From: jskinla@verizon.net
To: Placer County Environmental Coordination Services;
Subject: Re: Squaw Valley Projects comments
Date: Friday, November 09, 2012 1:58:43 PM

The Squaw Valley applicant has separately proposed to permit an on-hill attraction called the "twister". A separate permit is fine at the applicants discretion. However, CEQA mandates the EIR considers the cumulative impact of other projects in the area by the host applicant and any other defined project. Please ensure the proposed project considers the cumulative impact of both projects. Personally, i would have chosen to permit them together to avoid the risk of being accused of piecemealing the project. Valid challenges to certification of EIRs are precedented on the basis of piecemealing permits of separate projects that should have been considered for total impact. The EIR should also address other projects in the area like NorthStar's village changes or other Truckee-Tahoe developments.

Jeff Krag
Owner Squaw Valley First Ascent

From: jskinla@verizon.net
To: Placer County Environmental Coordination Services;
Subject: Squaw Valley Projects comments
Date: Friday, November 09, 2012 1:48:08 PM

CEQA now has defined review of the projects impact on Green House gases. The plan documents indicate that the impact could be potentially significant. Domestic production of natural gas has created an economic opportunity for lower energy costs if switched from oil based fuels. Also, natural gas reduces green house gas emissions versus propane by 30 percent. Please ensure the proposed project considers supplying natural gas to the valley as an alternative to propane. Besides reducing green house gases and substantially lowering energy costs for decades, eliminating the storage of large volumes of propane would avoid the safety issues related to storing and managing large volumes of propane.

Jeff Krag
Owner Squaw Valley First Ascent

From: Bernie Lacroute (WK)
To: Maywan Krach;
cc: Bernie Lacroute (WK);
Subject: Village at Squaw Valley Specific Plan
Date: Friday, October 19, 2012 6:38:43 PM

To: Maywan Krach
From: Bernard Lacroute
Date: 10-19-2012
Subject: Proposed Village at Squaw Valley Specific Plan and Phase I Project

I am the owner of a Condominium Unit in the First Ascent Building at Squaw Valley, unit 349 in Building 3 and I would like to offer the following comments:

1- What studies and conclusions if any, have been made with respect to the geological stability of the area? Are there any earthquakes faults running in the proposed development and/or adjacent to such development?

2- What is the impact on the traffic in Squaw Valley road? The area is already congested during many weekends in the winter. What provisions if any, have been made to mitigate the problem?

3- The same question applies to the traffic implications on Highway 89

4- The request for zoning change is unwarranted as it will negatively impact the occupants of the existing condominium in the Village at Squaw

5- Some of the proposed buildings are 10-12 stories tall. The proposed location of such buildings will completely block the views of many existing units. There is no justification for this. New buildings which impact existing residents should not be made taller than what already exists. Taller buildings can be moved to areas where they do not impact the views and light of existing buildings. The argument by the developer that the proposed location is the most economically advantageous for the project is a slap in the face of the current owners. Moving the tallest buildings a few hundred yards to accommodate the neighbors makes sense and would not impact the value of the proposed project.

6- The proposed demolition of the "Members Locker Room" does not make sense. The building was constructed in 1960 and is a landmark which is a candidate for historic preservation. This should not be allowed.

Thank you

Bernard J. Lacroute

From: Lawrence M. Le Vine
To: Placer County Environmental Coordination Services; Alexander Fisch; Jennifer Montgomery;
cc: Sandy Richert; kluhe@comcast.net; Patrick Neeb; Bill Canihan;
Subject: change in zoning for the Squaw Valley development
Date: Wednesday, November 07, 2012 2:36:29 PM

Any change in zoning will establish precedent for further development, ie.: the domino effect. The developers may point to the reduction in height of the hotel they agreed to as their effort to cooperate, but only they know if that is part of their plan to get you to allow the change in zoning. Before you do that, consider the possibility of a hotel and/or houses and condos at the Gold Coast area or the top of the tram. Go to Northstar of California and look at all the development around the Ritz. Visit Telluride to see the mid-mountain village that wasn't there some years ago or the chair that isn't even a "green run" to give homeowners ski in and out ability. You can also find that at Mammoth Mountain and the Canyons or the Park City ski area in Utah. I could go on as I have seen residential buildings on the mountain in many ski areas. Squaw Valley has "street cred" as a true skiers area with unaltered scenic views. If you allow the zoning change not only will you deprive the present owners of the view they expected when they bought their property, but you may also change Squaw forever. L.M. Le Vine, 2-229; 4-308W.

