Maywan Krach

From: Cheryl Varner <cherylvc@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2015 7:53 AM
To: Placer County Environmental Coordination Services
Subject: Squaw Valley

Below are my comments on the proposal by KSL, for Squaw Valley:

1. The 90,000 square foot rec. center: The amount of people it would take to make this viable would cause a constant traffic jam on the 2 lane road in Squaw Valley. This road is a 35mph road and it can not handle that many more cars. There is no need for an complex to offer what mother nature already offers in the Tahoe Basin..ie..rafting, rock climbing, mt biking. The complex at Boreal works because it is accessed by I80, not a 2 lane road.

I291-1

2. New hotels that would exceed the total of the 3 biggest hotels in South Shore: South Shore has a huge hiway configuration. Squaw Valley has one 2 lane road to enter and exit by. This valley cannot handle that kind of traffic and all the emissions that go with it. They say they will get additional water from more wells on the mt. Taking into consideration of the 4 year drought we are in, these additional wells will just deplete the aquifer that much quicker.

I291-2

I live in Squaw Valley and the increase in traffic at 8 and 3 by the new school up valley has been significant, what in the world would it be like with 1000's of more bed spaces, if they are all occupied. Which brings up the question of the need for those extra beds. The Village at Squaw , as it is now, only fills the existing beds completely , less than 20 days a year. Why don't they efficiently market the rooms they have now, before building more. 100 ft tall buildings would be a disaster. There is nothing wrong with having a parking lot to hold your skiers.

I291-3

The auto emisions that would fill Squaw Valley would be overwhelming. There is constantly an inversion in the valley, that would trap these cancerous causing fumes , causing poor health conditions to all that live here.

I291-4

3. Construction lasting 25 years! Look how Sacramento was worried that the new stadium was going to disrupt downtown for 2 years. Squaw Valley is a small valley surrounded by mts and the sounds in itself would be a health issue for 25 years. What about adding all the additional employees traveling in/out of the valley at the same hours that folks go/leave skiing, the parents bring/pickup there kids from the new school. The one road in/out of Squaw cannot handle this additional increase in autos. you cannot add street lights at every side street. That would just back up incoming autos more, causing back up on hiway 89, both north and south Every day would be like the 4th of July traffic in Tahoe City.

I291-5

This project is just too big for our small valley.

I291-6

Sincerely
Cheryl Varner
a registered voter and occupant of Squaw Valley.

I291Cheryl Varner
July 16, 2015

- I291-1 See the Master Response regarding the MAC.
- I291-2 The comment states that Squaw Valley cannot handle the amount of traffic and emissions that would result from the project. These issues are discussed 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.
- Regarding water supply to be provided by new wells on the mountain and the impact of the 4-year drought, see the Master Response regarding water supply.
- I291-3 See the Master Response regarding occupancy assumptions.
- I291-4 Air quality and the effects of emissions on public health is addressed in the DEIR in Chapter 10, "Air Quality."
- I291-5 See the Master Response regarding the 25-year construction period.
- I291-6 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.

1292

Maywan Krach

From: Eva Vincenti <evavincenti@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 07, 2015 2:41 PM
To: Placer County Environmental Coordination Services
Subject: Village at Squaw Valley Specific Plan

Project Manager Alex Fisch and Placer County Planning Department,

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

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

1292-1

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.

1292-2

Thank you,
Flavio & Eva Vincenti
201 Squaw Peak Road Unit #232,
Olympic Valley, CA. 96146

I292

Flavio & Eva Vincenti
July 7, 2015

I292-1 See the Master Response regarding traffic issues at Squaw Valley Road and Squaw Peak Road.

I292-2 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.

1293

Maywan Krach

From: Billy Volkmann <wvolkmann@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, June 17, 2015 8:06 AM
To: Placer County Environmental Coordination Services
Cc: Kathleen Volkmann
Subject: Comment Letter re: KSL Development of Squaw Valley

June 17, 2015

TO:

Placer County Community Development Resource Agency

Attention: Maywan Krach

3091 County Center Drive, Suite 190

Auburn, CA 95603

email: cdraecs@placer.ca.gov

COMMENT LETTER FROM:

Billy Volkmann wvolkmann@gmail.com

Homeowner Alpine Meadows

and Squaw Valley Skier for 40 years.

