

3.2.7 Responses to Late Comments

This page intentionally left blank.



Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Report Village at Squaw Valley

Peter Bansen, Fire Chief - Squaw Valley Fire Department

3.4.3 Public Services and Utilities

Electrical Power

The Draft Environmental Impact Report has no mention of backup power generation for the facilities proposed. We feel strongly that any building equipped with an elevator should be provided with backup power from a generator with automatic transfer capability.

LL1-1

Propane/Liquified Natural Gas

“Propane to serve the main Village area would be stored at a “tank farm” in the Mountain Maintenance Yard planned at Lot 19 (see Exhibit 35). The storage tank(s) would be periodically filled by tanker truck and would be of sufficient size to support a week or more of propane usage without refilling. It is estimated that storage capacity would total approximately 30,000 gallons per tank, and there could be up to five tanks (four new for the project and one existing that would be relocated).”

This is an interesting idea and is probably one of the only ways in which propane can continue to be used as the primary energy source for heating, however the plan described above doesn't come without significant challenges. Installation of LPG tanks is regulated by the California Fire Code and National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) Standard 58, as well as local ordinance. To accommodate five tanks of 30,000 gallons capacity each, the tank farm will need to be approximately 175' by 150' in size with additional area to accommodate a tractor-trailer combination to fill the tanks and a means of allowing it to turn around. In addition, code requires access along the ends of the tanks for a crane (although this could be the same roadway or pad on which the tanker truck would park to fill the tanks). The overall area required would be about the same whether aboveground tanks, mounded or buried tanks were installed: for 30,000 gallon tanks, a distance of 50' to surrounding structures and a minimum separation of 5' between tanks is required. In order to provide adequate fire suppression and to protect adjoining structures, an additional fire hydrant or hydrants will be required; the number and location will depend on the configuration of the tank farm.

LL1-2

The installation of underground piping, vaporizer units and pressure regulators must also be considered for a propane system, although with the exception of the vaporizers, the same infrastructure would be required if natural gas was proposed as the fuel.

Fire Protection and Emergency Services

As noted in the DEIR, a study (Citygate, 2014) commissioned by Squaw Valley Public Service District to assess the potential impacts of the proposed project identified key components that must be addressed if Squaw Valley Fire Department is expected to maintain or improve the level of service provided to the area it serves. Without recapping the findings of that study here, the statements in the DEIR are generally accurate regarding the study and the facilities it proposed.

LL1-3

One statement with which we would take issue is the notion that the project would pay a “fair share contribution” to construction of the West Valley fire substation, because all of the impacts that would

occasion the development of such a station would result from the proposed development - to impose fees on existing ratepayers or development elsewhere in the Valley would be patently unfair. One item that is not addressed in the DEIR is the potential for the project providing housing for employees who could be 'shared' between Squaw Valley Resort and Squaw Valley Fire Department. There is a significant pool of well-qualified, motivated community college fire academy graduates who are required to fulfill an experience component prior to receiving their Firefighter 1 credential from the Office of the State Fire Marshal. It has long been a goal of Squaw Valley Fire Department to establish a resident firefighter program that would help provide additional staffing for emergencies, replacing the fire department personnel who at one time resided primarily in the Valley or nearby. We believe that there could be a mutually beneficial relationship between Squaw Valley Resort/KSL and Squaw Valley Fire Department in which a small group of these fire academy graduates could be selected each year to work as seasonal, full-time employees at the Resort (and be provided housing in the East Parcel employee housing) while working as part-time firefighters for the Fire Department. The Resort would gain reliable, motivated, presentable staff while the Fire Department would increase the available number of qualified callback personnel for larger emergencies.

I LL1-3
cont.
LL1-4

We agree with the DEIR for the need for a dedicated emergency helipad for air ambulance transportation of persons with injuries or illness requiring rapid transport to a hospital or trauma or burn center. The timing of the construction of this facility is not, however, addressed in the DEIR.

LL1-5

9.3.3 Issues or Potential Impacts Not Discussed Further

"Effects associated with parking are not considered a significant criterion under CEQA."