From: Lawrence M. Le Vine
To: Jennifer Montgomery; Alexander Fisch;
Placer County Environmental Coordination Services;
cc: Sandy Richert; Patrick Neeb; kluhe@comcast.net; Bill Canihan;
Subject: Property owners response to the proposed Squaw Valley development
Date: Tuesday, October 30, 2012 5:02:58 PM

At the annual village owners meeting on Oct.13 at S.V. owner after owner stated they had selected their property because of the view. One said she advertises her unit she rents herself "with view". She will no longer be able to do that. The response was: we turned the (10 story) hotel slightly to give some of you a view. An owner commented " your 10 story hotel will stand as a raised middle finger to all the owners in the valley." Most owners are not opposed to the development of Squaw. They are opposed to the density, location and height. The speaker told the owners "there is no height limit in the area, so we can go as high as we want." We all knew there was a stage 3 and 4 in the original Intrawest plan. One supposed reason for not building 3 and 4 was Alex Cushing felt " That's enough". Many owners of property in various locations in the valley during separate conversations, when told a zoning change is necessary for the construction in the area between the present village and the mountain, said " someone is getting paid off". When it was suggested that they limit the development to the areas of 3 and 4 and place the higher buildings in the area of the Far East lift, the response was "you will not prevent us from maximizing our profit." It was suggested that we have an attorney look into all the owners in the valley placing their property taxes into a trust to get the attention of Placer County. Personally, all of this has made me understand the term "ugly American" and why there is "jihad". I guess if you make someone feel so frustrated and so hopeless they would even consider becoming a suicide bomber. Please consider the feelings of the present owners before making your decision. Thank you, L.M. Le Vine, owner 2-229 and 4-308 W.

From: john massey
To: Maywan Krach;
Subject: RE: Village at Squaw Valley
Date: Thursday, October 11, 2012 5:58:53 AM

I see nothing in this information other than significant impacts that will be impactive to Squaw Valleys, low impact residential uses, etc. I cannot believe that any provided mitigation can be made for buildings with heights in excess of existing buildings. This will definitely effect my view plane from unit 705 at Squaw Valley Lodge. I was also told that all historic buildings existing would never be disturbed, nor altered, only maintained. I read noting about shading impacts, nor mitigation. Visual impacts for this project appear to be significant and there is no mitigation for this impact. This was an issue with the expansion project next to my unit at Squaw Valley Lodge. The project contemplates one access point, with no transportation improvements, this was an issue with the expansion project next to my unit at Squaw Valley Lodge.
I also do not understand how the removal of so much open space can be mitigated. This development appears to assume that existing developments are second place and are intended to be overpowered by the intensity of the new development. This has never been the case in the real world of development. The plan provided does not approach drainage impacts, storage of flows, nor mitigation of silt and sediment control, it appears to exacerbate this issue. I hope you will continue to update me and I am certainly willing to become involved to review and comment on proposed development mitigation efforts, I am an engineer, we work in 35 states and have been involved with multiple environmental impact ordinances including the State of California, thanks, John Massey, PE,RLS
We own unit 705, Squaw Valley Lodge

From: Maywan Krach [mailto:MKrach@placer.ca.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, October 10, 2012 6:03 PM
To: Maywan Krach
Subject: Village at Squaw Valley

To Interested Parties,

Attached, for your review, please find the Notice of Preparation for the subject project. The document, along with the Initial Study Checklist, can also be found at this link on County's website:
http://www.placer.ca.gov/Departments/CommunityDevelopment/EnvCoordSvcs/EIR/VSVSP.aspx

The public comment period starts on 10/10/12 and closes on 11/9/12. Your

November 1, 2012

RECEIVED
NOV 05 2012
ENVIRONMENTAL COORDINATION SERVICES

Placer Co. Planning Department

3091 County Center Drive

Auburn, CA. 95603

Attention: May Wan Krach, Community Development Technician

Dear May Wan Krach,

I am writing to you to oppose the *enormous,* out of scale development that KSL has in the planning stages for Squaw Valley, California. This company is aiming to make a lot of money to the horror, discomfort, and imposition of the current residents. They are not doing our county or residents any favors. Squaw Valley is not the proper place for such a heinous, improper and distasteful development.

The general plan states that when you have a two to three story building, it is to be constructed as to go up gradually. KSL has stated that it wants to put a 6 to 10 story hotel right in the middle of the existing village at the site of the current Bar One. ONE: it is totally out of scale TWO: It will block mountain views and sunlight THREE: The access that they have planned will seriously impede the traffic on the skinny two laned road between Plump Jack and the Cable Car building. That is only ONE of MANY aspects of this proposed development that I oppose.

On a busy ski day with the existing village development, the traffic getting in and out of Squaw Valley extremely difficult.(They make it a two lane outbound by coning it and taking half of the inbound lane.) Can you imagine if they put the thousands of units in that they are proposing? Highway 89 is already a parking lot on busy winter ski days. Does this means that there will be a four lane highway going into Squaw Valley and a four lane highway to replace the two laned Highway 89? Who will pay for that?

Then, there is the WATER issue, and SEWAGE, and GROCERY STORES, and PARKING, and EMERGENCY SERVICES. PLEASE save the valley from this destructive debacle.

