DAVID A. BREW, Ph.D.

629 BENVENUE AVENUE
LOS ALTOS, CA 94022
650 941 6485

1540 LANNY LANE
OLYMPIC VALLEY, CA 96146
530 581 5108

650 380 0505 (Mobile)

Maywan Krach
Community Development Technician
Environmental Coordination Services
Placer County Community Development Resource Agency, Suite 190
3091 County Center Drive
Auburn, CA 95603

November 7, 2012

To whomever it concerns:

Thank you in advance for your serious consideration of the concerns that I express in the subsequent pages.

These comments are on the Notice of Preparation (NOP) and Initial Study (IS) released on October 10, 2012 by Placer County. Both documents pertain to preparation of the forthcoming Environmental Impact Report (EIR) covering the proposal by Squaw Valley Real Estate, LLC (the developer) to construct an expanded all-season destination resort complex adjacent to the site of the existing village at Squaw Valley.

There are four (4) major and critical elements that are imbedded in proposed plan, but none of them are, in my judgment, dealt with appropriately as to their potential environmental impact. They are:

1. The need for an extended road circling the valley that would provide both the safety- and normal-traffic-related ingress and egress for the valley that is appropriate to the scale of the proposed development: Such a road would mitigate potentially severe environmental impacts from emergency traffic and congested skier traffic. Satisfying this need will require the developer to alter their present plans for the southeast part of their Phase I.

2. The need to completely rehabilitate the existing trapezoidal channel of Squaw Creek that was constructed by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers before the 1960 Olympics at Squaw Valley: This rehabilitation is required according to the policies of the *Placer County General Plan (PCGP)* and the *Squaw Valley General Plan and Land Use Ordinance (SVGPLUO)*. Appropriate rehabilitation of the creek would not only effectively restore a more natural stream flow (with all that that implies), but would also provide a more natural scenic corridor for the use of wildlife and human visitors. Satisfying this need will require the developer to extensively alter their present plans for the northern part of their Phase III and the southern part of their present Phase II, but it would reverse what is now an unacceptable man-made environmental impact.

3. The need to provide for an adequate and appropriate park or parks for public use within the area of their proposal: This is required by Policy 5.A.3 of the *Placer County General Plan* and the developer is to provide a minimum of 5 acres of improved parkland and 5 acres of passive recreation area or open space for every 1,000 new residents. The developer may argue that the transient visitors to whom they intend to market their development are not *bona fide* residents, but this, in my judgment, would be an outrageous effort to circumvent the established County's Policy. That Policy is intended to provide the citizens of Placer County with a fitting and extensive environment in which to spend their leisure time.

4.The need to provide on-site housing for at least 50% of the employees who would maintain and service the proposed development: The developer has not provided an estimate of the number of individuals who would be employed in the proposed village. However, based on the proposed number of residential units, together with accompanying shops , restaurants, security personnel, ski patrollers, supervisors, shuttle drivers, ski -slope groomers, lift mechanics, snow-making crews, and the like, I estimate that a minimum of 400 employees would be on site at any given high-occupancy time. This translates to on-site employee housing for a minimum of 200 persons and their families. The Squaw Valley Municipal Advisory Council (SVMAC) has already sent a letter to the Placer County Board of Supervisors supporting essentially this same position. The adverse environmental impacts of not providing adequate on-site housing would be added traffic, accompanying added wear and tear on the roads, and additional pressures on existing off-site residential communities.

In the following pages I comment on many potential omissions and inadequacies concerning items that are likely to be in the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR), make suggestions for improvement, and also reiterate the above points.

All of the following comments are keyed to the numerical system of the Initial Study.

1. Project Description:
1.3 Study Area Characteristics:
1.3.1 Property Ownership:

All maps and plans should show the parcel owned by the Squaw Valley Mutual Water Company. None of them in the IS do so.

Exhibit 2:

Area (14) is not Meadow as shown on the map; it is part of the golf course. Correct it.

1.3.2 Existing Land Uses:

A misstatement here: The area has been used "historically" for grazing and timber harvest.

1.4 Project Objectives:

There is no bullet that states that an objective is to preserve the environmental and cultural heritage of the valley as a whole. This is of concern to both current locals and potentially to visitors who realize that the overall ambiance of the valley has been severely affected by the proposed development.

Although are bullets dealing with access and circulation and with a "multi-modal" transportation system, there is no mention of intra-village people shuttles in the document. More on this below.

The bullet on affordable opportunities for housing disagrees with the main part of the IS in that the latter does not clearly provide such opportunities. More on this below.

The Squaw Creek bullet implies a commitment to restoration that is not apparent in the main body of the IS. More on this below.

The bullet that mentions avalanches is gratuitous at best. First, there have been no avalanches in the vicinity of any of the phases since Squaw Valley opened for skiing. Next, the snow safety operations of the Squaw Valley Ski Patrol are perhaps the very best in North America. Some uninformed individual may believe the statement, but it is misleading.

The bullet about visual access to views of the mountains is incorrect according to my analysis of the existing village sightlines and the heights of the buildings that are proposed to be constructed. More on this below.

1.5 Description of the Proposed Project:
1.5.1, Table 1-1:

Some recent oral presentations by C. Hosea suggest that the height information in the table may be incorrect. If so, the successors to the table should be corrected.

Exhibit 3:

Both the flood plain location (from the FEMA FIRM site map) above and below the eastern bridge and the noise propagation distances and the proposed maintenance center near there should be shown on this or some other map.

1.5.3 Circulation and Parking

The section titled "Proposed Roadway System Improvements " is unclear in that the direction beyond the intersection of Squaw Valley Road and Far East Road is not specific; I assume it is to the south. Further, going from a 2-lane Squaw Valley Road to a four-lane Far East Road makes little logical and operational sense. Further, this is where the sure-to-be-needed intra-village shuttle system should be described for the first time.

The section titled "Parking" does not include any mention of parking for village employees. If, as estimated above, there may be as many as 200 employees or more arriving via private car at the proposed village. Here also is the first and only mention of a "a shuttle bus system". Here also is the first mention of "Lot 4" which is unspecified as to location, but which I understand from other sources it is the Poulsen-owned land opposite the new fire station, well outside of the project area. This is also considered below.

1.5.4 Public Services and Utilities:

The section titled "Water Supply" is woefully inadequate in that it does not give the location of the wells that are to be brought into production, nor those that are to be abandoned. Further, it does not mention specifically or give the proposed location of a 1,000,000-gallon storage tank that has been mentioned in various meetings. Clearly, the Squaw Valley Public Service District's water-supply assessment (WSA) will consider these questions, but a clear and direct statement is needed about water supply. Such a statement should include the differentiation between a verified water-supply assessment for Phase I, and a less-rigorous assessment for the subsequent planned phases. This is also considered below.

The section titled "Wastewater" is deficient in that it does not quantify the amount or timing of wastewater production from the proposed development, nor does it include a statement from Tahoe Truckee Sanitation Agency (TTSA) about the capacity of the Truckee River Inceptor line to handle the increased amounts of waste from the proposed project (as well as that from the Homewood and other upstream developments).

1.5.5 Resource Management:

There is a section that is completely missing here; it should be titled "Snow Removal and Storage". This is an important environmental consideration because the removed snow is in part contaminated with automotive emission substances and dirt, and where it goes and eventually melts potentially affects the environment with snow-removal-plowing traffic and snow-trucking traffic, as well as disposal of the removed snow into areas where it may melt and impact surface water or groundwater.

Similarly, there should be mention of the developer's efforts (we hope) to contact the California State Office of Historic Preservation to classify and make recommendations about the existing historic structures that date from the 1960 Olympics.

Similarly, there is mention of plans by the Friends of Squaw Creek to restore the channel of Squaw Creek; but if these plans are real, then they should be included with appropriate details and maps.

Similarly, there is also no mention of the California State, Placer County, and Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (LTRPA) regulations regarding tree removal, and maps showing trees that would be removed.

Similarly, The FEMA FIRM map noted above in reference to Exhibit 3 should be used to plot the flood plain (as FEMA defines it) on one or more of the maps.

1.5.6 Project Phasing:

The developer intends to use the specific analysis of Phase I as the cover for the programmatic treatment of the subsequent phases. This proposed greater in-depth analysis of Phase I as compared with that of the subsequent phases is analogous to buying the proverbial pig-in-a –poke. Given the varied environmental impact of each phase, every phase should be given the same degree of scrutiny, public exposure, and County analysis before permits and approvals are granted.

It is stated that the proposed project would be built over a period of 12 to 15 years. I judge that approvals and permits may not be issued until at least 2015, which means that completion would be about 2030. The environmental impact of this schedule should be evaluated in terms of potential climate change because construction impacts will vary with precipitation duration, timing, and amounts.

Further, verbal information from C. Hosea indicates that the developer would only assume responsibility for maintenance of the planned Squaw Creek restoration measures for five (5) years following approvals for the project. This commitment could well end before the end of construction. This commitment should be permanent.

Phase I Project:

The overall footprint size and height (reported to be 125 feet), as well as the unusual roofline of the proposed Mountain Adventure and Aquatic Center (MAAC) would constitute a major visual impact for visitors driving into the valley, skiers and hikers looking down on the village, and on the view lines to the east-southeast of a number of residential units in the existing village. It would also be an obvious and irregular-appearing structure as viewed from existing houses and condominiums on the north side of the valley. All of these, together with the consumption of water (17 acre-feet per year) from the valley's aquifer, add up to a very significant cumulative impact of the valley's visual and physical environment. This impact does not include the cultural question of whether an installation of this type and size is appropriate to the end of a subalpine valley.

Similarly, the proposed Landmark Condo Hotel (what ever its maximum height—10 or 12 stories above grade) would be a severe visual impediment to the view lines to the south of many residents of the existing village. This environmental impact does not include the cultural question of whether a tower of this type and size is appropriate to the end of a subalpine valley.

The vague allusion to member's facilities is of concern to many long-time Squaw Valley skiers who are accustomed to renting a locker from the ski corporation. Verbal information from C. Hosea suggests that the developer's intent may be to make memberships in a private club (complete with spa and workout facilities) available to others than corporation-facilities guests and owners. This would be an impact on the local culture, albeit one that the developer would likely discount.

Building Design:

The "strong visual and architectural framework" proposed for the buildings along the "snowbeach interface" would be really a barrier to the view lines and sunlight of the residents of the adjacent existing village. This by itself would, in my judgment, be a violation of the basic environmental tenets contained in the *1983 Squaw Valley General Plan and Land Use Ordinance.*

The developer might ask me what I would consider to be appropriate building design for an expanded subalpine mountain village (but I doubt it!). My reply would be to look to some of the developed villages and towns in the Alps of Switzerland and Austria; in the best and most harmonious of those the buildings are of varied, but approximately, the same height, and only a church steeple rises above the ridge lines. The ridgelines flow with the slopes and the impression is that of a organic community adjusted to its environment. In the case of Squaw Valley, following this model would restrict the height of the proposed buildings to approximately the same height as the existing village and the streets and walkways would provide sightlines of their own to the surrounding mountains. At the same time, sightlines and sunlight access for all buildings are preserved.

The main difference between the Alps and Squaw Valley is that the villages in the Alps evolved and grew from functional grazing communities into functional mountain resorts, and were not plunked down by a developer whose intent is to construct, essentially from scratch, a destination resort that would appeal to an affluent population that might not otherwise visit the mountains.