Dear Placer County Community Development Resource Agency,

I would like to stand up for Squaw Valley and the Tahoe Sierra and ask that you please deny the KSL Capital Partners development proposal. Regarding KSL's Squaw Valley proposal even a quick read of the draft EIR makes it clear that the proposed development would transform Squaw Valley into a noisy, urbanized place. In the terminology of the draft EIR, the proposed development would have "significant" and "unavoidable" impacts on Squaw Valley – and beyond. For example:

1293-1

- *Traffic:* According to the document, development would add to area traffic and "exacerbate unacceptable operations" on Squaw Valley Road, on Highway 89 in Tahoe City, in Truckee, and in between.

1293-2

• *Views:* To Squaw's iconic mountain scenery, the project would make a "substantial contribution to the cumulative degradation of the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings" with a "significant and unavoidable impact on scenic vistas."

I 1293-3

• *Noise:* The project would generate noise louder than "applicable Placer County noise standards", especially for the 25 years it would be under construction – even at night.

I 1293-4

I disagree strongly with KSL's development plan. Thank you very much for denying it.

I 1293-5

Best Regards,

Billy Volkmann

Homeowner Alpine Meadows and Squaw Valley Skier for 40 years.

wwolkmann@gmail.com

I293Billy Volkmann
June 17, 2015

- I293-1 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.
- I293-2 The comment correctly summarizes the DEIR's conclusion that the project would result in significant and unavoidable traffic impacts. No specific issues related to the content, analysis, or conclusions in the DEIR are raised in this comment. No further response is provided here.
- I293-3 The comment correctly summarizes the DEIR's conclusion that the project would result in significant and unavoidable impacts to the existing visual character or quality of the site as well as scenic vistas. No specific issues related to the content, analysis, or conclusions in the DEIR are raised in this comment. No further response is provided here.
- I293-4 The comment correctly summarizes the DEIR's conclusion that the project would result in significant and unavoidable noise impacts. See the Master Response regarding noise.
- I293-5 See response to comment I293-1.

I294Denise & Richard Wall
July 17, 2015

- I294-1 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.
- I294-2 The comment addresses existing parking issues at the ski resort. This is an existing issue and not a comment on the project.
- I294-3 The comment expresses general opposition regarding the project based on potential traffic impacts. No comments are raised on the contents of the DEIR, so no further response is provided.
- I294-4 The comment expresses concern about construction noise, dirt, and traffic as well as noise from helicopters. 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.
- I294-5 The comment expresses concern about building heights, open spaces with deep shadows, congestion, and poor planning of walkways. Section 2.1, "Project Modifications," of this FEIR describes the applicant's proposed modifications to the project in response to concerns expressed by the Squaw Valley Design Review Committee and members of the public. These comments express general opposition to the project. 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.

1295

Maywan Krach

From: Eric Wall <walldds@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 07, 2015 5:43 PM
To: Placer County Environmental Coordination Services
Cc: Squaw Valley Lodge - Evan Benjaminson
Subject: RE: Squaw Valley Lodge - Important Notice

Eric Wall, DBS
1 of 55

Squaw Valley Lodge - Important Notice

Inbox
x

10:58 AM (6 hours ago)


Placer County

To: cdraecs@placer.ca.gov
Subject: Village at Squaw Valley Specific Plan

Project Manager Alex Fisch and Placer County Planning Department,

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

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

1295-1

Furthermore the road is not crowned and has a dip to collect run off that freezes and never melts due to the shadow effect of the tram building. Attempts by the county to clear the road of ice have been ineffective and result in a traffic and pedestrian hazard. I have seen many pedestrians fall in this area and near miss collisions.

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

1295-2

limit the construction noise and traffic.
Thank you.

1295-2
cont.

eric wall

201 Squaw Peak Road Unit #
522

Olympic Valley, CA. 96146

I295Eric Wall
July 7, 2015

I295-1

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

The second part of the comment states that the road at this location “is not crowned and has a dip to collect runoff that freezes and never melts due to the shadow effect of the tram building.” This is an existing condition and is not an impact of the project.

I295-2

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.

1296

Maywan Krach

From: David Walters <dwwlaw@comcast.net>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2015 6:40 PM
To: Placer County Environmental Coordination Services
Subject: Village at Squaw Valley Specific Plan

Project Manager Alex Fisch and Placer County Planning Department,

Subject: Village at Squaw Valley Specific Plan

Dear Mr. Fisch:

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.

1296-1
1296-2

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

Thank you.

David Walters
201 Squaw Peak Road Unit # 307
Olympic Valley, CA. 96146

Sent from my iPhone

I296David Walters
July 16, 2015

I296-1 See the Master Response regarding traffic issues at Squaw Valley Road and Squaw Peak Road.