Squaw Valley is a gem in the pristine Sierra Nevada Mountains, and is slated to be wiped out by rampant over building and expansion. Let KSL take their destructive and grandious plans somewhere else...maybe Utah or Nevada. California does not need any more resorts, especially in a rare and wild high mountain valley. KSL states that it will be a 20 year plan. Can you just imagine what havoc it will be for the next 20 years with construction going on continuously? The noise, the trucks, and all of the usual disruptions associated with building up and tearing down would be unbearable and overwhelming.

Don't let KSL destroy Squaw Valley. For them it is a way to make money, while wasting and ruining one of the most beautiful valleys in California.

Cheri A. McCarty

Cheri A. McCarty, Property Owner, Olympic Valley, California

2260 Saint Francis Drive
Palo Alto, CA 94303
28 October 2012

RECEIVED
OCT 31 2012
ENVIRONMENTAL COORDINATION SERVICES

Planning Services Division
Attn: Maywan Krach
3091 County Center Drive
Auburn, CA 95603

Re: Village at Squaw Valley Specific Plan

There is a difference between progress and greed. Progress benefits many people of different walks of life; it normally involves few detriments and normally takes effect gradually; regrets are few. This four-phase development is not progress; it is greed. It seeks to enrich a small number of out-of-town investors at substantial local cost. Even the first phase of the project is too aggressive and will leave Olympic Valley with persistent problems.

1. Loss of Forest Recreation Land

In order to build the proposed condo hotels, substantial land would need to be re-zoned from Forest Recreation to Village Commercial. Such a re-zoning represents a significant "ratcheting-up" of the type, number and intensity of impacts on the land. Preventing such intensification is what the original zoning is all about. If such zoning changes are allowed, what's to stop development from climbing up the mountain, project by project? I urge that the zoning stand as is. After all, the land doesn't vote, nor can it hire lobbyists.

2. Blocking Scenic View

A major reason people come to the mountains, whether to visit or to live, is to see the beauty of the mountains. The view of Snow King from various congregating areas and residences, including the existing Village, Red Wolf Lodge and numerous private homes is an important part of the area's visual character. The proposed 10-story Landmark Condo Hotel will permanently degrade these vistas. From the golf course to Squaw Peak Way, it's difficult to imagine a place from which this colossus won't be visible. Being right at the foot of the mountain, it's like a tall man in the front row of a theater deciding to stand up—everyone behind him is disturbed. If he were polite and considerate, he would move to the rear to stand. Likewise, the hotel structures in this proposal need to shrink and move away from the mountain. Otherwise this landmark will more aptly be described as a mark upon the land.

On a related note, the proposed project blocks access as well as views. From the concept plan, it's clear that anyone trying to access the Far East Express lift from the north will have to do a substantial amount of extra walking in order to circumvent the snake of buildings.

3. Large Beyond Reason

The existing Village at Squaw Valley has 300 units. Another 300 are in the Squaw Valley Lodge. Between the Resort at Squaw Creek, Plumpjack and the

Red Wolf Lodge, there are about 326 more. If the current proposal is built, the number of units grows to almost 2½ times the current level. This is recklessly large.

It has been obvious for a number of years that the greatest source of profits in the ski industry is real estate. According to Hal Clifford's 2002 *Downhill Slide*, Skiing and snowboarding are not growing. Annual visits are flat. Resorts are waging an arms race trying to acquire customers from their competitors. Amenities are increasing. Season pass prices are declining. The number of customers is actually declining, but they visit more frequently, according to NSSRA 2006 data. The problem with an arms race is that too many arms get built and no one wants to clean up afterward. We should remember that Intrawest, developer of the original Village, went bankrupt. If this much real estate is built, the environment suffers and the pocketbooks of owners, old and new suffer as well.

And what is to become of the day skier, local skier and budget skier? As Squaw Valley caters more and more to America's wealthiest, what happens to the economic and cultural diversity that are so critical for a thriving community? As surface parking lots give way to parking structures, so too does free parking give way to $20 parking.

4. Overloading Roads

According to the North Tahoe Regional Traffic Management Plan, much of the existing peak traffic delay experienced along Interstate 80 and State Routes 89, 28, and 267 can be attributed to peak traffic volumes generated from ski area parking lots. I will add, from personal observation, that Squaw Valley Road is frequently overwhelmed. Even with the road temporarily reconfigured to have two lanes travelling east, it often takes 60 exhaust-spewing minutes to travel from the ski area to the traffic light at 89. Driving north on 89 to 80 is only slightly better. The existing transit infrastructure cannot support this massive proposed development.

5. Destroying Historic Buildings

The current Members Locker Room and Far East Center were originally built in 1959 as Spectator Centers for the VIII Olympic Winter Games. At the time, they were known as the California Welcome Center and Nevada Welcome Center. These unique triangular-shaped A-frame buildings are iconic as Olympic heritage. With the demolition of Blyth Arena and the substantial modifications to Olympic House, these twin buildings stand as the only remaining intact works of award-winning architect Russell Francis Stechschulte from his time as resident architect for the Winter Olympics. With the ski jump also gone, there are very few genuine connections to Squaw Valley's Olympic past in the base area.