This sentence compromises the validity of almost every other finding, conclusion and mitigation suggested in the section of the DEIR dedicated to traffic and circulation, because virtually ALL of the current issues associated with traffic and circulation in Squaw Valley - and the ripple effects on SR 89, SR28, Donner Pass Road, West River Street and Eastbound I-80 - have their basis in poor planning and management/operation of parking at Squaw Valley Resort.

LL1-6

No amount of off-site parking can compensate for inadequate management of parking within the project area if that poor management results in delays in accessing the base area: it will be difficult enough to convince guests to utilize off-site parking and a connecting shuttle system, but shuttle buses crawling in traffic on Squaw Valley Road will drive a stake through the heart of any glimmer of hope for a successful off-site parking system.

"To manage parking during peak ski days, resort attendants will direct motorists to appropriate lots/garages in an efficient and safe manner."

This would be a much more compelling promise if Squaw Valley Resort showed any indication of the willingness or capability to address their current parking situation in similar manner: if it can be done in the future, why is it not possible to do so now, when the parking situation is significantly less complex and confusing? As stated above, virtually all of the traffic impacts to roadways in the region can be traced to Squaw Valley's parking lots and the inefficiency with which parking in surface lots (which should be more than capable of managing the demand) is implemented. The inadequate design and staffing of the parking system is merely a software modification: redesigning the parking and access patterns in the parking lots and providing staffing that can quickly, safely and efficiently fill the lots is a matter of making the commitment and a plan, but year after year this potential solution to the traffic

LL1-7

and circulation issues that plague the entire region is ignored. A vague promise to manage parking “in an efficient and safe manner” is an entirely unacceptable answer to an issue that affects not only the vast majority of guests to Squaw Valley, but virtually every resident in the region, has a significant effect on public safety and - save for the four or five busiest days of the year - is predictable and preventable, requiring only the willingness to do so.

LL1-7
cont

Impact 14-7 Increased demand for fire protection and emergency medical services

We again take issue with the notion of a “fair share contribution” for the construction of a fire station in the west end of the Valley. Virtually all of the impacts creating a need for such a station are being created by this project and it would be unfair and inappropriate to apportion the costs of addressing those impacts to other development.

LL1-8

Mitigation Measure 14-7b: Provide additional fire protection facilities and staffing

We agree with the proposed development benchmarks and staffing increments embodied in the Citygate report with the caveat that if fire staffing mitigation phases have been implemented at the time of the achievement of development benchmarks (due to delays in development, for example), achievement of development benchmarks will trigger the implementation of subsequent fire staffing mitigation phases. In other words, the ability of the Fire Department to achieve identified staffing levels independent of the project does not relieve the project of its responsibility to implement succeeding staffing phases as development benchmarks are reached.

LL1-9

In addition, the DEIR seems non-specific on the characteristics of the fire substation being “in place and active” - it should be understood that this means that in addition to the structure having been constructed and operable, there must be adequate available staffing and apparatus to make the substation functional. We would also reference the earlier discussion of the development of a resident firefighter program with shared employees between the Resort and the Fire Department with the provision of employee housing specifically reserved for the use of those shared employees, in a number to be determined by agreement between the Fire Department and project proponents.

LL1-10

LL1 Squaw Valley Fire Department
Peter Bansen, Fire Chief
No Date – (Received July 22, 2015)