I296-2 The commenter states that the project will result in inevitable noise and traffic impacts necessary to create a village. See the Master Response regarding noise and the Master Response regarding traffic. The remainder 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.

1297

Maywan Krach

From: Alexander Fisch
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2015 4:57 PM
To: Maywan Krach
Subject: FW: Comment on Village at Squaw

Please add to the list of DEIR comments.

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

From: Neil Wangsgard [<mailto:neil.wangsgard@sbcglobal.net>]
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2015 4:50 PM
To: Alexander Fisch
Subject: Comment on Village at Squaw

Dear Mr Fisch

This note is to register my opposition to the approval of the Village at Squaw expansion plan. I am a full time, 25 year resident of Tahoe City. While expansion of Squaw valley is desirable, this plan is to large in scale and scope. I believe the board of supervisors should deny KSLs request.

I 1297-1

Thank you

Neil Wangsgard
875 Bunker Drive
Tahoe City, CA. 96145

neil.wangsgard@sbcglobal.net

I297 Neil Wangsgard
July 16, 2015

I297-1 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.

I298

Maywan Krach

From: Harold F. Weaver <hweaver@berkeley.edu>
Sent: Tuesday, June 16, 2015 5:17 PM
To: Placer County Environmental Coordination Services
Subject: KSLPROPOSAL FOR SQUAW VALLEY

We plead with Placer County not to ruin our mountain resort/village and its surroundings with the proposed monstrosity We will defend our beautiful valley and urge you to preserve what can never be restored.. the peacefulness, the beauty, the quiet, the views . IT WOULD IMPACT NOT JUST OUR VALLEY BUT THE WHOLE TAHOE AREA. The traffic on I 80, and 89 is bad enough already, most any time in the year. Even the sky is in danger. Already helicopters often swarm over the valley drowning out the song of birds.and making it difficult to have a conversation on the deck of our beautiful mountain home.

We have enjoyed our Squaw Valley home for many years and now our children , grand children and great grandchildren, come to hike, enjoy the mountain air, the sunsets, ski in winter and get away from the hustle and bustle of the city.

KSLmay have bought some land, but they do not have right to destroy an alpine area that can never be replaced.

Cecile and Harold Weaver on Paiute Place

I
I298-1
I

I298

Cecile & Harold Weaver
June 16, 2015

I298-1

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 remainder of the comments describes concerns such as aesthetics and views, traffic, and noise. These issues are addressed in the DEIR.

1299

JUNE 18, 2015

Kenyon S. Weaver
1320 North Carolina Ave NE
Washington, D.C. 20002

Placer County Community Development Resource Agency
Attention: Maywan Krach
3091 County Center Drive, Suite 190
Auburn, CA 95603
email: cdraecs@placer.ca.gov

BY E-MAIL AND POST

Re: KSL Partners’ Development Proposal Is Unreasonable And Therefore Must be Rejected

Dear Placer County,

This letter is to protest in the strongest terms KSL Partners’ (KSL) development proposal for Squaw Valley.

1299-1

I urge Placer County to do the right thing and reject KSL’s proposal.

KSL’s vision for Squaw Valley is an “alpine lite” theme park that debases Squaw’s unique legacy and turns what is now a world class heritage destination into an imitation Aspen, with a side of Six Flags.

Here’s a picture of life in Squaw Valley in the future, were KSL to do what it wants – here is KSL’s Squaw Valley:

- A “village” that is just a copy of every other new mountain “destination” conceived by focus groups obsessed about what is considered to be elite luxury.
- A line of stop-and-go traffic stalled on highway 89, then inching along Squaw Valley Road, to and from, creating endless noise and a haze of particulate pollution.
- Huddles of tourists who come for the “experience” of shopping and entertainment, to peek at the mountains between ducking into the Hermes or Longchamps across the “village” square.

1299-2

- Visitors emerging wet-haired from an indoor slip'n'slide to hardly notice – or care -- about the actual streams and rivers around them (“Why touch the dirty Truckee when we have the Mountain Adventure?”).
- The history of the greatest upset in Olympic bid history, lost except for grainy black and white photos posted on conference walls.

And for what? Marginally higher year-on-year returns for the shareholders of a Denver company.