Phase 1 of this project proposes to eliminate these historic structures. A number of cases can be made that the Members Locker Room and Far East Center are historic landmarks. Not only are they the last of their type in the region, but they are also associated with the 1960 Winter Olympics, which had a profound influence on the history of California. Further, they represent the best surviving work of this pioneering architect in this region.

6. Overtaxing Water Resources

The water situation in Squaw Valley is already marginal. The source of water in the valley is pumped groundwater. It is already the case that groundwater levels do not fully rebound in some years, according to the 2007 Olympic Valley Groundwater Management Plan. Squaw Creek now goes dry more frequently and more severely than in the past. This kills various aquatic species that rely on the creek for habitat. In a comment on the 2007 GMP, Squaw's lawyers, Minasian et al. admit, "There is no perpetual surplus to be exported…" Where, then, will this new development get water? Imagine the water disaster to be caused by even a single 10-story hotel, let alone the full 1,295 housing units envisioned by this proposal.

The situation is no better on the discharge side. Squaw Valley Ski Corp. has a long and difficult relationship with water regulators going back decades. Squaw is under strict limits on the level of turbidity in Squaw Creek, and they've spilled diesel fuel without reporting. Rather than comply, however, they have at times gone to the courts to try to intimidate employees of the Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board. How can Squaw Creek survive the proposed intensified use of the surrounding land?

Conclusion

I strongly oppose the specific plan as proposed. It is beyond reasonable scale. It seeks to maximize profits for Squaw's owners while providing detriments to almost everyone else. Squaw Valley Real Estate must come back with a new plan that shows respect for the people, environment, and history of the area.

Sincerely,

Alex Meyer

Alex Meyer
owner, parcel 096-691-012-000

November 9, 2012

Sandy Richert
1340 Happy Valley Road
Pleasanton, CA 94566

Owner: 22 Station Village condo - #4-312
Olympic Valley, CA

Mr. Alex Fisch, Senior Planner
Placer County Planning Dept.
3091 County Center Drive, Suite 190
Auburn, CA 95603

Here are my comments on the Village of Squaw Valley NOP/IS:

1) Proposed Specific Plan – On page 4 of the NOP, paragraph 1, the proposed project includes amendments to the land uses previously approved for the site in the 1983 SVGPLUO. I would ask that the EIR take a very serious look at these proposed land use amendments, which are asking for current Forest Recreation Area to be converted to Commercial Condo Core to enable the construction of a multi-storied condo hotel. The 1983 plan was put together with input from the general public, residents of the Valley, and the Leadership at that time. This will impact the Environment in a number of ways as outlined below in subsequent items.

2) Land Use and Forest Resources: Again stated, the proposed project includes rezoning portions of the area from Forest Recreation to Village Commercial. In the 1983 Squaw Valley General Plan and Land Use Ordinance document on page 17 under Visual Analysis, the very first paragraph states: The visual characteristics of the Squaw Valley environment are one of its most important atributes." Also stated on Page 18, paragraph 4 that 'In all cases the placement of buildings, roads, & recreational facilities shall be placed so as to minimize their visual impact'. Rezoning of the proposed areas should receive special attention in the EIR in my opinion, and I am personally opposed to this re-zoning/re-alignment of currently zoned specific areas.

3) Noise: Several potential noise issues have been identified so far, but I would ask that you also evaluate how additional noise may be 'trapped' or deflected back into the existing residential and commercial Village due to the close proximity, height and mass of the proposed Condo Hotels should they be allowed to be developed. Will you assess how a 6-10 story building adjacent to a 2 or 4 story building will impact the increased noise level for the 2-4 story dwelling?

4) Visual Resources: In addition to the adverse effects or virtual elimination to scenic vistas already identified, I would also ask that you prepare a 'Shadow Analysis' on how the proposed project would impact the natural daylight currently available for the existing structures and environment. Many of the proposed higher structures are on the South side of the existing development, which will cast many more shadows on the current dwellings and environment.

I know that others have submitted items to be added to the list of consideration for the preparation of the Draft EIR such as increased traffic and the resulting impact, historic buildings, on-going construction noise, water resources, and more, so I will not unnecessarily duplicate those items here.

The NOP states that alternatives should be addressed as part of this process, and I for one look forward to reviewing alternatives to the currently proposed project. The Developer has stated numerous times that they have a right to develop the property they purchased; I am not disputing that. However, they purchased property with current zoning, with no guarantee that a re-zoning or re-aligning would be granted. I would like to see an alternative development plan that would enable the applicant to build an economically viable project without rezoning and without so many detrimental aspects to the environment.

Respectfully,

Sandy Richert

From: Alexander Fisch
To: Maywan Krach;
Subject: FW: Update from MAC meeting 11-1-12
Date: Monday, November 05, 2012 8:31:15 AM

Please add this to the Village NOP comments.