As noted above, the best way to address this situation is to bring all of the proposed buildings to about the same height as those in the existing village.

Recreation and Open Space:

The environmental impact of the proposed MAAC is described above in the section titled "Phase I Project".

Maintenance Facility Relocation:

The snow-making and grooming machine traffic noise from the relocated Maintenance Facility would impact the residents of the proposed adjacent condo hotel and the residents of the homes and condominiums on the north side of the valley. The developer should be required to prepare day and nighttime maps showing the maximum noise levels likely to be generated from both the point and traveling sources together with the distances they will either persist or diminish. This location is very likely to be within the floodplain as shown on the FEMA FIRM map and the boundaries of the floodplain should be shown on all maps.

Water Supply:

The water supply description provided is of necessity incomplete because the data are simply not available to support an adequate description. Those data are being accumulated by the developer and must be made publically available, and preferably before, when the DEIR is released. The Water Assessment document to be prepared by the Squaw Valley Public Service District will undoubtedly integrate all the data and present conclusions regarding the verification of water supply for Phase I and a programmatic assessment for the remaining phases.

However, my own analysis (which admittedly is fraught with assumptions about scaling numbers of units to potential demand, and of current use by non-reporting pumpers) of the potential water demand indicates that full build out of the project would increase the amount of water needed by about 63% above current pumping rates. The SVPSD assessment should provide a more reliable estimate as well as a judgment as to whether the aquifer is capable of supplying the additional demand on a sustainable basis.

The projected demand will determine if an additional 1,000,000-gallon storage tank is required for either Phase I or full-project build out. As noted above, there needs to be a description of that possible tank, its probable location, and of its impact on the surrounding environment.

Other Improvements:

It should be clearly stated if "Lot 4" is to be developed for overflow parking, or, as implied elsewhere, for employee housing, or both. The impact on the environment surrounding that area should be fully described and addressed in the EIR.

Phase II – Village Neighborhoods:

Nowhere does the IS discuss the tree removal that would accompany the construction of Phase II. The DEIR should address the topic, giving full consideration to local tree-removal ordinances or guidelines. Similarly, Phase II would remove an existing recreational/commercial use, the Ropes Course.

1.5.7 Construction:

Here is the first mention of the construction of possible off-site facilities that would be needed to support the build out of the project. However hypothetical, such facilities should be described at the appropriate place in the DEIR.

1.6 Potential Permits and Approvals Required:
1.6.1 Requested County Actions and Entitlements:

The mention of a Specific Plan must mean an amended Specific Plan appropriate to this stage of the process and not the Specific Plan of May 4, 2012. To my knowledge a complete revised Specific Plan has not been prepared or released by the developer. This should be done before the DEIR is completed and presented to the public.

Two bullets indicate amendments to the *1983 Squaw Valley General Plan* and the *Placer County General Plan*. To the extent that these represent re-zoning, then the proposed re-zoning should be the subject of its own description and compared with existing zoning, and not left in an obscure section of the revised Specific Plan.

1.6.2 Other Approvals:
Federal:

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers bullet contains the reference to the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA). Shouldn't this be a separate item?

State:

There is no mention of a logging permit.

Local:

There is no mention of a logging permit.

2. Initial Study Environmental Checklist:
I understand that this is unlikely to be modified, but here goes, anyway—

Page 2-2:

I disagree with the selection regarding whether or not an EIR is required; it definitely will have a significant effect on the environment, not a potentially significant environmental impact and an EIR is definitely needed.

Page 2-3:
Item 2:

Two words "onsite" here; the first should be "offsite".

2.1.2 Discussion:
(a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista; and ditto for the rest of this section (b, c, d):

The impacts are not Potentially Significant from almost any concerned person's point of view!

Exhibit 10; Building A. East and West Elevations:

As noted previously, the use of the term "avalanche protection wall" for the structure so indicated is incorrect and misleading because no avalanches have ever been documented

Moving on—
2.6. Geology and Soils:
2.6.1 Environmental Setting:
Geology:

The valley fill is well known now to be as much as 160 feet deep, not 120 feet.

Avalanche Hazard:

As commented on previously, at the site of the project, the avalanche paths do not extend onto the "snow beach".

Seismicity and Faulting:

I disagree, type A, B, and C faults exist within 10's of kilometers of the plan area. See the references below. The situation is potentially much more serious than is indicated in the current write-up. Also, if desired, I can contribute several references pertaining to the not-too-distant Polaris and Dog Valley fault systems; just ask.

Any Squaw Valley resident can tell you that the small earthquakes on the Polaris fault zone are frequently felt in the valley.

More importantly, the recent peer-reviewed study by Howle and others (2012) cited below states that the Tahoe-Sierra frontal-fault zone which cuts across Squaw Valley has the potential of generating magnitude 6.2 to 6.3 earthquakes. The potential for such magnitudes, together with the USGS maps that identify the region as having high shaking potential, suggests that other than customary construction techniques should be required for any large structures. Howle and others (2012) do not suggest any return intervals for earthquakes, but the potential exists. One map by Schweichert and others (2000, also cited below) shows a surface rupture of a glacial deposit on a fault strand not far north of the valley.

References:

Harwood, D.S., 1981, Geology of the Granite Chief Wilderness Study Area, Calif.: U.S. Geological Survey Miscellaneous Field Studies Map MF 1273-A; 1 sheet, scale 1:62,5000.

Howle, J.F., Bawden, G.W., Schweichert, R.A., Finkel, R.C., Hunter, L.E., Rose, R.S., and von Twistern, B., 2012, Airborne LiDAR analysis and geochronology of faulted glacial moraines in the Tahoe-Sierra frontal fault zone reveal substantial seismic hazards in the Lake Tahoe region, California-Nebada, USA: Geological Society of America Bulletin, published online on May 18 2012 as doi:10.1130/B30598.1

Saucedo, G.J., 2005, Geologic map of the Lake Tahoe Basin, California and Nevada: California Geological Survey, Regional Geologic Map Series Map No. 4, scale 1:100,000.

Schweickert, R.A., Lahren, M.M., Karlin, R.E., Smith, K.D., and Howle, J.F., 2000, Preliminary map of Pleistocene to Holocene faults in the Lake Tahoe Basin, California and Nevada: Nevada Bureau of Mines and Geology Open-File report 2000-4, scale 1:100,000.

2.6.2 Discussion:
a) i) ii) iii) iv)
See comments above.

2.9 Hydrology and Water Quality:
2.9.1 Environmental Setting:
Squaw Creek:

The "unnamed tributary" is known locally as the South Fork of Squaw Creek. The following statement is incorrect: "... flows for a considerable distance beneath the Squaw Valley Village area ...". Instead, it is diverted with an almost right-angle bend just above the village and flows in a man-made channel to its juncture with the South Fork of Squaw Creek.

The 1997 January storm event produced an overflow at that bend and a large volume of sand, gravel, and debris was transported around and into structures at, near, and around Squaw Valley Lodge.

None of these areas are in the FEMA FIRM floodplain. Any similar event could, however, affect proposed Phase V structures and have an affect on the environment nearby, including Lake Cushing. The probability of any effects reaching Phase I structures are likely small, even though Squaw Valley Real Estate, LLC's representative, C. Hosea, has made statements to that effect.

Flooding:

The current FEMA FIRM map shows that only a small part of the Squaw Creek Channel above the easternmost bridge is in the floodplain, plus a somewhat larger area east of the bridge. Comparing the FEMA map with the Phase I plan indicates that the proposed maintenance structure and perhaps the adjacent condo hotel are in the flood plain and thus could be subject to flooding. The present statement could be interpreted to suggest that a much larger part of the site is in the flood plain and thus susceptible to flooding; which may be misleading to readers.

2.9.2 Discussion
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies, et seq.:

This has been commented on above. The SVPSD Water Assessment will provide the definitive information to the DEIR.

c) and d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern, et seq.:

There would be environmental impacts if the trapezoidal channel of Squaw Creek were to be altered to restore a semblance of its original sinuosity, as I have suggested above.

Such restoration would like decrease the likelihood of downstream flooding, and thus lessen the potential environmental impact of floods.

g) and i) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area, et seq.:

As noted above, the proposed maintenance structure and adjacent proposed condo hotel are probably in the FEMA flood plain and would be subject to flooding.

2.10 Land Use and Planning:
2.10.2 Discussion:

a) There appears to be no slot for the environmental effects on existing human cultural resources and general ambiance in the valley.

b) What's more, as stated the policies of the *Placer County General Plan* and the *SVGPLUO* require restoration of natural waterways previously modified by channelization. This clearly applies to the trapezoidal channel reach of Squaw Creek and is a mandate for restoration as described previously.

2.11 Mineral Resources:
2.11.2.b): Result I the loss … et seq.:

A neat bit of illogic here! No known sites = No impact? Not so, because this disregards the possibility of as-yet-undiscovered mineral resources.

2.12 Noise:
2.12.1 Environmental setting:

As described previously, the decibel-diminution factor should be applied to the point source of the snowmaking and to the traveling sources of grooming machines for different times of the day, and maps prepared to demonstrate what those environmental impacts would be from the relocated maintenance center. Nearby existing residences and the adjacent condo hotel would be impacted.

This is not to mention noise from the separately applied-for Timberline Twister alpine coaster.

2.12.2 Discussion:
a) b) c):

Construction noise is a certain environmental impact on both residents and visitors. The times indicated for construction are too long to properly accommodate the sensitivities of both groups. Mitigation measures should restrict hours of construction activity to 0800 to 1800, not 0700 or 0800 to 2000 or 2200.

2.13 Population and Housing:
2.13.1 Environmental Setting:

In order to fully understand the various environmental impacts of commuting employees, the DEIR should include data establishing how many employees now live in the valley and how many commute from distant localities, and from which localities. Following that, there should be an analysis of the impact of the present pattern and a comparison with alternative environmental impact patterns that would follow different scenarios for different types on on-site and off-site employee housing.

2.13.2 Discussion:

As mentioned and loosely quantified previously, the addition of about 1,295 units (or slightly fewer) would require additional employees, and the question of where and how they would be housed is a critical one that has significant environmental impact. In the previous mentions the impact of the additional visitors themselves was not noted. However, the potential addition of more than 1,295 or more skiers on the mountain cannot be ignored. Most of their impact would be operational and thus not in the scope of environmental analysis, but they would add to pedestrian traffic, shuttle traffic, and overall experience that indicates that this aspect should be examined in the DEIR.

2.14.14 Public Services:
2.14.1 Environmental Setting:
Fire Protection:

According to information received from the SVPSD Fire Chief, the valley does not receive fire protection from the U.S. Forest Service, so the statement here is incorrect and should be corrected.

Police Protection:

Given the projected increase in the valley's population as a result of the village expansion and the added number of employees that would be needed to service that growth, it appears that a Sheriff's substation would be needed in the valley. The cost of that station and of its personnel would have a fiscal impact on Placer County that could be counted as an indirect environmental impact.

2.14. 2 Discussion:

Fire Protection? and Police Protection?:

See immediately above.

Schools?:

The IS and NOP do not directly address the possible need for a local school to service the children of employees who could be resident on the project site. The analysis will require a definite statement from the developer as to how many children are likely to be resident, and to whether the developer would construct and support a local school.