- LL1-1** The Squaw Valley Fire Department’s concern related to equipping buildings that have elevators with backup power from a generator with automatic transfer capability is noted. The design details for these buildings are not provided in the DEIR because they have not been finalized at the permit level of detail, which is where these types of issues are typically addressed. To the extent that use of generators could have an environmental impact, however, these effects are addressed in the DEIR. See the discussion of long-term effects on air quality on page 10-23 of Chapter 10, “Air Quality,” and pages 11-25, and 11-27 through 11-29 of Chapter 11, “Noise,” of the DEIR for a discussion noise generated by emergency generators. Furthermore, if the specific plan is approved, applications for subsequent discretionary entitlement requests will be circulated to responsible agencies, including the Squaw Valley Fire Department, for review and comment. Any comments made by the Fire Department will be analyzed as part of the project review. In addition, prior to recordation of a Final Map for a development phase, the applicant will be required to receive a Will-Serve letter from the Fire Department, and the project will be required to adhere to service requirements established by the Fire Department as a condition of receiving service.
- LL1-2** The code requirements for design of the proposed propane tanks are noted. See Section 2.1, “Project Modifications,” of this FEIR for information on how the proposal for propane storage has been modified since release of the DEIR. None of these modifications would be inconsistent with these comments or the analysis in the DEIR.
- LL1-3** The comment that the Fire Chief agrees with most of the DEIR analysis is noted. Regarding funding for the fire station, Mitigation Measure 14-7b in the DEIR states on page 14-45 that, as part of the development agreement with the SVPSD, the project applicant will support a new fire substation in the western Olympic Valley area. The DEIR lists the ways in which this support could occur, such as provision of land within the Specific Plan area for the substation, provision of land elsewhere in the Village area, or assistance with conversion of the old fire station on Chamonix Place. The DEIR also identifies the minimum size of the station.
- The DEIR states that the developer will be responsible for an equitable share in any gap in financing for the station (page 14-45). The developer’s share is to be based on the cost of a substation less the incremental and cumulative tax revenues earned by SVPSD that are specifically related to development of the project and that are not used to meet funding gaps for other mitigation. If the substation is required solely to serve the VSVSP, then the project’s fair share of the gap funding would be 100 percent. However, if there are other new projects that would also benefit, they may be required to fund their prorated share of the cost, which would reduce the obligation of the VSVSP. However, in no case would existing ratepayers or new development that would not benefit from construction of the substation be required to contribute toward its funding.
- LL1-4** The comment suggests that there could be advantages to sharing employees between the Fire Department and Squaw Valley Resort. The DEIR does not address this issue because it is not proposed as part of the VSVSP project, and is not required to implement Mitigation Measure 14-7b, which addresses the provision of additional Fire Department staff and a new substation (see pages 14-44 and 14-45 of the DEIR). An agreement between the Fire

Department and Squaw Valley Resort regarding sharing employees would be separate from the proposed project and what is studied in the DEIR.

- LL1-5 As stated on page 5-27 of the April 2015 VSVSP, the timing of the helipad will be determined in the Master Phasing Plan. At this time, it is anticipated that the helipad will be constructed by the recordation of the small lot map that includes the 300th bedroom. However, the helipad could be required at an earlier phase if the Fire Department determines it is required to serve a proposed project (Will-Serve letter). See also response to comment LL-1.
- LL1-6 As noted in the comment, the DEIR does not address the question of whether the proposed parking infrastructure would have capacity to meet demand, particularly during the busiest four ski days annually. This is consistent with CEQA, under which a parking shortfall relative to demand is not, in and of itself, an environmental effect. However, parking is included in the analysis to the extent that inadequate parking could result in other impacts (such as to air quality and roadway safety). Specifically, the DEIR address the effects of parking on Placer County roadways (see Impact 9-1) in Chapter 9, "Transportation and Circulation." For further discussion of the effects of parking on traffic, see the Master Response regarding traffic.
- LL1-7 The project applicant is currently working to design and implement an expanded traffic/parking management program. Unlike the current program under the long-standing agreement between the Squaw Valley Resort and Placer County that focuses on afternoon traffic conditions, the expanded program would also consider means of addressing morning traffic conditions through a combination of faster handling of inbound skier traffic and expanded driver information systems. This, in turn, is expected to reduce traffic queuing along Squaw Valley Road and associated impacts on emergency response.
- LL1-8 See response to comment LL1-3.
- LL1-9 Mitigation Measure 14-7b in the DEIR identifies the staffing additions required for specific development benchmarks, based on the Citygate report. As with the fire station, if staffing levels identified in the Citygate report cannot be fully met with development-generated fees and taxes, then the proposed project must provide funding based on a series of triggers. If development fees and taxes are adequate to provide for initial staff increases, but not all five positions, the project would need to provide gap funding for the later positions. As a result of this mitigation measure, the Fire Department would have adequate staffing to serve project development while maintaining adequate levels of service. If one or more benchmarks are met independently of project development due to the timing of construction or other factors, the proposed project would still be responsible for funding the full complement of staff identified in the measure.
- LL1-10 Mitigation Measure 14-7b in the DEIR requires that the proposed project fund additional fire protection staff according to a specific set of triggers, and that the proposed project support the location of a fire station in the western Olympic Valley and provide the project's equitable share of any funding gap for the station. The station must be constructed by the time that 50 percent of condo hotel units have been built. The determination of how and when to staff the station once it is constructed would be an operational decision made by the Fire Department. Given the staffing schedule described on page 14-44 of the DEIR, it can be expected that the proposed project would have provided funding for two staff positions by the time that 50 percent of the hotel condo units are developed. These issues could also be further refined in the development agreement between the proposed project and SVPSD, which the County understands will be required as a condition to serve the project.