Alex

From: Alexander Fisch
Sent: Monday, November 05, 2012 8:30 AM
To: 'Sandy Richert'
Subject: RE: Update from MAC meeting 11-1-12

Hi Sandy,

I do have one correction. Comments received on the NOP become part of the administrative record but the County does not prepare any type of written response to those comments. Comments on the Draft EIR must be responded to, and both the comments and responses will be included in the Final EIR. Thanks

Alex Fisch
Senior Planner
Placer County Planning Services
530.745.3081
www.placer.ca.gov

From: Sandy Richert [mailto:sv.project.updates@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, November 02, 2012 1:51 PM
To: Sandy Richert
Subject: Update from MAC meeting 11-1-12

Update from last night's MAC meeting:

First off, thank you to everyone who took the time to reply to my "who is this" email – with over 30 replies, it tells me I should have sent that out earlier! I wanted to get this email out first, so will reply to your individual inquires & replies next. Thank you very much for all of the positive feedback – it is encouraging that so many of you want to participate, even if it is writing a letter or two!

The meetings yesterday were very well attended, and although I could not attend the NOP Scoping meeting in the morning, people who attended both said a lot of the same information was shared in the MAC meeting.

Good news first! Chevis Hosey (representative of the Developer) made the announcement that the building heights for building "A" and building "O" were going to be reduced to 6 stories + parking under!! Down from 10 stories above 2 levels of parking! The details are not yet published, and the County has not yet received the formal adjustment to the application. It is my understanding that some other buildings will gain in height to compensate for the reduction, although we don't have those specifics yet either.

Additionally, the Developer will do a comprehensive restoration of Squaw Creek, with sedimentation collection points, widening some aspects, flood control measures, etc. There are also additional upgrades to the linear park proposed, "celebrating the creek and history of the Valley".

To Chevis' point, they were "listening to the feedback from the residents", and that was what drove the change.

While this is great news, and in my personal opinion a move in the right direction, there still remains the question of "is this project the appropriate size and mass for the Valley"?

Their plan is still to re-zone a portion of Forest Recreation Area to Commercial Condo Core in the area of the current Members Locker Room, while changing currently zoned forested area from commercial to forest recreation, moving the HC (high density commercial), etc. This is needed to accommodate the Condo Hotel – Building "A". The new height will be approximately 95 feet high, as compared to an average of 60' for the Village. Alex Fisch reiterated that as a property owner, like any property owner, they have the right to ask for areas to be rezoned, and their request is being made in this process and will be considered as part of the Project Review. There are some who believe this rezoning should be open for

Public Comment and not tied to the EIR process in which comments are limited to those relating to the environment. Hmmmm.

The Timberline Twister application that I sent out previously is NOT a part of the Project application and review process, and is being reviewed separately. There was discussion last night from people who felt that they should be reviewed as "one", and made part of the EIR process. I have attached a letter submitted by Judy Carini which will shed more light on this suggestion. Judy's letter also gives some great examples that could be used for a letter addressing the NOP.

Alexis Ollar of the MAPF (Mountain Area Preservation Foundation) gave commentary at the NOP Scoping meeting in the morning and an announcement that a group was being formed and a website was being developed for the "Friends of Squaw Valley". Details to follow on that site once it is established so you may join that group for updates too. If anyone attended the morning meeting and has notes on Alexis' commentary please forward to me and I will distribute.

There were also representatives from the Lodge Condominium neighborhood, and they expressed a lot of concern about Project and specifically the proposed new Condo Hotel – building "O" in Phase 4 – located between the Lodge and KT-22 lift. One of their Board of Directors sent me Chapter 18 of the Placer County Code - California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), and I have attached that document also, which gives quite a bit of detail for those who will be writing a letter in response to the NOP. They are now working to get the word out to all of they Homeowners about the proposed project.

Which leads me to the next topic, what letters to write and to whom! Again, your comments are DEFINITELY read and considered! From what I can tell, there are 2 types of letters that you can write, although all comments will be considered.

1: Letter addressing the NOP. This letter should be written expressing concerns about Environmental Impacts this proposed project will have on the current Village, Valley, etc. The comments should be focused around the list provided in the NOP document which I have attached for your convenience. **The deadline for these letters is November 9, 2012 at 5:00pm**. That being said, they made an announcement yesterday that due to the nature of this project and its impacts, and the fact that there are so many absentee owners potentially impacted, the Squaw Valley Owners Assoc. is holding a "mixer" on December 1st from 5:00-7:00 at the Resort for those who wish to comment on the project. Details to follow later. Those comments will be recorded and made part of the record for the NOP process, and Jennifer Montgomery has stated that she and perhaps other County Supervisors will be on hand to listen to your comments and concerns. Alex Fisch stated that his goal and desire is to have all correspondence by November 9th, but that comments from December 1st will be included even though it is after the deadline. This correspondence is best delivered as a written letter, since it will become part of the official EIR and every letter submitted will require a response from the County. I will send out a separate e-mail this evening with some examples of comments for you to consider. (This email is getting too long already).