Parks?:

The County requirements are clear that a public park must accompany any significant development. The available information from the Squaw Valley Real Estate, LLC developer does not show any public parks or areas of significant size in their plan. This is a violation of County regulations and should be corrected in the developer's redesigned plan for the DEIR.

2.15 Recreation:
2.15.2 Discussion:

See the above comments.

As stated the *Placer County General Plan* requires 5 acres of improved park and 5 acres of passive recreation area or open space for every new 1,000 residents. The developer may argue that their transient time-share owners do not count as residents; I argue that the developer needs to provide 10 acres of onsite parks within their 101 acres and I expect that the preparation of the DEIR will compel the developer to provide it.

2.16 Transportation/Traffic:
2.16.2 Discussion:
a) b) c) d) e):

As described at the beginning of this letter, the valley and the project need a circum-valley road for safety reasons of different kinds. It is critical to both the emergency-hazard minimization and the economic viability of the valley and of the proposed project.

One important environmental impact that is not well described is the inevitable deterioration of Squaw Valley Road as a result of 12 to 15 years of heavy construction-vehicle traffic. This would have an increasing adverse environmental impact as well as additional costs for road maintenance to be paid for by the County.

2.17: Utilities and Service Systems:

As written, this section does not address one of the most important aspects of the water-supply system.

It is imperative that the developer be compelled to dedicate all of their valley and on-mountain water wells to the ownership and management of the Squaw Valley Public Service District. This requirement would insure uniform management of the water supply over the years and would provide for fair and equitable distribution to all owners should impending climate change affect the amount of water available for use by the whole valley.

Water Supply:

This section as written ignores the significant contribution to the domestic water supply in the valley from the horizontal wells into bedrock on both sides of the valley.

Waste Disposal:

I may be ignorant, but exactly where in the valley are the drop-off recycling centers to be found other than at SVPSD facilities and where are the buy-back centers? The DEIR should be explicit in describing such facilities.

2.17.2 Discussion:
Water Supply Facilities:

As described previously, any tentatively planned storage tanks and their environmental impact should be fully described in the DEIR.

Wastewater Collection and Treatment Facilities:
d) e):

As noted previously, there is some question whether the Truckee River Interceptor waste system is adequate to handle the waste derived from the proposed development and from oter developments upstream from Squaw Valley.

2.18 Mandatory Findings of Significance:
2.18.1 Discussion:

Nowhere in the NOP or IS is there adequate discussion of the potential impacts of the propsed project on Squaw Valley's resident black bear and coyote populations. Both construction and post-construction impacts need to be considered.

Almost finally, thank you for your attention to this lengthy series of comments. The preparers of the DEIR have, in my opinion, a long way to go, and I hope and expect that they will be thoroughly objective and professional in the preparation, will take all of the time needed to do the job right, and will present all of us with a comprehensive, intelligible, and useful document.

Finally, for the record I have appended a copy of the email message that I sent to the Placer County Board of Supervisors 'way back in July 2012.

Sincerely,

David A. Brew

APPENDIX : Copy of July 11, 2012 email from David A. Brew to the Placer County Board of Supervisors: <bos@placer.ca.gov>
cc: mgeary@svpsd.org, doced@att.net,alfisch@placer.ca.gov,dstepner@gmail.com,alexis@mapf.org
Comments on proposed expansion of the Squaw Valley village by developer KSL

Dear Honorable Supervisors:

This message briefly expresses my interest in, and concern about, the proposed expansion of the village at Squaw Valley. With but one interruption, my wife and I have been second homeowners in the valley since 1964.

I consider some expansion of the village to be desirable, but I envision an expansion that would take into careful consideration the existing culture, natural environment, and village structures.

The existing IntraWest-constructed village is a relatively harmonious entity within the natural environment and it is more or less aesthetically compatible with the surrounding mountains. With some adjustments along the way, it has accommodated itself into the pre-existing local Squaw Valley outdoor-based culture. Its many dwelling units are arranged to provide outward views and sunlight to a optimum number of the units.

In my opinion, the KSL-proposed expansion unfortunately would degrade these positive features while essentially doubling the number of dwelling units in the valley. The mountain village look would be lost with numerous tall structures, and those structures would effectively block the views and sunlight now enjoyed by the unit owners in the existing village. The valley would lose its outdoor-oriented ambiance and become an urban, rather than a mountain experience.

All of these degrading features would be to the financial benefit of the developer and, by taxation and fees, also to Placer County. However, the sacrifice cost to the existing Squaw Valley environment and culture is intangible and incalculable.

Finally, I have a special interest in the water supply and use situation that would accompany the KSL expansion. I know that all domestic water for the valley, as well as that used for irrigation and snowmaking comes from a relatively small, alpine-valley aquifer with as-yet-undetermined capacity to supply the greatly increased demands that would accompany the proposed expansion. The potential water production from different parts of the aquifer is not the same, nor is the quality of the water. Thus the availability of sufficient water for now-existing uses and for the village expansion is over the long term a factor as, or more, critical than those described above. Current information indicates that climate change (whatever its cause) is already affecting the amount, type, and timing of precipitation; and that alone may cause now unanticipated reduction in the water supply.

Thank you for your attention--

David A. Brew
2012.07.11.1600

From: Michael Carabetta
To: Placer County Environmental Coordination Services;
Subject: Written Comments on Squaw Plan
Date: Thursday, October 18, 2012 2:28:17 PM

I have some comments on the Village at Squaw Development Plan that I would like addressed during the review process. Please let me know if I have submitted these comments correctly.

1. Connecting the proposed and existing bike paths

There will be an increase in traffic on Squaw Valley Road as well as a reconfiguration in places. In the scope of work there are plans for a new bike path around the "new" Village. It is difficult to tell whether the new paths connect to the existing bike path that runs parallel to Squaw Valley Road. It is imperative that these two paths connect - particularly with the creation of a round about in Squaw Valley Road.

2. Plowing and sanding the bike path in the winter

On busy weekends in the winter when Squaw uses "cones" to turn the two lane road into three lanes - the three lane configuration eliminates the already limited ability for pedestrians to walk on Squaw Valley Road. Given the changes in the road as well as increased traffic - walking will prove even more difficult. Squaw needs to commit to plowing and sanding the existing, new bike paths as well as any sidewalks in the winter to insure safe walking.

3. Construction hours

Placer County allows construction and construction vehicles to start too early in the morning. Squaw should be restricted so that construction vehicles cannot use Squaw Valley Road before 7am and for actual construction to not start before 7am. Hours should be further restricted or eliminated on weekends.

4. Access to pools, skating, spas and exercise rooms for locals

Free access to these amenities should be provided local Olympic Valley residents (similar to the agreement done with Homewood).

5. Complimentary Season Passes for Squaw Valley Road abutters.

Olympic Valley residents that have houses abutting Squaw Valley Road should be provided season passes for the duration of the construction period to compensate for the noise and inconvenience they will endure during this period. Phase 1 of the Village was **HELL** for people with houses on Squaw Valley Road!!!!!

Date: November 9, 2012
To: Alex Fisch, Senior Planner, Placer County Planning Dept.
Mike Johnson, Placer County Planning Department
Placer County Board of Supervisors
Paul Thompson, Placer County Planning Department
David Boesch, County Executive Office
From: Judy Carini
Subject: NOP of a Draft Environmental Impact Report for the Proposed Village at Squaw Valley Specific Plan and Phase 1 Project

Project Background and 1983 General Plan

The Specific Plan is being proposed under the Squaw Valley General Plan and Land Use Ordinance which was adopted by Placer County in 1983. The 1983 General Plan was drafted in a cooperative effort by members of the business and residential community in Squaw Valley along with a number of officials from Placer County. At the top of page 3 of the SVGP, it says "The 1983 Plan updates prior planning efforts, and sets forth a program and plan of action for at least the next ten years."

The current proposal has been submitted on the eve of the 30th anniversary of the 1983 Plan. The suggested timeframe of 'at least 10 years' is not consistent with '30' years. Clearly, the 1983 SVGP was not intended to be utilized for such an extended period of time.

I compared the dates on 16 Community Plans County wide. Of the 16, five have been updated in the last 12 years, 6 were updated between 1996 to 1999, two were updated in 1990, Squaw Valley dates back to 1983, Wiemar/Applegate/Clipper Gap dates back to 1980, and Alpine Meadows dates way back to 1968. Of the three that should be considered out of date, only Squaw Valley is facing a life changing proposal. Even the Placer County General Plan, completed in August of 1994 and slated for an update within 10 to 20 years, is on the eve of being out of date.

Much of what is being proposed in this development is based on the 1983 SVGP. Again, the authors of that plan intended it to be used for a period of approximately 10 years. I strongly encourage Placer County Planning and the Board of Supervisors to take a closer look at this issue. I am not proposing that there be no development. I just feel the current proposal is not right for Squaw Valley.

Specific Plan

The applicant has stated that they are looking for approval of the entire 101 acre Specific Plan along with approval of Phase 1. The applicant also states that the Specific Plan would be developed in four phases over 12 to 15 years. They propose that construction of Phase 1 will begin in 2014, and could bring completion of the Specific Plan, if kept on schedule, to somewhere around 2027. Then they state that the other phases would proceed as dictated by market conditions. Based on the history of developments in Squaw Valley, that could mean years into the future or maybe never.

No matter how thorough an Environmental Impact Study is, it is almost impossible to calculate every environmental impact that may occur in the future, and mitigations are not always successful in saving a community from negative impacts. The extent of negative impacts from this development can only be determined after the project is completed.

Squaw Valley is very small, about 3 miles long and maybe ½ mile wide. Approval of this development on a Phase by Phase basis would be a much safer approach. It would give the County and the Community the opportunity to see what impacts have occurred before approving the next Phase. I encourage Placer County to consider this option.

The County should also impose time limits on every project approval. That would further protect the Valley against projects that sit idle or unfinished for years and become visually impacting to the area. There should also be conditions placed on the developer so that unsightly buildings that are not finished or are no longer being used must be completely removed and the land returned to a natural state.

Phase 1 Project

The applicant is proposing to move the Operations and Maintenance facilities, including the snow making building, to Parcel F, which will substantially increase Valley wide noise impacts. Squaw Valley is a natural amphitheater, and placing a noise making facility in that area should be closely studied.

The Mountain Adventure and Aquatic Center is proposed for Parcel D. They failed to state the height of that building in the NOP, but at a recent MAC meeting, the developer stated the height to be 126 feet. That is a massive structure that will block the view of not only the mountain but also the Village. This building is poorly located and far too large. I encourage the County to study closely the height and location of this building and the dramatic impact it will have on the views and on visitors trying to navigate the Village.

As I understand it, the heights have been lowered to 6 stories plus parking. That is an improvement but still too high. The height limit should be established within the EIR, and not in the 1983 GP. I believe a height limit of 4 stories would be generally supported within the community. The buildings on Parcel A and B are the tallest buildings in Phase 1 and are right up against the ski hill. They will completely block the views of the lower mountain. The developer should reconsider the placement of the taller buildings.

Noise

The Resort at Squaw Creek produces noise that was probably not included in their EIR. The air conditioning and heating unit, which is located outside, is a constant source of noise. It has a hum noise that is ongoing day and night but most noticeable at night. Also, a conversation on a terrace at the Resort can be heard and understood all the way across the meadow to the Squaw Valley Main Road.