Maywan Krach

From: Melissa DeCarlo <meldecarlo@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, July 18, 2015 6:08 AM
To: Placer County Environmental Coordination Services
Subject: Please don't do this to Squaw Valley!

I can think of nothing that would ruin the natural beauty of the area more than the development that's being considered. Isn't enough of California already packed with high-rises and amusement facilities? Please don't do this--let Squaw Valley retain it's rustic natural charm. LL2-1

Thanks for your time
Melissa DeCarlo

Melissa DeCarlo
www.melissadecarlo.com

LL2

Melissa DeCarlo
July 18, 2015

LL2-1

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.



Maywan Krach

From: Bryan Garrett-Farb <bgarrettfarb@wesleyan.edu>
Sent: Sunday, July 19, 2015 5:13 AM
To: Placer County Environmental Coordination Services
Subject: Public Comment on Proposed Squaw Valley Development

Hello,

I'm writing to express my strong disapproval of the proposed development in Squaw Valley. I have lived part time in Squaw for the last fifteen years, and during that time developed a great appreciation and love for the mountains. I hope that anyone else living, working, or visiting in the Valley feels a similar connection. From this hope comes my view that any further human development of the area should be modest and in line with the natural surroundings, not getting in the way of anyone's ability to see and more importantly feel the mountains. It seems to me that this proposed development does not meet that standard of modesty, and will likely make it more difficult to appreciate the stunning natural surroundings of Squaw.

LL3-1

For that straightforward reason, I urge you to deny the application for proposed development.

I LL3-2

Thank You,
Bryan Garrett-Farb

LL3**Bryan Garrett-Farb**
July 19, 2015

LL3-1

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.

LL3-2

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.



Maywan Krach

From: Michelle Nowicki <michelle2011@charter.net>
Sent: Sunday, July 19, 2015 9:50 PM
To: Placer County Environmental Coordination Services
Subject: Squaw Valley Village Specific Plan Project; Public Comment

As a long time Tahoe north shore resident, I oppose the Squaw Valley Village Specific Plan Project (the "project"). I LL4-1

I support the effort of Sierra Watch to reduce the scale, scope, intensity and impact of the project. I do not feel that we need another village like this in the area and that it contributes to needless sprawl and commercialization. I LL4-2

I do not deny the landowner's right to develop the property. But, I urge you to downsize this project in height, scale, scope and intensity. Please preserve the character of the region and prevent the development of unprecedented tall buildings and Disneyland-style amusements. Please assure convenient day-use access by mandating day-use parking in sufficient quantity during the entire build-out. Such FREE parking quantities should be rigorously studied and vetted as to amount and location and timing of its placement. I LL4-3

The place has always been known as "Squaw-lyworld". Let's not make it more so. Just because something "can" be done does not mean it "should" be done. I LL4-4

Thank you for considering these comments. Please confirm receipt.