My family and our friends have visited or lived in Squaw Valley for over 50 years, on Paiute Place. I learned to ski at Squaw, have hiked the peaks around it. We come regularly, and I have been to Squaw at every season. In the winter, we ski the bowls and slaloms of Squaw and Alpine. In the summer, we walk up Shirley Canyon and to the top of KT, trek to Five Lakes, tube the Truckee, and camp outside, looking up at the stars.

What makes Squaw Valley exceptional is that it is a world-class ski area located in the stunning Lake Tahoe wilderness. Squaw Valley is already a year-round destination. Throughout the years, Squaw Valley has remained confident that it will endure ups and downs in the economy, will endure even the most recent, record-breaking drought.

What Squaw Valley, residents of Squaw Valley, and visitors to Squaw Valley both regular and occasional, however, will not endure is a project that transforms a gem into a trinket, packaged as an “authentic” experience. Squaw Valley is not a Six Flags. Squaw Valley is not a mall. Squaw Valley is not Aspen. And to attempt to make Squaw Valley into any or all of those would only lose what it already is -- which is extraordinary.

And once lost, it will be gone.

If that is not enough, the social and environmental costs are simply jaw-dropping. The Draft Environmental Impact Report (**DEIR**) shows that KSL’s proposal means:

- no fewer than 23 “significant and adverse” impacts even after mitigation measures;
- of these 23 significant and adverse impacts, a total of 12 cumulative impacts on every measure that makes Squaw Valley the exceptional destination that it is now: scenic vistas, traffic, light pollution, short *and* long-term noise levels, and greenhouse gases (a measure of sustainability as well);
- a 25-year build-out period – more than a generation – meaning that children born today will only know a Squaw Valley that *isn’t* under construction when they are adults; and
- the final destruction of the 1960 Olympics legacy.

I299-2
cont.

I299-3

KSL’s proposal is therefore unreasonable, and Placer County should reject it.

I 1299-4

KSL can always come back with a proposal that actually fits with the objectives of the General Plan and with the landscape and heritage of Squaw Valley.

I 1299-5

It is worth noting that KSL is proposing a project that could take a quarter century, but KSL could at any time sell, swap, pledge or otherwise transfer its property interests in Squaw Valley to other corporate entities.

And if KSL is purchased or merged with another company, you can expect a corporate re-prioritization.

1299-6

Moreover, if KSL fails to obtain lending, or misses certain milestones for its portfolio of investments, or even goes bankrupt, then construction could stop midway through, leaving rebar-spiked buildings strewn across the valley. (Don’t think it could happen? Harvard University, with its \$36 billion endowment, halted indefinitely on a massive educational campus across the Charles river during the 2008-2009 recession, and then had to go through another planning process.)¹

KSL’s proposal is not for Squaw Valley. To be here is to experience a place of natural beauty and homegrown legends. To be in KSL’s Squaw Valley is to experience a constructed fantasyland of lowest-denominator pleasures.

1299-7

Have KSL come back with something reasonable. In the meantime, reject KSL’s proposal.

Sincerely Yours,



Kenyon Weaver

¹ <http://www.nytimes.com/2009/12/11/education/11harvard.html>

I299Kenyon S. Weaver
June 18, 2015

- I299-1 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.
- I299-2 This comment also 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.
- I299-3 See the Master Response regarding significant and unavoidable impacts and the Master Response regarding the 25-year construction period. Effects on Olympic-era cultural resources are addressed in Chapter 7, "Cultural Resources," of the DEIR.
- I299-4 The comment is directed towards the project approval process and does not address the content, analysis, or conclusions in the DEIR. Therefore, no further response is provided here. All comment letters submitted during the DEIR public review period will be reviewed and considered by the Placer County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors before a decision on the project is rendered.
- I299-5 The comment suggests that the project be revised, but does not comment on the contents of the DEIR.
- I299-6 The comment addresses potential business eventualities concerning the current project applicant. No comments are provided on the contents of the DEIR.
- I299-7 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.

I300

Maywan Krach

From: Kirk K. Weaver <kkweaver@cedarbayresources.com>
Sent: Wednesday, June 24, 2015 8:57 AM
To: Placer County Environmental Coordination Services
Cc: Kirk K. Weaver
Subject: KSL Partners' Development Proposal for Squaw Valley

Kirk K. and Jacqueline L. Weaver
5484 Holly Springs Drive
Houston, TX 77056

Placer County Community Development Resource Agency

Attention: Maywan Krach

3091 County Center Drive, Suite 190

Auburn, CA 95603

E-mail: cdraecs@placer.ca.gov

RE: KSL Partners' Development Proposal for Squaw Valley

Dear Ms. Krach:

We are writing you to protest the KSL Partner's Development Proposal for Squaw Valley and to urge that Placer County reject it outright.