2: Letter expressing opinion of the Project in general, aesthetics, architecture, etc. This letter can be sent at any time during the process, and should be addressed to the MAC committee members, the Planning Department, and definitely your Board of Supervisors individually. Again, I will supply details on addresses, contact info, examples, etc. in a separate email.

Finally, there was quite a bit of discussion about the General Plan for Squaw Valley from 1983 vs. the "Community" Plan which is what the County is considering it. As more information becomes available on this I will forward out.

Hopefully I didn't leave out anything important, and if you were there and I did miss something please forward me a note and I will make sure the group gets updated. Alex, I have copied you too, so if anything needs correction please let me know.

Thank you,
Sandy

From: Alexander Fisch
To: Maywan Krach;
Subject: FW: Intro on Proposed Development at the Village
Date: Friday, November 02, 2012 9:33:12 AM

Please add this to the NOP comments for the Village Specific Plan.

Alex

From: Sandy Richert [mailto:sv.project.updates@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, November 01, 2012 10:57 AM
To: Alexander Fisch
Subject: Fwd: Intro on Proposed Development at the Village

Hi Alex, thought you should have a copy of what was sent .... since I included your contact info!

Thanks, Sandy

---------- Forwarded message ----------
From: **Sandy Richert** <sv.project.updates@gmail.com>
Date: Fri, Oct 26, 2012 at 11:27 PM
Subject: Intro on Proposed Development at the Village
To: sv.project.updates@gmail.com

To our Squaw Valley Village Homeowners at First Ascent and 22 Station:

Some of you might already be aware of the proposed new developments at Squaw Valley, and for some this may be new information.

I will be sending out informational e-mails about the new proposed project as I get more information, and will be sending another update with additional information in the next day or so. IF AT ANY TIME YOU DO NOT WANT TO RECEIVE THESE E-MAIL NOTICES, PLEASE REPLY WITH "REMOVE ADDRESS" IN THE SUBJECT LINE. I will then remove you from further correspondence. Reciprocally, if you want more information, please do not hesitate to send a reply asking for more.

Whether you agree or disagree with the Proposed Project, in whole or in part, you should educate yourself as to the scope, location and magnitude of what the Developer, Squaw Valley Real Estate, LLC is proposing to develop around the existing Village. This is a HUGE project, and will forever change the Valley and more specifically the Village at Squaw Valley.

This Development is one of the largest and most significant proposed for the Tahoe area, and will consist of 1,295 new residential units, 454,000 s.f. of new Commercial space, an ice rink, aquatic center, and more. To put this in perspective, the current Intrawest Village has 151 residential units at 22 Station, and 139 residential units at First Ascent.

While this new development is very exciting, and will bring much needed new traffic and business into our existing Village, you should be aware of what is being proposed and where, as it could ultimately affect the value of your current home in the Village. It will most definitely affect the landscape of the entire valley floor.

An example of what could be of particular interest is the Landmark Condo Hotel, referred to as Parcel A in Phase 1. 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.

The developer is on track to break ground on Phase 1 at "snow melt" 2014, which is approximately 18 months away, provided there are no obstacles to this timeline.

How can you learn more about the proposed development?

1. The Placer County Planning Department has assembled a website with links to important documents and contacts. Please go to http://www.placer.ca.gov/Departments/CommunityDevelopment/Planning/TahoePlanning/VillageAtSquawValleySpecificPlan/SpecificPlan.aspx to access this information. I HIGHLY ENCOURAGE you to explore the website for the proposed development plans. This

project is receiving the attention of Sierra Watch and the Mountain Area Preservation Foundation among others.

2. A Public Scoping meeting will be held by the County to inform interested parties about the Proposed Project, and provide an opportunity to provide comments on the scope and content of the EIR. The meeting time and location:

Thursday - November 1, 2012

10:00 a.m

Resort at Squaw Creek

400 Squaw Creek Road, Olympic Valley

3. **The MAC (Municipal Advisory Committee) meets on the first Thursday of every month at 6:00 p.m. The meetings are held at the Squaw Valley Public Service District Community Meeting Room, 305 Squaw Valley Road, Olympic Valley (in the firehouse building). The MAC advises the Board of Supervisors who will ultimately make the decisions on this project. The next MAC meeting will be on Thursday, November 1, 2012.**

The NOP (Notice of Preparation) was officially made public on October 10, 2012. This is in advance of the formal EIR (Environmental Impact Report) being published and examined in a few weeks. **Because of time limits mandated by State Law, you will have 30 days to provide any written comments on topics to be address in the EIR for the Project from October 10, 2012, if you so desire.**

Interested parties may provide the County with written comments no later than 5:00PM on November 9, 2012. Please send all comments to:

Placer County, Planning Services Division
Attn: Maywan Krach, Community Development Technician
3091 County Center Drive, Suite
Auburn, CA 95603

or contact Alex Fisch, Senior Planner, Placer County afisch@placer.ca.gov for additional information on the proposed project.