Every building in the development will have a heating and air conditioning unit, each adding to that humming noise which could become an unpleasant impact to the whole valley.

Population, Traffic, Circulation and Parking

The applicant is downplaying the increase in population by stating that it is transient. Population is population. If, on any given day, the population, both residential and transient, reaches 15 thousand people, the result is a very crowded valley, with lots of traffic, congestion and problems with parking. The cumulative population of the proposed development and the existing housing should be carefully studied to insure that there will not be overpopulation within the Valley, which will have an effect on the environment, the culture, the skier experience and everyday life in general.

The traffic and the parking have not been adequately addressed by the NOP. During the EIR process, traffic and parking should be studied very closely. There is only one road accessing the core area in Squaw Valley. That will not change. The developers answer to lowering the potential for traffic congestion is to discourage day skiers.

Morning and evening traffic on most Saturdays and good ski days will need a closer look and more research. The 'commuter traffic' is very predictable. It starts around 7:30AM and sometimes doesn't stop until about 11:30AM. These timeframe could increase once the parking areas begin to disappear and the buildings start to take over. Cars will have a limited number of choices as to where to enter and where to park. The cars will be forced to stay in lines, waiting to be directed into either underground parking or the parking structure. There will have to be traffic controllers who monitor the available parking spaces in these areas otherwise the cars will be driving in, have no place to park and become gridlocked. This could cause a real problem, not just

with the cars but with fumes from the cars. In cold weather, exhaust fumes tend to hang in the air and could quickly cause the air to be toxic. Surface parking solves all of these problems. The developer should be asked to provide more surface parking within the development. Every successful shopping center has a large, convenient surface parking area.

Historic Buildings

In the application for the Coaster, the applicant listed two buildings from the 1960 Olympics that may be eligible for listing 'as an historic site, a state historic monument, or for the national register.' In the NOP, those two buildings are slated to be demolished. This would be a tragedy. Part of the cultural heritage of Squaw Valley is the 1960 Olympics. Through the EIR process, an effort should be made to incorporate those two buildings into the plan and preserve them.

Public Services

The NOP has not adequately addressed an evacuation plan should that become necessary. The applicant should be required to provide a feasible evacuation plan for a full capacity situation and that should be included in the EIR.

Economic Blight

The definition of Economic Blight is: The visible and physical decline of property due to a combination of economic downturns. This is a big concern within the Squaw Valley Community. One way we can protect our property and investments would be to give approvals on a Phase by Phase basis. There should also be conditions placed on the developer that provide for a plan that would take affect if any part of the development became a victim of Blight. If, for instance, the hotels or condos are empty, the Mountain Adventure and Aquatic park is not open and operating or the Coaster is no longer popular and is sitting idle, then a plan should be in place that would provide the money necessary to remove those structures and restore the land to a natural state.

Construction

Squaw Valley will be burdened with years of construction, construction employees and related traffic. I ask that the County implement rules and restrictions with regard to the ongoing construction so as to minimize the negative impacts to the community.

Thank you for considering my comments,

Sincerely,
Judy Carini

From: Chase, Andy L
To: Placer County Environmental Coordination Services;
Subject: Village At Squaw Valley Specific Plan Project NOP Scoping Comment
Date: Friday, November 09, 2012 3:09:01 PM

Dear Sirs:

I am a condo owner at 22 Station which I purchased when the Village was initially under construction and have just recently been made aware of the proposed development in the surrounding area.

I have several concerns with the proposed development:

Aesthetics: The Landmark Condo Hotel is to be a 10 story building which would have a direct effect on the surrounding condo owners natural light, leaving many in the shadows of the building with no direct sunlight. The location of this building also means the current view of the mountain would be obstructed for current residents. Added to this is the "Timberline Twister", which is completely out of character for a mountain environment. (What color would this be, how noisy and would it be built with surroundings in such a way to not impede local residents view of the valley and mountain)? The design of this development does not seem compatible with the current aesthetics of the surrounding area. Allowing this opens the door to an amusement park type destination and takes away from the natural beauty of the valley and mountain.

Noise: We experience several noises at present although some are only seasonal (snow-making, grooming machines, explosives) and sound travels quite easily throughout the valley, especially within the village where the noise seems to bounce off the building walls. By adding a roller coaster type ride we'll be adding the screaming and yelling of children and the general noise of a roller coaster (neither of which are quiet), especially if you are removing trees. I am not a full-time resident of Squaw Valley but I purchased my condo because I enjoy the peace, tranquility and beauty of the valley and mountain.

Environmental: By removing so many trees and soil, erosion would be extensive, not to mention the impact it would have on our wildlife.

The proposed development is projected at 12 – 15 years for completion. It has taken me up to an hour to get from my condo in the village to Highway 89 just to go to dinner after the mountain closes. I can't image what this type of development would do to the traffic situation in the valley with only one way in and out.

Thank you for taking the time to read this.

Andy Chase

Important Notice to Recipients:

Please do not use e-mail to request, authorize or effect the purchase or sale of any security or commodity. Unfortunately, we cannot execute such instructions provided in e-mail. Thank you.

The sender of this e-mail is an employee of Morgan Stanley Smith Barney LLC. If you have received this communication in error, please destroy all electronic and paper copies and notify the sender immediately. Erroneous transmission is not intended to waive confidentiality or privilege. Morgan Stanley Smith Barney reserves the right, to the extent permitted under applicable law, to monitor electronic communications. This message is subject to terms available at the following link: http://www.morganstanley.com/disclaimers/mssbemail.html. If you cannot access this link, please notify us by reply message and we will send the contents to you. By messaging with Morgan Stanley Smith Barney you consent to the foregoing.

From: Cosentino, Anthony - SMMC-SF - 001
To: Placer County Environmental Coordination Services;
cc: Chuck Eaton;
Subject: Squaw valley project
Date: Friday, November 09, 2012 10:47:07 AM

Maywan Krach,

I attended the hearing at Squaw Valley on 1Nov12. I am a condo owner in Squaw Peak apartments & I am an elected member of the management board. I represent 50 home owners. The meeting was conducted in a very professional manner & those who spoke out were articulate & concise. Clearly it was the consensus of those present that the valley cannot accommodate the traffic required in the construction phase nor the ensuing traffic resulting from the development.
Those of us in the Squaw Peak complex are back in the cul-de-sac on Squaw Peak Road & are vey susceptible to the down stream traffic jams which will occur if such a plan is approved & implemented.The traffic on holiday week-ends is already crippling. We are especially concerned about a proposal to build a parking facility at the far west end of Squaw Peak Road.I assume this is to accommodate new lodgings. The exit from this area cannot tolerate such an additional burden.

This plan is madness.

Respectfully submitted.

Anthony M. Cosentino

Howard DeBow
Dennis Markus
409 Park Way
Piedmont, CA

November 9, 2012

Alex Fisch, Enviroinmental Coordination Services
Community Development Resource Agency
3091 County Center Drive, Suite 190
Auburn, CA 95603

Re: Village at Squaw Valley Specific Plan Project NOP Scoping Comment

Dear Alex,

Thank you for accepting our comments for the Village at Squaw Valley Project. We own unit 3-351 at the Village in Squaw Valley. The intent of this message is to convey our strong concern that land that is designated Forest Recreation will be rezoned to Village Commercial. When we purchased our unit at The Village, we bought knowing that the land in front of our unit was forest land and could not be developed. In fact, we called the Placer county planning commission to confirm that this land could not be used for commercial purposes as it would spoil our view of Red Dog. In our opinion, rezoning of the proposed areas should receive strong consideration in the EIR. Additionally, the Squaw Valley General Plan and Land Use Ordinance states that "the placement of buildings, roads & recreational facilities shall be placed so as to minimize their visual impact." This report was considered when we purchase our unit, so it is of great concern that the interests of KSL will supersede the plans that were established in 1983 with input from the community.

Thank you

Howard DeBow

Dennis Markus

Sunday, October 28, 2012 4:54:21 PM CT

Subject: Environmental Impact Report for the Proposed Village at Squaw Valley Specific Plan and Phase 1 Project (PSPA 20110385)

Date: Sunday, October 28, 2012 4:54:04 PM CT

From: Etienne Deffarges

To: cdraecs@placer.ca.gov

Maywan Krach,
Environmental Coordination Services,
Community Development Resource Agency,
3091 County Center Drive, Suite 190,
Auburn, CA 95603
Tel: (530) 745 3132
FAX: (530) 745 3080

October 28th, 2012

Dear Maywan,

I am writing to you to express my strong concern about and opposition to this proposed Village at Squaw Valley Specific Plan project by Squaw Valley Real Estate, LLC.

I believe this proposed project will transform an already thriving mountain family skiing resort into an industrialized resort which will no longer have the attraction of a nice, friendly, human scale community village that we enjoy today at Squaw Valley.

As the father of five children, aged 21 to 10, who all ski, and owner of four condos in the Village (3-443; 3-444; 423 West; and 430 East), I must express my opposition to this monumental development project which will completely destroy the feeling of community and history (1960 Olympics, etc) that we have today in the Village. In particular, the Proposed Project phase 1 Landmark Condo Hotel, referred to as Parcel A in Phase 1, will likely look like a gaudy skyscraper amidst some of our finest white mountain peaks scenery. This Condo Hotel will be 10 stories high, over a 2-level podium garage, totaling 154 feet high located approximately where the current Squaw Kids and Locker room are at the base of Red Dog. By comparison, the current Intrawest Village has an average height of 60 feet at the roof peaks. This phase would also require a re-zoning of part of the area from its current "Forest Recreation Use", to "Village Commercial-Core" to facilitate this Condo Hotel. All of these are extremely negative potential developments: to use European winter resorts examples, whereas Squaw today has the size and feel of a small Swiss skiing resort, this Proposed Project will take us towards the path of mega resorts with high level structures such as you can see (unfortunately) in large French resorts like La Plagne ou Les Menuires, definitely not what we want in our relatively sheltered Lake Tahoe region.

I hope that the Environmental Impact Report for this proposed project will not allow it to proceed in its current form: rather, we need a much scaled down project, if any, and one that does not massively change the vertical height of the buildings and destroy the Village scenery at Squaw Valley.

With my best regards,

Etienne

Etienne Deffarges
Vice-Chairman
Accretive Health, Inc. | Tel: 415-519-7012 | edeffarges@accretivehealth.com | http://www.accretivehealth.com

From: Peter Di Domenico
To: Placer County Environmental Coordination Services; Alexander Fisch;
Subject: Comments to Village at Squaw Valley Specific Plan and Phase I Project
Date: Sunday, November 04, 2012 12:11:22 PM

Maywan Krach & Alex Fisch,

Please see my comments and questions listed below. Please add me to your email list of documents and meeting concerning the subject development.

Thank you,
Peter Di Domenico

1. Village at Squaw Valley Specific Plan and Phase I Project, Section 1.5.3, Parking: How do skiers travel between the parking structure and the lifts? Walk?

2. Village at Squaw Valley Specific Plan and Phase I Project, Section 1.5.4, Public Services and Utilities: Address the impact of using grey water for irrigation upon the quality of the water in the aquifer.