The KSL proposal reflects a mountain monstrosity, inconsistent with the aesthetic, historic, human and current commercial values of Squaw Valley. The development will transform a place of natural beauty into a cheap imitation of natural beauty – while destroying the natural beauty itself. It will destroy the currently manageable scale of the commercial and recreational activity into a "mass production" vision of how the outdoor environment is experienced and enjoyed. It will take a unique place – a site of singular beauty and recreational opportunity – and make it commonplace, because that's what this kind of development does. In short, the KSL Development Proposal seeks to convert a world class mountain destination into an amusement park. We don't need it and we don't want it.

We have been coming to Squaw Valley to ski, hike and enjoy the outdoors for over 40 years, and we are property owners there. Squaw Valley is a family destination in both winter and summer. For us, the KSL Proposal will destroy the things that have made Squaw Valley special – the dark sky and bright stars on a winter's night, the sound of snow falling in the winter, the pine-scented breezes, the small-community

I300-1

environment, among many other things. So, we strongly oppose the KSL Proposal, and urge you to reject it so that we can continue to enjoy these things.

I 1300-1
cont.

As property owners, we believe the value of our property will be diminished if the KSL Proposal is accepted. We have a house on Paiute Place, and our views, serenity, and access will all be adversely affected by the KSL Proposal. Their construction activity will create a major nuisance and, we believe, diminish the value of our property. This is unfair to us. We strongly oppose the KSL Proposal on these grounds, and urge you to reject it also.

I 1300-2

Finally, the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) reflects the staggering and, truly, unconscionable social and environmental costs that the KSL Proposal will impose – and there seem to be at least 23 “significant and adverse” impacts, AFTER mitigation. These are 23 reasons to reject the KSL Proposal, and we strongly urge you to reject the KSL Proposal for those reasons.

I 1300-3

One impact that we think is incompletely assessed is water. It appears that the study of water availability is flawed from a technical standpoint, from a lack of current information, and from a lack of realism. A hard-headed, realistic view of water availability, and the legitimate, competing public needs for water should be reflected in all development decisions. We believe water availability is, by itself, a reason to reject the KSL Proposal.

I 1300-4

Please judge the KSL Proposal on the basis of its absolute merits, and take no notice of claims that this project has already been “scaled back” and “adjusted for community concerns.” The absolute merits of their proposal warrant rejection by Placer County, and arguments about how much worse it could have been are simply irrelevant and a distraction from how really terrible what it is that KSL proposes to do.

I 1300-5

One further consideration: KSL is a business, and they are proposing a 25-year development cycle. What assurances that any development undertaken by KSL can be financed, implemented and sustained over the period they project? What is the realistic likelihood that their timetable can be maintained? KSL’s management will change, its investment priorities could change, the availability of financing and the availability and cost of many other resources that go into a project of this sort will change over the anticipated development period. In the end, the customers will determine the success of the any project undertaken by KSL – and customer preferences change over time. Approving the KSL Proposal makes a lot of bets about the future – except for one: the certain destruction of the what is unique, special and valuable about Squaw Valley. Placer County can’t necessarily preserve Squaw Valley, but it can certainly destroy it.

I 1300-6

You Placer County officials are the guardians of the future of Squaw Valley – and its unique and historic heritage and character. That character will be irretrievably lost if you approve the KSL Proposal. Please protect Squaw Valley, and reject the KSL Proposal.

I 1300-7

Please do the right thing for the Squaw Valley community, the citizens of Placer County, and for everyone who enjoys the unique experience of the Sierra Nevada, and reject the KSL Proposal.

Yours sincerely,

Kirk K. Weaver

Jacqueline L. Weaver

I300Kirk K. & Jacqueline L. Weaver
June 4, 2015

- I300-1 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.
- I300-2 The comment asserts that the value of the commenter's property will be diminished if the project is approved. Financial issues such as these are not an environmental effect under CEQA, as described in Section 15131 of the CEQA Guidelines.
- I300-3 See the Master Response regarding significant and unavoidable impacts.
- I300-4 See the Master Response regarding water supply.
- I300-5 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.
- I300-6 See the Master Response regarding the 25-year construction period. The comment speculates on a possible outcome resulting from the financial failure of the project. Speculation on the financial success or failure of a project is not an environmental effect under CEQA.
- I300-7 See response to comment I300-5.