Thank you,
Sandy Richert

From: Alexander Fisch
To: Maywan Krach;
cc: Lisa Carnahan;
Subject: FW: SV update - Timberline Twister info
Date: Friday, November 02, 2012 9:38:29 AM
Attachments: Timberline Twister application.pdf
Dave Brew letter re Twister application 10_2012.docx
Jon Shanser - Timberline Twister application ltr.docx

Maywan,

Though this is not part of my project it includes a reference to the NOP. Please add it to the Village Specific Plan NOP comments file. Thanks

Alex

From: Sandy Richert [mailto:sv.project.updates@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, November 01, 2012 11:11 AM
To: Sandy Richert
Subject: SV update - Timberline Twister info

To the Village Homeowners:

Additional component being proposed!

I am forwarding information on the "Timberline Twister" because it is not currently included in the NOP for the EIR. (I know … the world needs more acronyms!) As such, I haven't seen it on the Placer County website because it is my understanding that the application is still going through a review process, so this will most likely be new information to you.

This roller-coaster type ride is proposed for the timber section to the "left" of Red Dog. I have attached the application for everyone and would encourage you to at least read the description starting on page 12.

I have included a copy of a couple letters that were submitted by Valley residents. Please keep in mind that the full time Residents of the Valley that I have spoken with are not opposed to "Development", however, are taking a position on certain aspects of what is being proposed. The purpose of including these letters is that I feel they are well written, and while it may or may not align with your preferences does give an excellent example of addressing items that can be discussion points for the EIR on the project. **Again, it is my understanding that all letters submitted become part of the record and are considered by the County, whether or not they are addressing EIR items, or expressing an opinion.**

So if you have something to say, put it in writing! The deadline for submitting Public Comment in writing for the EIR is 9 days away! November 9th at 5:00pm is the deadline for submission.

I will be composing information on who to send notices to, and some possible topics to consider, after the MAC meeting tonight. Stay tuned!

Thank you for your continued interest in this Proposed Project,

Sandy Richert

From: Alexander Fisch
To: Maywan Krach;
Subject: FW: Reminder! Squaw Valley MAC meeting this Thursday at 6:00pm + project pics
Date: Tuesday, October 30, 2012 8:22:58 AM
Attachments: Proposed Development pic 10_13_12.JPG
Future hotel site_current view 10_13_12.JPG

Please add this to the NOP comments file.

Alex

From: Sandy Richert [mailto:sv.project.updates@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, October 30, 2012 8:05 AM
To: Sandy Richert
Subject: Reminder! Squaw Valley MAC meeting this Thursday at 6:00pm + project pics

Good morning!

This is a reminder that the monthly MAC meeting will be held on Thursday - November 1st at 6:00pm. This meeting is important in that it will be primarily dedicated to the NOP and future Environmental Impact Report to be assembled and studied for the proposed development in the Village area of Squaw Valley. This is a great opportunity to be able to speak to the Municipal Advisory Committee about your thoughts on the proposed environmental impact this proposed project will have on the Valley.

For those of you who were able to attend the HOA annual meeting on October 13th, you may remember the rendering that Chevis of the Squaw Valley Real Estate LLC presented. The attached picture was an amature shot with my phone so my apologies for the quality. The "beige" buildings are the current village, and this perspective is looking towards the South-East/mountain/Red Dog. Also attached is a photo of the current Squaw Valley Locker room from the 1960 Winter Olympics - the future site of the 10 + 2 story Landmark Hotel slated in Phase 1.

Again, I encourage you to explore the Placer County website http://www.placer.ca.gov/Departments/CommunityDevelopment/Planning/TahoePlanning/VillageAtSquawValleySpecificPlan/SpecificPlan.aspx for additional information, details on the NOP, **contact information for your County Supervisors to submit your comments**, maps of what is being proposed and more.

The developer is also hosting a website for additional information, so please also check out http://www.squawrenaissance.com for some of the great things being proposed and accomplished. ***They have definitely dedicated resources to improving the skiing/riding experience on the slopes and more.***

Please do not hesitate to reply with questions or comments. I will do my best to answer them or at a minimum redirect you to someone who can.

Next email notice: The proposed "Timberline Twister". Details to follow ... stay tuned!!

Make it a great day!

Sandy

From: Alexander Fisch
To: Maywan Krach;
Subject: FW: Squaw Valley Village -- new plans
Date: Tuesday, October 30, 2012 8:20:22 AM

Please add this to the NOP comments file.

Alex

-----Original Message-----
From: J Rocchio [mailto:jprocchio@comcast.net]
Sent: Monday, October 29, 2012 8:47 PM
To: Alexander Fisch
Subject: Squaw Valley Village -- new plans

Hello,

I just wanted to provide comment about the proposed village plans at Squaw Valley Resort.