3. Village at Squaw Valley Specific Plan and Phase I Project, Section 1.5.4, Public Services and Utilities: Should the installation of a natural gas supply be added while major work is being performed on the roads and lanes. I would think that use of natural gas in lieu of propane would be more economical and environmentally friendly. Furthermore, a natural gas powered snow making cogeneration facility should be much more efficient than using diesel oil or electric power.

4. Village at Squaw Valley Specific Plan and Phase I Project, Section 1.5.5, Resource Management and 2.9.2 Discussion g): With the seemingly increase in weather extremes, is using the conventional '100-year floodplain' still an adequate design parameter?

5. Village at Squaw Valley Specific Plan and Phase I Project, Section 1.5.6, Project Phasing: Any modifications and enhancements to utilities and services (sewage, potable water, power, refuse disposal, fire fighting, etc.) – i.e. 'backbone infrastructure' - made during the Phase 1 development should be designed and installed to easily accommodate the ultimate development of the Village including the Mountain Neighborhoods, Village Neighborhoods, Village Core, and the Phase 1. This will minimize the overall environmental impact and should minimize total development cost. This philosophy of building-out the ultimate 'backbone infrastructure' only once should be followed during all subsequent phases.

6. Plans for enhancing Squaw Valley snow making equipment and systems have been discussed elsewhere. Also, there are plans for adding an ice skating facility.

These snow making systems and refrigeration for the ice skating rink should be treated like a cogeneration facility by providing waste heat for heating a portion of the new development.

7. With the merger of Squaw Valley and Alpine Meadows, skiers are increasingly taking advantage of skiing the two areas within any given day. How are increased transportation requirements between the two areas being addressed?

8. Address housing for resort workers.

From: Chuck Eaton
To: Placer County Environmental Coordination Services;
Subject: Squaw Valley Plans
Date: Friday, November 09, 2012 11:02:38 AM

Maywan Krach,

I am President of Squaw Peak Apartments III Homeowner's Association at 440 Squaw Peak Road. Our association consists of the twelve condominium owners in our building, and we are very concerned about the plans for parking garages on upper Squaw Peak Road and the increased traffic that would result. Even with the current traffic loads, it is virtually impossible to get to and from our residences at busy times, and increased traffic from the parking garages will only exacerbate this already-difficult situation.

We are strongly opposed to the current plans unless substantial changes are made to allow traffic to flow more smoothly.

Chuck Eaton
(415) 381-4300

From: John Eidinger
To: Placer County Environmental Coordination Services;
Subject: Squaw Valley draft EIR
Date: Wednesday, October 17, 2012 4:11:17 PM

Reference: Squaw Valley Plan (signed by Alex Fisch, Oct 9 2012)

Please add the following comments to the draft EIR.

1) the new "village" high density buildings should have a required fire flow of 4,000 gpm for 4 hours = 960,000 gallons. This should be available by gravity flow, and not by pumped flow, owing to the high potential of power outage during major fires. For operational storage, the daily water demand will likely peak at around 360,000 gallons per day (2400 hotel units, fully occupied, at 100 gallons per person per day), plus allowance for 50% for outdoor irrigation, lost water, pools, etc. Standard water system design would required 1.5 days operational storage plus fire flow storage (EBMUD standard in high fire zones, the de-factor standard for 23 cites in the Eastern San Francisco Bay Region).

Therefore, a new tank for 960,000 + 360,000 * 1.5 = 1,500,000 gallons is required.

The existing water system will be severely compromised by the new demands and services. therefore, the existing water system needs to be expanded with:

a) additional well (existing wells cannot keep up with increased demand, and this presumes additional water rights / acquifer storage is available)
b) additional storage tank(s), located at elevation 6,330 feet or higher. In-building storage and pumps and backup power will be required.
c) new 12" to 16" diameter pipes to carry all flows at peak hour rates with concurrent fire
d) all new pipes must be designed for frost heave plus seismic liquefaction (high chance) and fault offset (potential). Latest seismic design guidelines for water pipes are ALA (2005). (www.americanlifelinesalliance.org). New pipes 12" diameter and larger should be designed as "essential"

A new fire ladder truck may be required. The new high rise 10-story buildings will need either: a) ladder truck (costing $500,000 or more); many external fire escapes; etc. to provide adequate protection to residents at higher floor levels.

I do not agree with "no impact" assessment by Mr. Fisch / Gary Jacobs with regards to converting forest resources into high density residential and commercial space!

Seismicity. Ranking local faults as "C" is based on outdated information and is no longer correct (page 2-25). UN Reno has identified local faults as ACTIVE (2011-2012 reports for faults near Truckee). Due to the existing faults mapped in the project boundary, an updated subsurface and geologic hazard investigation is clearly needed, to confirm that the local faults are either "NOT ACTIVE", or if "ACTIVE", then suitable mitigation must be included.

the EIR completely omits rock-fall due to ground shaking. Rock fall due to ground shaking killed many people in recent earthquakes in New Zealand (2011) and China (2008). This hazard should be addressed.

Any new building should NOT be designed by CBC title 24 for versions earlier than 2012. The latest USGS seismic hazard maps, complemented by new information form UN Reno on local seismicity, should be used to establish local ground motions suitable for design. Likely, this will mean about PGA = 0.40g to 0.50g. Older seismic codes placed Squaw Valley as seismic zone 3 (PGA = 0.3g), but this is likely too low for new construction.\

Noise. Any new construction should be limited to 75 dB (or lower) at the project boundary. The draft EIR proposes that ANY sound level will be acceptable during construction.... but this is not tolerable by the neighbors, who are located within 20 feet of the new construction site. Sound walls must be installed for mitigation. a 75 db level during construction is the current noise standards for new construction in cities such as Pasadena. No exemptions should be allowed except between the hours of 8 am and 5 pm. No construction shall be allowed before 8 am (not 6 am !!). No "back up" noise signals for equipment shall be allowed except between the hours of 8 am to 5 pm.

Thank you,

John Eidinger
1880 Village East road, 3-447
Squaw Valley CA 96146-3592

From: John Eidinger
To: Placer County Environmental Coordination Services;
Subject: Village at Squaw Valley
Date: Wednesday, October 17, 2012 3:08:49 PM

Dear Placer County,

I am the owner of property located at 1880 Village East Road, Squaw Valley (unit 3-447), located about 20 feet from the proposed new construction.

Can you please add to the EIR the following comments on the "Village at Squaw Initial Study - Specific Plan and Phase I Project, dated October 2012" (VSIS). These comments need to be addressed and the proposed new development suitably mitigated.

1) Solar Panels. FAOA (the First Ascent Owners Association) buildings may install solar panels on its south-facing roofs. FAOA homeowners are considering this installation in 2012-2013, over the next 12 months. Please confirm that the proposed new 10-story buildings will not throw any shadows over any portion of FAOA's roofs, between the hours of 7 am and 6 pm during winter months, or during the hours of 6 am to 9 pm during summer months.

2) The "Members Locker Room" building was constructed in 1960, and is now a candidate for historic preservation. This building's outstanding and unusual vaulted-roof architecture and historic use as part of the 1960 Olympics are unique. This building also remains in active service, and serves as a meeting and gathering place for 1000's of people during the winter months, and forms a critical nucleus of the Squaw Valley Community. The EIR proposes to tear this down and replace with vaguely-specified storage lockers, located at a significant distance from the main lifts. Effectively, the tear down of this Historic building, and relocation of lockers to a distant location, will destroy a sense of history and community of Squaw Valley.

3. Several of the FAOA buildings and condominiums face the Red Dog slopes. This area is "quiet" every evening after about 6 pm. However, the VSIS proposes to replaced this quiet-zoned area with public areas with late night and noisy activities, such as a outdoor skating rink, commercial venues, etc. Nothing in the EIR addresses the changes in land use, noise, and impacts to the neighbors. Some areas of the new development have been requested to be re-zomed to allow high-density building and commercial use, from current forest / ski area use. All these need to be mitigated, and zoning changes should only be allowed if the area remains quiet after nightfall.

4. The proposed location of the new buildings are subject to potential surface

fault offset of the earthquake faults located at the base of the mountains. Ongoing work (2011, 2012) by University Nevada - Reno has identified that several of the faults in the North Lake Tahoe to Truckee area are ACTIVE. The California Alquist Priolo act specifically states that no structure for human occupancy can straddle active faults. The EIR has not presented subsurface geologic investigations to show the locations of these faults relative to the buildings; their activity rates; or any mitigation strategies. Please require that the full EIR include these studies; that the results of these studies be available for Peer Review by suitably licensed professionals; and all results available for review by FAOA.

A major life safety threat from earthquakes is shaking-induced boulder-rock avalanches. Above the new property, along the steeper slopes of KT-22 / Red Dog Ridge, are several "source zones" for builders / rocks. The recommended mitigation would be to remove all such materials 9requires some blasting and rock quarry), which can remove a percentage of the threat and risk, but not eliminate it. Should the area be exposed to ground shaking much higher than about PGA 0.25g or so, rock slides and boulders can be expected. These risks, often 3 to 5 feet in diameter, will roll down the slope and impact any structures (they will likely destroy most styles of wood structures). Superior mitigation will include removal of source zone rocks (especially near the crest of the mountains) as well as installing 20-foot tall berms to deflect the rocks as they hurtle down the slopes, to locations away from buildings for human occupation.

5. With the proposed huge percentage influx of hotel-units for rent (1200 units with 2 rentals per unit, or 2,400 total new hotel units) compared to the existing inventory (290 units in the Village), there will be huge increases in traffic, noise, commercial activity; almost all of which will be placed on the existing private property (SVNC / FAOA and 22 Station). There will be increased trash, wear and tear, maintenance, crime, noise, parking needs, traffic, etc. The EIR proposes no mitigation for the SVNC / FAOA / 22 Station. Unless there is suitable mitigation and sharing of the increased costs, some SVNC / FAOA / 22 Station owners have already suggested to put a fence all around our existing property, to keep out all the influx. Ideally, a coordinated and cost-shared method to absorb total long terms costs should be required.

6. The EIR proposed to remove the Village East road located on the south side of our property. tho sis the main access road for fire department trucks, and location of fire hydrants. By removing this access, the de-facto risk to life and property increases, as we lose the wide access road for Fire trucks and equipment; as well as a secondary egress route in the case of fire. I would recommend that this Village East road be retained, wide enough for fire trucks with turn-around capability.

7. SVSI proposed to heavily use the privately-woend Village at Squaw as a major draw / amenity to help sell their new development. However, KSL / Squaw Valley representatives have informed SVNC / FAOA / 22 Station owners that they will not pay for this; nor will they offer as compensation offsetting new amenities they they plan to construct. Please make, as a condition of the EIR / permit, that the new development may not use any image of private property, nor infer that purchases of KSL's new development will have access to that private property or to the community functions that SVNC pays for.

thank you very much,

John Eidinger
1880 Village East road
Unit 3-447
Squaw Valley
Olympic valley
CA 96146-3592

From: Roy Farrow
To: Placer County Environmental Coordination Services;
Subject: Sq Vy Village
Date: Monday, October 22, 2012 12:57:32 PM

Please help, not hinder, this effort of KSL to provide a world class resort.