Best regards,

Michelle Nowicki
Box 1252,
Kings Beach CA 96143

LL4

Michelle Nowicki
July 19, 2015

- LL4-1 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.
- LL4-2 See responses to comment letter O8 for detailed responses to the Sierra Watch comment letter.
- LL4-3 The Reduced Density Alternative and its potential effects as compared with the proposed project are described on pages 17-24 through 17-31 of the DEIR. See also the Master Response regarding the Reduced Density Alternative.
- See the Master Response regarding the visual impact analysis for discussions of the character of the region and building heights. Also, see the Master Response regarding the MAC.
- See the Master Response regarding traffic for a discussion of day skier parking.
- LL4-4 The comment provides an opinion regarding the merits or qualities of the proposed project and does not address the content, analysis, or conclusions in the DEIR. The Placer County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors will take the commenter's opinions into consideration when making decisions regarding the project.



Maywan Krach

From: Eric Woodman <ewoodman@jps.net>
Sent: Monday, July 20, 2015 10:03 AM
To: Placer County Environmental Coordination Services
Cc: Sierra Watch
Subject: KSL Partners vision for Squaw Valley

Dear Placer County:

I have been an owner of our home in Squaw Valley since 1972 and have been witness to the many changes occurring in Olympic Valley. LL5-1

The original Village Plan called for a sensical approach to land use. After the initial construction, the remainder of the plan was never implemented. LL5-2

Although scaled down, the current plan would create in the Tahoe basin the biggest and highest resort city ever imagined. If approved, it would open the region to more development of the same. LL5-3

The current plan is backed by inappropriate data generated over years of depressed snow cover and drastically reduced day and weekend visitors due to economic recessions dating back to 9/11/2001 and competition from Northstar. LL5-4

KSL partners seized upon Squaw Valley as a place for large scale development leading to departure to obtain the highest profit returns possible with the least amount of management exposure to running the finished project. Rumors abound about their 5 year plan to obtain entitlement approvals and for sell off of the rights as the ultimate profit extraction plan LL5-5

Build such a huge "destination resort" and the day and weekend visitors will return to the mega site. The traffic congestion from Truckee to Squaw/Alpine Meadows will drastically increase, over taxing the greatly reduced parking and leaving existing property owners to face the results. Plans of bussing from Truckee parking lots wont detour visitors from Sacramento and the Bay Area from hunting for closer parking inside Squaw Valley. LL5-6

Also, data taken of water table levels over the past consistent drought years is inadequate to insure lose of water use by existing residents unless infrastructure is placed to provide adequate reserve sources that aren't also taxed by increased demand from drought years. Further the cost of such infrastructure should not fall on existing owners instead as a development cost for the mega resort's drastically increased demands. LL5-7

Simply put, the current development plan is too much, too high and too detractive to outdoor use for the great scenery of which Squaw Valley has always been a part. LL5-8

Eric Woodman
(650) 207-5810

LL5

Eric Woodman
July 20, 2015

- LL5-1 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.
- LL5-2 No specific issues related to the content, analysis, or conclusions in the DEIR are raised in this comment. No further response is provided here.
- LL5-3 No specific issues related to the content, analysis, or conclusions in the DEIR are raised in this comment. No further response is provided here.
- LL5-4 See the Master Response regarding water supply in response to the comment that the WSA studied years with depressed snow cover, and the portion of the traffic Master Response regarding use of the 2011-2012 ski season data.
- LL5-5 No specific issues related to the content, analysis, or conclusions in the DEIR are raised in this comment. No further response is provided here.
- LL5-6 The project's traffic-related impacts, including those related to traffic congestion and parking, are addressed in Chapter 9, "Transportation and Circulation," of the DEIR. The commenter's concern about these issues is noted. The Placer County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors will take the commenter's opinions into consideration when making decisions regarding the project.
- LL5-7 Regarding the comment that the WSA studied years with depressed snow cover, see the Master Response regarding water supply.
- LL5-8 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.

This page intentionally left blank.