Sent from my iPhone at an undisclosed, but exotic, locale

Nov. 9, 2012

Tracey Grown & Martin Haeberli
525 Nimitz Ave
Redwood City, CA 94061-4227

Mr. Alex Fisch
Environmental Coordination Services
Community Development Resource Agency
3091 County Center Drive, Suite 190
Auburn, CA 95603
cdraecs@placer.ca.gov

Re: Village at Squaw Valley Specific Plan Project NOP Scoping Comment

Mr. Fisch,

We are writing in response to the Squaw Valley Specific Plan Project NOP.

We have owned our condominium property at The Village at Squaw Valley since it was completed in December 2001.

We are concerned about a number of issues raised by the proposed development. At a minimum:

Visual and Scenic Resources: We ask that you evaluate how the proposed development, at all phases, will impact the views available to current residents and owners, as well as the expected impact on available sunlight and the amount of shade in the Village. It is our understanding that the current proposals only show renderings from the point of view of the mountain, not from the point of view of pedestrians in the village nor from the viewpoint of condominiums in the existing village.

Traffic: Please evaluate how the proposed development, at all phases, will affect traffic into and out of the Squaw Valley area, especially during peak occupancy times.

Noise: There are already issues with noise at or around our property. We would like to ask that the impact of the proposed development on noise levels be studied, including, for example, noise reflected from the new buildings back into the existing village.

Sincerely,
TG by MH with permission

Tracey Grown & Martin Haeberli
Owners
1995 Squaw Valley Road, Unit 1205
Olympic Valley, CA 96146

From: Bryan Grunwald Home
To: Maywan Krach;
cc: Alexander Fisch;
Subject: Re: Phase One Squaw Valley Specific Plan
Date: Saturday, November 10, 2012 10:05:02 AM

Please add the following to the scope.

1. What will be economic impact of the Squaw Valley Specific Plan on retail and hospitality economic activity in Tahoe City.
On Nov 5, 2012, at 8:45 AM, Alexander Fisch wrote:

> Please add Mr. Grunwald's questions to the NOP comments and add him to the email distribution list. Thanks
>
> Alex
>
>
>
>
> -----Original Message-----
> From: Bryan Grunwald Home [mailto:planarch@sbcglobal.net]
> Sent: Friday, November 02, 2012 3:25 PM
> To: Alexander Fisch
> Subject: Phase One Squaw Valley Specific Plan
>
> Please put me on the mailing list for the DEIR and any further Specific Plan information.
>
> My specific questions are:
>
> Where is the parking? How much now and how much in the future.
>
> How do you get from the new parking to the lifts? How far will you have to walk?
>
> Is there going to be any free public transportation from Tahoe City to the lifts. Possibly on a new 3rd lane of Hwy 89.
>
> What is the status of the gondola from Squaw to Alpine? Is this part of the project?
>
> What will be traffic, air quality and Lake water quality impact of the proposed development?
>
> Bryan Grunwald
> 6440 Hillegass Ave.
> Oakland, CA 94618
>
>
>
>

From: Alexander Fisch
To: Maywan Krach;
Subject: FW: The Village at Squaw Valley Specific Plan and Phase 1 Project
Date: Wednesday, October 31, 2012 1:54:33 PM

Please add this to the NOP comments

Alex

From: Laura Hanley [mailto:lhanley4211@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, October 31, 2012 1:48 PM
To: Alexander Fisch
Subject: The Village at Squaw Valley Specific Plan and Phase 1 Project

Dear Mr. Fisch, Planning Commission and Supervisors,

I am writing to you today to request that you vote against the proposed Village at Squaw Valley Specific Plan and Phase 1 Project as planned.

We have been homeowners at The Village of Squaw Valley since it was constructed. We paid a premium for our special corner unit to maximize our privacy and mountain views stretching from Olympic Lady and Head Wall to the mountain range beyond the valley floor and Hwy 89. If this project, and subsequent planned phases, goes forward, our view of Headwall and Red Dog mountains will be replaced with a 10 story monstrous complex, our view of Far East will be blocked by another 10 story hotel and our balcony view of Squaw Creek golf course and the beautiful mountains and sky beyond will be obstructed by a proposed 6 story reception building.

First to the economics. A spokesperson for this building project recently insisted that the real value of our properties will increase with this new development. This seems unlikely for either rental value or long term equity. We rent our home when we are not in residence and enjoy higher that average occupancy and command higher rents due to our mountain views. This value would evaporate as our view and privacy is obliterated. The long term resale value of our unit would decline likewise, but further the local market would be flooded with a glut of open real estate creating further value depression. As you are all well aware, the housing market for condo units in Squaw Valley has been in a state of collapse for some years now, and the values of all our properties are significantly lower than at the time of original purchase. It appears that the real estate market in Squaw Valley might be starting to recover, but markets like certainty, and the success of this proposed project is anything but certain. For these reasons, as well as the burden of years of construction, the value of our property will be negatively impacted for the foreseeable future.

But, economics aside, the tranquility and beauty of Squaw Valley is very much forefront in our minds. I learned to ski on these mountains in the 70s and raised my daughter here since before she was old enough to enter ski school. The vistas driving up the valley are spectacular. The development has always been low and understated, taking care to have as little impact as possible on the nature that surrounds. We did not choose to live in Vail, with its shopping and fashionable parties. We live where you can still hear the wind through the trees. Our enjoyment of our home at The Village and the surrounding area would be irreparably harmed by the proposed development.

It is important to communicate to you that I am not opposed to all development in Squaw Valley. Indeed, it was understood by myself, and my fellow homeowners, that an additional two phases of construction were planned for The Village complex as well as amenities such as a common pool. However this additional construction was of a scope that complimented our homes in size and function. A 10 story luxury hotel and ballroom is a very different matter. The traffic implications alone will be catastrophic not only with all the additional visitors but all the staff required to maintain a complex of this size.

One final point I would ask that you consider: The unfortunate situation of the current real estate market in Squaw Valley is further exacerbated by institutions disinclined to lend to individuals for the purpose of purchasing condos and, specifically, vacation homes. Hence, even if we were inclined to sell our home, to relocate to another part of Tahoe where tranquility and nature is preserved, we are unable to do so without a huge personal loss, if at all.

We thank you for your time and consideration. If you should wish to contact me for further discussion I am at your disposal. I look forward to speaking with you in person at the upcoming meetings on November 1.

Regards,

Laura and John Hanley
The Village at Squaw Valley, 5-202
650-224-6111
lhanley4211@gmail.com

RE: Village at Squaw Valley Specific Plan Project NOP Scoping Comment

As a property owner in Squaw Valley, 1728 Christy Lane, I have concerns about the proposed Village at Squaw Valley Specific Plan adversely impacting the unique aesthetic and environmental aspects of Squaw Valley.

The following sections and page numbers refer to the Village at Squaw Valley Specific Plan and Phase I Project (Initial Study) document prepared for Placer County, Planning Services Division:

Phase I Project

Recreation and Open Space (page 1-19)

"The Phase I Project includes the construction of an outdoor winter ice skating rink/ summer performance area...and an indoor water focused MAAC. The MAAC would offer activities such as indoor rock climbing, water-based recreation and ***rides*** in an ***extensive indoor/outdoor*** pool system and ***additional entertainment options***..." (italics added)

The inclusion of "rides" in this description is very concerning, is an amusement park/water park being proposed? If so, that would not be compatible with the quiet enjoyment of the natural environment of Squaw Valley. And "additional entertainment options" does not clarify whether these would be limited to inside the MAAC, or again, if entertainment options might include incompatible outdoor activities. Additionally, the outdoor summer performance area and the MAAC would need restrictions on lighting and noise, especially amplified noise to ensure the project does not adversely impact residents.

Aesthetics 2.1

2.1.2a (page 2-5)

The proposed heights of some of the buildings, up to 154 feet, would impact scenic vistas and seem excessively tall and out of proportion with existing structures. The views from homes on the north side of Squaw Valley Road across from the Village would be adversely impacted. The maximum heights should be reduced and should be in scale with existing Village structures.

2.1.2d (page 2-7)

One of the assets of Squaw Valley is the natural darkness and nighttime views of the stars in the sky. The proposed development could have significant impact on artificial light levels and night sky viewing. Strict measures to minimize sky glow, such as no up-lights, full-cutoff fixtures, and a lighting plan and other light fixtures which minimize excessive lighting, such as those approved by the International Dark-Sky Association (IDA), could mitigate this effect, and save energy and benefit nocturnal wildlife.

Land Use and Planning 2.10

2.10.1d (page 2-43) Relocation of the maintenance and snowmaking facility closer to the residences on the north side of the project will probably increase noise and light pollution for the homes and residents on the north side of Squaw Valley Road. Light pollution could be addressed as noted above (section 2.10.1d)

Noise 2.12

2.12.2 (page 2-47)

The adverse impact from short –term construction noise could be mitigated by reducing the exemption hours for construction from the current 6am-8pm to a more reasonable time frame, e.g. 8am-6pm.

Long-term operational noise from the outdoor performance area is definitely a concern and could be mitigated by limitations on allowable activities and associated noise levels, and by restrictions (level and directional) on amplified sound. Sound and amplified sound, carries across the valley floor and can be quite loud and disturbing on and above Squaw Valley Road. A weekend sports car rally this past August in the ski resort parking lot is an example of disruptive sound experienced by valley residents. The noise from revving engines and screeching tires carried up the slope and was so loud that sitting outside was impossible and even inside the house, with the double-paned windows closed, the noise was disturbing. Other examples of the noise carrying properties of the valley include amplified sounds from coaches' bull-horns during summer sports camps, and amplified music during large events/conferences.

The noise from MAAC could also be a problem, especially as noted above in Phase I Project section if outdoor water-based recreation and rides are built.

Similarly, "ground level commercial, retail and entertainment" could adversely impact existing residents especially if typically late-evening noisier establishments (e.g.bars, restaurants) have open areas/entrances facing Squaw Valley Road. As noted above, sound carries across the valley and up the slope and can disturb residents. This negative impact could be mitigated by limiting use of areas facing Squaw Valley Road to those establishments which don't have typically excessive noise and/or late hours.

Mandatory Findings of Significance 2.18

Although mentioned in 2.18.1b cumulative considerable impacts, included in aesthetics, light pollution can have significant negative impacts beyond aesthetics. According to the International Dark-Sky Association (IDA), light pollution wastes energy, harms ecosystems, increases greenhouse gasses, threatens astronomical research, affects nocturnal wildlife and affects human health. Most life on Earth adheres to a circadian rhythm, a sleep-wake pattern dictated by the 24-hour cycle of light and dark. Exposure to excessive artificial light at night can disrupt the circadian rhythm and deregulate biological functions like eating and sleeping. Prolonged disruption of the circadian rhythm has been linked to sleep disorders, obesity, depression, diabetes, and an increase in the growth of cancer cells, specifically breast cancer. (Source: www.darksky.org) Requiring adherence to IDA recommendations could mitigate this negative impact.

Submitted by:

Carol Harding-Brown

1728 Christy Lane, Squaw Valley

From: Alexander Fisch
To: Maywan Krach;
Subject: FW: Comments on Squaw EIR
Date: Monday, October 29, 2012 8:18:20 AM

Please add this email to the NOP comments.

Alex

-----Original Message-----
From: Richard Harper [mailto:RHarper@hrgarchitects.com]
Sent: Saturday, October 27, 2012 4:49 PM
To: Alexander Fisch
Subject: Comments on Squaw EIR

High Rise Fireprotection?
Traffic Study?
Sewage Treatment Plant Upgrades?
Massive project with many issues and impacts.

Sure you have many agencies watching over this project.

Regards Rick

Richard Harper, NCARB,
The HR Group Architects
Ph: 916 993 4800
M: 916 717 7872

November 9, 2012

To: Alex Fisch, Senior Planner
Placer County Planning Department
3091 County Center Drive

From: Ed Heneveld, Squaw Valley Resident
589 Forest Glen Road
Olympic Valley, CA 96146

Re: Comments on the Notice of Preparation of a Draft Environmental Impact Report for the Proposed Village at Squaw Valley Specific Plan and Phase 1 Project

Mr. Alex Fisch,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Upon review of the NOP/IS for the proposed project, I wish to address the inadequacy of the section concerning Hydrology and Water Quality. While acknowledging "potentially significant impact" and the need for the SVPSD to prepare a Water Supply Assessment, the NOP/IS is deferential to the SVPSD to conclude the impacts to water quality and quantity, both surface and groundwater. Much is known about this watershed but past analyses by the PSD and others is inadequate to ensure adequate water exists for the project. The project proponents undoubtedly have their own analysis. I would request an independent 3rd party review and affirm the water supply analysis conclusions.

The SVPSD has no jurisdiction over the Squaw Creek and no thorough knowledge of impacts to it. An incomplete study by HydroMetrics may provide some insight to aquifer-well-creek interaction if it is concluded. We need to know the significance of well pumping on the creek. The EIR needs to analyze the effects of additional well pumping by this project, not only on groundwater but also on surface water.

The Lahontan and State Water Boards have not only expressed concern about the creek suffering from excessive sediment (TMDL 2006) but also diminished in stream flows (2007). There can be no further degradation of Squaw Creek! Sediment must be reduced and flows enhanced. The EIR should analyze ways to address both these concerns.

New wells will replace old ones. There are toxic plumes in the region of existing wells. It will take years to know if new wells are vulnerable to contamination and to appreciate their full interaction with each other and the creek. How can the EIR assure us of new wells being safe and sufficient to replace what is now a known status of wells?

There is a need for an entire watershed analysis to understand the effects of what is being proposed by this project. There is no mention of the "water budget" for the valley. There is no accounting for extractions above the valley floor and aquifer. SVPSD (2 wells) and Mutual (2 wells) water districts as well as SkiCorp (7 wells) extract water from the watershed by pumping "horizontal" and "bedrock" wells significantly upmountain above the aquifer. Quantifying this extraction, which would otherwise be a source of aquifer recharge, is needed.

I take issue with the requirement for "verifying" water supply for phase 1 while granting a less stringent "assessment" level of analysis for the entire project (full build out). We need to know the total demand for the entire project and the EIR must analyze if there is adequate water for all of what is being proposed. Otherwise, what is being proposed is not achievable.

Laudable creek restoration planning has been proposed. However, before granting approval of this project, a credible CEQA approvable plan must be in place. And, given the uncertainty of creek restoration, especially the dysfunctional processes that run through this village footprint, there needs to be a requirement for (at least) 5 years of funded adaptive management to have a successful restoration project.

The NOP/IS make reference to unnamed tributaries "from the southwest near Squaw Peak" and "in the northwestern portion of the plan area". Please define and identify more clearly what/where are these tributaries.

A final comments on NOISE. As I complained 10 years ago when Placer County approved the Intrawest project, the noise of SV Main Road in front of my house already exceeds County thresholds. But the project was allowed to proceed. How can you analyze the effect on me and my home with proposed 15 years of construction?

Respectfully submitted,

Ed Heneveld
PO Box 2488
Olympic Valley, CA 96146
doced@att.net
530-583-1817

copies emailed, faxed, and sent by US Postal Service

17110 Pine Avenue
Los Gatos, CA 95032
November 9, 2012

Alex Fisch
Environmental Coordination Services
Community Development Resource Agency
3091 County Center Drive, Site 190
Auburn, CA 95603

Re: Village at Squaw Valley Specific Plan Project NOP Scoping Comment

Dear Mr. Fisch:

My husband and I own a condominium in the Village at Squaw Valley, and I am writing to express my concerns about the proposed Squaw Valley Development Project. Obviously, this is a large and highly complex project, so I do not pretend to have an expert opinion or a sophisticated understanding of the permitting and development process. However, as a homeowner (albeit an absentee one), I do have some concerns related to the environmental impact of the proposed project which I hope you will carefully consider as you evaluate the project.

Here are the environmental issues that most concern me at this stage:

1) Water. Is there enough water to sustain a development this large? How much will the development need to rely on Squaw Creek for water? Will Squaw Creek be able to sustain that level of usage? How will the construction and then the final project affect the quality of the water in Squaw?

2) Noise. Obviously, construction noise on a project of this size will be dramatic and will alter the serene nature of the valley. Construction noise, however, will end. Once the project is finished, how much will the noise increase because of dramatically increased usage of the area? For those of us who own condos in the existing village, how much is the noise level outside our windows expected to increase because of the fact that we have, in effect, been boxed in by the development? With the development, particularly with the multi-story hotels, there will be many more hard surfaces for the noise to bounce off of. How much will that impact overall noise level in the village?

3) Wildlife. Since the project is largely being built where there is an existing parking lot, it seems unlikely that much wildlife habitat will be affected by the project. However, how will the presence of so many more humans affect the resident wildlife?

4) Light. One of the joys of going to Squaw is the stunning night sky with seemingly endless stars, a sky that those of us who live in urban areas see only rarely.

How much light pollution will there be resulting from the project? And how much will this alter what visitors are able to see in the night sky?

5) Traffic. Is expansion of Squaw Valley Road a part of this project? If not, how will such a dramatic increase of lodging affect traffic entering and leaving the valley?

6) Energy usage. I assume that the new units will be air-conditioned. If the new development is successful, it is important to know how much energy usage will increase, particularly during the summer.

6) Aesthetics. Admittedly, aesthetics are subjective and difficult to measure. However, the massive size of this project and many of the proposed elements threaten the beauty and serenity that residents and guests now associate with Squaw Valley. I appreciate the promise of the developers to provide more pedestrian walkways and an open space network in the project. And I look forward to landscaping with native plants. However, the scope of the project is huge, and it is hard to imagine it not changing the very character of the valley.

I recognize that all decisions related to this project must be made within the context of the projected positive impact the project will have on the economy of the region, and I realize that these benefits may demand that we accept some change we don't like. However, it is incumbent on all involved to recognize that a project of this size and scope will, by its very nature, have an environmental impact. The nature of that impact must be carefully weighed and evaluated. Squaw Valley is a precious environment. Once it is altered, it is altered forever.

Thank you for providing me an opportunity to express my concerns.

Sincerely,

Jane Hiatt

Jane Hiatt

From: Alexander Fisch
To: Maywan Krach;
Subject: FW: Squaw valley development
Date: Friday, November 09, 2012 1:34:49 PM

Please add these to the NOP comments.

Alex

-----Original Message-----
From: Karl Hoagland [mailto:KHoagland@LarkspurHotels.com]
Sent: Friday, November 09, 2012 12:59 PM
To: Alexander Fisch
Cc: Pauline Henderson
Subject: Squaw valley development

Alex, thank you for chatting with me yesterday. I think you are doing a great job on this and I appreciate your thorough approach and open communication. I reviewed the NOP and the consultant's assessment, it seems like the EIR will focus on the relevant issues. My situation is that i own a condo directly facing the mountain - i paid an enormous premium for the view of the mountain and direct access to the base resources. The proposed condo hotel on 'site O' would appear to completely eliminate that view, evening sun glow and the unique positioning of the condo. When i acquired the condo i was assured by the seller and real estate agents (perhaps erroneously now realize) that the condo would enjoy this 'front row' positioning and view forever because future development was only anticipated/approved in the parking lot areas and the historical significance of the Olympic lodge buildings would not allow their destruction. So that is where i am coming from.

More about my situation - I am not opposed to development at all, and i really appreciate the investments and improvements that the new owner is making to the mountain and the village. I also truly love Placer county - I can say that because i have run Western States 100 5 times and i am affiliated with the event. Every step of that trail is in Placer county and i treasure each one on my way on foot from Squaw to the track at Auburn high school. The real reason I bought my condo is because I can see the race starting line of the race from it.

Squaw Valley is a natural treasure with international historic significance due to

the 1960 Olympics. The proposed development in its scope, scale, height and location would generate significant profit and income to the developer, but at the expense of materially detracting from Squaw's scenic vistas and historical legacy. It would be a taking by private developer from the public and from property owners who would be shadowed and cut off from the mountain by their proposed buildings to the south and west of the current village. The greatest mountain villages and resorts in the world are ones with development that is sensitive to the greatest resources -the mountains and peaks themselves and preservation of views, as well as historically significant structures, however quaint or humble, such as old churches. By erecting what would amount to massive walls at the base of the mountain, the developer could sell the units at record-breaking prices per square foot, but Squaw Valley and its special character and beauty would be lost forever. Lets not see Squaw Valley become "Vail - west" - an intensely developed and generic monolith adjacent to I70.

I am very hopeful that the EIR will carefully address the preservation of scenic vistas and the historical significance of the Olympic Lodge, as well as the extraordinary impact on the Village and special character of Squaw Valley that would be destroyed by the intense and aggressive development proposed at the base of the mountain. This process should guide the developer to pursue development in existing parking lots and the other less sensitive areas that the original Intrawest project was approved for and anticipated. By starting with an outrageous project intensity at the base of the mountain, hopefully the developer is not rewarded with a vastly scaled back version of that, but one which still denudes scenic vistas, historic resources and the essential character of Squaw Valley.

From: Ann Hutchinson
To: Placer County Environmental Coordination Services;
Subject: Village at Squaw Valley Specific Plan Project NOP Scoping Comment
Date: Sunday, November 04, 2012 2:10:10 PM

Hello
My name is Ann Hutchinson and my family owns property one block off of Squaw Valley Road. My address is 934 West California, Mill Valley, California 94941.

I have been visiting Squaw Valley since my parents brought me up to learn how to ski when I was 5 years old. The beauty of the Tahoe National Forest is like no other.

I have reviewed the Specific Plan Project Description Summary and the Notice of Preparation of a Draft Environmental Impact Report for the Proposed Village at Squaw Valley and Phase I Project

I am opposed to this Project. This has already been done once by Intrawest. Intrawest's vision was one of a "Village environment with fractional units sitting above retail and commercial properties, with walkways for skiers, families and guests." This was done and has failed. The walkways have been empty in the years since it was built, many of the units are in foreclosure, and those owners I have spoken to report that the nose that migrates up to their units from the "village below" is unbearable. They are unable to rent their units to make ends meet. The current "Village" is unattractive, mostly empty and desolate, and the retailers have no business. This is an ill fated idea which will not improve with a second try.

Our family home is one block off of Squaw Valley Road. Our view will be irreparably damaged and from the plans, it appears we will now look out at the parking structure planned for Phase 1. Our property values will decrease directly as a result of this project and may become unmarketable.

The reports I have just read suggest an assault on the Squaw Valley Basin. 15 years of noise, pollution, toxic damage to our ecosystem and wildlife, parking lots created where beautiful trees currently exist, ridiculous "Disneyland" ideas like a rock climbing indoor wall and a "multigenerational arcade". This is Tahoe. This is a place for walks, family gatherings, intimacy, not the isolative activities that alienate us from each

other.

Please consider this proposal carefully. There is quite a lot at stake.

Sincerely,
Ann C. Hutchinson

Alexander Fisch

From: Fred Ilfeld [filfeld@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, November 09, 2012 3:21 PM
To: Alexander Fisch
Subject: NOP regarding proposed Village at Squaw Valley

Fred Ilfeld- filfeld@gmail.com

Fred Ilfeld, Jr.

218 Hidden Lake Loop

P.O. Box 2160

Olympic Valley, CA 96146

(530) 448-6060

FILFELD@GMAIL.COM

Mr. Alex Fisch, Senior Planner *afisch@placer.ca.gov*

Placer County Planning Dept.

3091 County Center Drive

Auburn, CA 95603

November 9, 2012

Dear Mr. Fisch:

In response to the NOP/IS regarding the Village at Squaw Valley, I would like to propose that the draft EIR attend to the following significant environmental impacts.

1) **Retain views and vistas of the nearby mountains.** Visual appreciation of the mountain beauty of Squaw Valley is a central feature of our environment. I would argue that blocking these views is a detrimental impact on our visual environment. These heights so close to the mountain and snow line will have a substantial, negative disruptive effect on our existing physical community. The proposed building heights, roughly twice as

high as those existing and located adjacent to the snow line, will greatly impair view corridors and largely remove the visual presence of our majestic surrounding peaks. - - - - - To mitigate against this problem I suggest three possible measures—either lower the proposed building heights to those currently existing, or if higher buildings will be built, that these be located further from the mountain and not next to the snow line. Moreover, the view corridors carefully planned and built for the existing Village should be maintained in any new building alignments.

2) **Water Availability and Quality.** A comprehensive and quantitative assessment should be made of (a) the need for and availability of sufficient water for all current and planned occupants (including all Phases, I through IV) and (b) how this development with its construction and water needs will impact the purity and quality of our aquifer. Providing a quantitative analysis do we indeed have enough safe water in the Valley's aquifer to meet everyone's needs over the long term? Will this development overwhelm our water resources, degrade water quality, deplete or contaminate our aquifer?

3) **Flooding of Squaw Creek.** With its straight course paralleling Squaw Valley road, high creek flow rates dump excessive amounts of sediment into the meadow to the east of the Village/parking lot. The current project appears to propose a wider channel which will help to mitigate this problem in part. I feel that even further mitigation is in order, which can be obtained by creating a more meandering creek course winding through the Village, which with its longer creek course and barriers to fast flow will cut down the sediment load that impacts the meadow. A secondary but quite meaningful benefit will be the creation of a natural aquatic feature throughout the heart of the village that provides a more scenic and restful space in the center of what will be a very dense human habitat.

4) **Traffic and Transportation.** While it might be argued that a destination resort will cut down on peak traffic flows, this does not negate the remarkable impact on total traffic volume that 1,300 additional housing units will have. Traveling east by turning left on Squaw Valley Road will become decidedly more treacherous for the residents that live on the north side of the Valley (by far the majority of residents). I would like to see a thorough quantitative assessment of this issue, including during times of high skier traffic. Also there is nothing that slows down the motorist for 2 miles, from the main road's junction with highway 89 to the Village. This makes for higher speeds and more hazard to all travelers.

To deal with these two problems I would first suggest a mitigation of two round-a-bouts which would be located where the most cross-traffic enters Squaw Valley road, allowing traffic to safely enter. The more easterly round-a-bout would be in roughly the middle of this two mile stretch where Wayne abuts the main road, and the second where Christy Hill Lane (next to Post Office) enters the main road. . . . . Another mitigation to reduce amount of traffic would be for the owners of the new Village to provide regular bus transportation to Valley residents to cut down on their car use in the Valley. This transportation for the public should have frequent stops and occur on a conveniently frequent schedule. . . . . A final mitigation regarding traffic that I would propose is to locate employee housing within the Valley, further cutting traffic volume.

5) **Economic Viability and Over-building.** Lack of economic viability directly contributes to impact on the environment by its preventing unoccupied and deteriorating buildings, associated with inadequate maintenance, vandalism, and robbery. In our region we have seen in some previous local building projects the

difficulties brought on by over-building residential and commercial space beyond what the market is absorbing. I believe there should be mitigation against this potential deterioration of our Valley by mandating a "next" Phase not be started until a given number of units have been sold in the "current" Phase. As an example, 80% of Phase I units must be sold before starting Phase II.

I appreciate your consideration of the above concerns.

yours truly, Fred Ilfeld

Click here to Reply or Forward

PLACER COUNTY
COMMUNITY DEVELOPEMENT

10-30-12

RECEIVED
NOV 0 9 2012
ENVIRONMENTAL COORDINATION SERVICES

DEAR MR. JOHNSON & STAFF,

REGARDING THE PROPOSED PROJECT "VILLAGE AT SQUAW VALLEY" AND ITS ASSOCIATED DRAFT EIR DOCUMENTS I SUBMIT THE FOLLOWING:

THE SCOPE, SIZE AND MASS OF THIS PROJECT IS GROSSLY OUT OF BALANCE WITH LOCAL CHARACTER OF OLYMPIC VALLEY. THE VIEW CORRIDORS, traffic, NOISE, WATER & SEWER COMPONENTS WILL COMPROMISE THE INTAGRITY OF THE VALLEY AND MOUNTAIN RESORT. IF YOU'd LIKE AND EXAMPLE OF THE CONFLICT, THINK SOUTHSHORE/STATE-LINE, LAKE TAHOE, A DISASTER THAT NEVER SHOULD HAVE HAPPENED.

THE SIZE AND VOLUMES OF THESE BUILDINGS 50-60% BIGGER THAN ANYTHING IN OLYMPIC VALLEY.

THE DRAW ON RESOURCES WILL NOT BE A MITIGATABLE ELEMENT.

WE DO NOT SUPPORT THIS PROJECT.

Colleen & William JAEGER SQUAW VALLEY LODGE.

William Jaeger
370 Magee Ave.
Mill Valley, CA 94941

YOSEMITE CONSERVANCY

OAKLAND CA 945
07 NOV 2012 PM 5 L

Liberty FOREVER

MAYWAN KRACH
ENVIRONMENTAL COORDINATOR
COMMUNITY DEVELOPEMENT AGENCY
3091 COUNTY CENTER DR. #190
AUBURN, CA. 95603

95603261440

Dear Alex Fisch and Maywan Krach,

I am a long time Squaw Valley home owner. I have been here since 1958. M y home is located on 1733 Christy Lane. I was unable to attend the meeting on Nov 1. Below are my comments for the NOP. I would like the following items to be analyzed in the DEIR for the Village at Squaw Specific Plan.

1. If an EIR and CEQA determined that the existing village should be the height that it is, then the currently proposed buildings should be the same height. An analysis should be done of the EIR and planning process that determined the height of the current village. The impact of up to 10 story buildings should be studied.

2. Snow Storage and CP land: What analysis is being done on snow storage on the parcel of land zoned CP between the homes on Christy and the Squaw Valley Main road? Currently the snow storage in this area has killed vegetation, polluted the hillside with garbage and destroyed other vegetation. It is a huge noise problem, operating heavy equipment next to homes. It is being used for commercial snow storage.

3. Building Mechanics and Systems noises: What is being done to address noise of the building mechanics such as HVCAC, Air exchange systems, generator, compressors, and any other noises emitted by the buildings?

4. Squaw Creek/Shirley Canyon: what analysis is being done on the impact to Shirley Canyon and Squaw Creek?

5. The impact this has on the quality of life of Squaw Valley residents should be of great importance.

6. If water from the ski hill is used to irrigate landscaping there should be a study done to see how pumping water from these wells or storage ponds affect the aquifer levels and wells on the valley floor.

My wife and I have not been following the plans in SV but will attend the meeting the homeowners association has scheduled for Dec 1.

Thank you,

Charles and Mary Jones

PO Box 183, Corte Madera, CA 94925

From: Jack Kashtan
To: Placer County Environmental Coordination Services;
Subject: squaw valley NOP
Date: Thursday, November 01, 2012 1:37:41 PM

I would like to elaborate on my comments of Nov 1. 1) Squaw Valley needs to identify the location of proposed off site parking, both for phase 1 and for subsequent phases, both in words and on it's maps, as well as how it intends to move people from the lots to the base area, including frequency of trips, types of vehicles to be used, etc, and also who is intended to use off site parking as well as parking in the village. The environmental impact of adding new paved parking areas obviously needs to be addressed, given the issue of runoff into the Truckee River. The lack of information in the proposal leads me to believe that KSL is planning to have day users use the off site lots or pay or parking or both and is keeping this quiet so as to avoid opposition from the local skiing community. 2) The EIR --both for the program and for the project--needs to identify the impact on the Town of Truckee of additional travelers attempting to pass through Truckee to get to I 80 during blizzards, particularly on weekends and when I 80 is closed. A traffic management plan should be developed which includes holding people at the resort who are attempting to cross Donner Summit when road conditions warrant. The current gridlock which develops on 89 and especially within the Town of Truckee is a serious threat to public safety, as emergency vehicles cannot move, and to the environment, due to the emissions from stopped cars with engines running to keep the heat on. 3) KSL should be required to fund free public transportation between the population centers of Truckee and North Tahoe, with frequent enough buses to encourage use, as is seen in other resort communities such as Whistler and Chamonix. KSL should identify existing lots or if necessary new sites which can be used for park and ride during the winter for those who are not walking distance from a bus stop, and should pay for snow removal at these sites. 4) Given the precarious nature of development in this era, KSL should be required to post a bond sufficient to demolish and restore to it's previous state any unfinished construction, should KSL go bankrupt or interrupt building for any reason. The residents should not be left with a hole in the ground as has happened with too many over-ambitious developments

elsewhere. (See Sacramento). 5) Given the large number of existing beds in the North Tahoe and Truckee area and the lack of growth in the ski industry, it seems that KSL's business plan depends on attracting visitors who are using facilities in those areas, rather than generating new business, which leads to the environmental impact of shuttered businesses in North Tahoe and Truckee, and means that any gains in employment KSL's project projects will be offset by losses elsewhere. 6) I share the opinion of so many others that KSL's project is simply too big for the narrow confines of Squaw Valley and of the Truckee River canyon, given the present infrastructure and the near impossibility, not to mention the desirability, of expanding roads in the area, not to mention the aesthetic impact of high rise buildings in the mountain setting.

From: jskinla@verizon.net
To: jskinla@verizon.net;
Placer County Environmental Coordination Services;
Subject: Re: Squaw Valley Projects comments
Date: Friday, November 09, 2012 2:06:24 PM

CEQA defines visual impact to view vistas a natural resource. The project must consider the view impact to surrounding properties including the initial village buildings and residences. The plan documents indicate that the impact could be potentially significant. Admittedly, the applicant has lessened the height and location of the proposed buildings as the project has evolved. However, the lessened impact is irrelevant. The impact must be considered from the project as defined. Given that it may be better than it was does not constitute a mitigation of the impact.

Jeff Krag
Owner Squaw Valley First Ascent