First I love the fact that something will be done with the mass of concrete seen when riding down the aerial tram. That is a huge positive. However, I have seen the images for the 10 story buildings and find that unbearable. Really? Is that something that can be done legally? It just seems too much for the village. Currently the buildings are four or five stories high. That itself is tall enough. Would the village see any sun with these massive structures of 10 stories? I am against the 10 story buildings and can't believe that zoning laws even allow them as a possibility. I am hoping that was a stretch by the architects and in fact that part of the plans will be changed. Moreover, I worry that the proposed new village provides way, way too much capacity with regard to living accommodations (whether these are hotel or condos).

I am excited about the idea of the ice skating rink at the base of the mountain in the proposed new village. I think this is a great added feature. I do not know enough about the proposed indoor aquatic park to have a comment. It sounds a bit odd but again maybe I am having trouble visualizing this feature of the village.

Regards,

Jolene Rocchio

October 28, 2012

RECEIVED
OCT 31 2012
PLANNING DEPT.

Jennifer Montgomery
Supervisor, District 5
Board of Supervisors
175 Fulweiler Avenue
Auburn, CA 95603

Subject: Proposed Squaw Valley Village Development

Our home is in Carnelian Bay over on the north shore of Lake Tahoe. I have been visiting Squaw Valley all my life, beginning in 1953. In the "old" days it always felt like Alex Cushing cut corners on most of the development there, which sadly cheapened the "alpine experience" we all sought, but the mountain and meadow are truly one of a kind.

When Intrawest unveiled their plan for "The Village at Squaw Valley" (what, 15 years ago?) we were all thrilled. It meant that someone was actually going to "build it right". The other alpine villages Intrawest built, most notably Whistler, British Columbia were wonderful. They built villages that are tasteful, functional and are among most beautiful mountain resorts in North America and Europe. Alas, as you know, only 2 of their 4 Phases for the Village were built.

When the new owners of Squaw announced they were planning to complete the village all of us (that love Squaw Valley) were thrilled. We recently attended a presentation made by Chevis Hosea, Squaw Valley's VP of Development. To be blunt, we were in shock over what is being planned.

Mr. Hosea had several poster board representations of their village expansion plans and in particular a depiction of how their "Landmark Condo Hotel" will look in relation to the existing buildings. As depicted, their proposed Hotel was only slightly taller than the tallest existing village buildings (which are already reasonably tall for a small mountain valley community). I scratched my head and wondered: ***How could a 10 story hotel built on a two story platform (12 stories in all) appear to be only one story (roughly) taller than the 4 story buildings directly behind and adjacent to it?***

My understanding is that their planned Hotel is 154 feet high. The existing Village ridgeline height is 60 feet. So the Hotel is over 2 1/2 times taller than the current village, yet on the presentation board it only appears to be slightly taller. Are they building floors that are just 5 or 6 feet tall?

Mr. Hosea was being terribly deceptive, and he knew it, and when questioned his answer was "it's a matter of perspective", never admitting that their building would tower above the existing village on the far southern edge.

So apparently we need to see it from a different "perspective". Then they should be required to present a 3-dimesional scale model, something the public can view, walk around and consider from different angles and heights to fully understand what a huge, out of place, mass the hotel will be. I recall that Intrawest had a scale model of the village that we were invited to view.

And as we listened to his their plan, it became apparent that there are so many things to question, among them:

1. Is it reasonable to build a village more than 4 or 5 times the footprint of Intrawest's plan and maybe 8 or 10 times the footprint Intrawest was able to complete? Water, Sewer, Environmental impact of so much development and population? I know there will be an EIR, but it's also a "no-brainer".

2. Can so many new beds be filled? And if so by whom (locals? Placer County residents? California residents?). Mr. Hosea said they plan "to get the people that currently go to Vail and Aspen" for extended stays in Squaw Valley and reduce the day use which will reduce traffic. This is good? The traffic part, OK, but to invite the world to come trample one of our most beautiful Sierra meadows and simultaneously reduce the number of regular people (who can't afford Aspen, Vail or an extended stays in Squaw Valley)? Why? so KSL and it's investors can make a profit?.

3. And can their new units be sold or will they just add to the glut of unsalable property in the Valley (the current Village has many, many units for sale, not selling due to lack of demand, and at the Resort at Squaw Creek they literally can't be given away)?

4. Who will pay for all the overdeveloped empty real estate, taxpayer bailouts, higher lift ticket, food and parking prices? They are virtually eliminating all of today's "free" parking. Once underground will they be charging a fee just to come to the valley for the day?

5. Who will complete the buildings when the developer walks away due to inability to sell the units (or will we all be happy looking up at 1/2 finished buildings as the wind blows through where windows and doors would have one day been installed) ?

6. To increase demand to be in the Valley they propose a "Mountain Adventure and Aquatic Center". Is a beautiful High Sierra meadow where we want or need a "Disneyland-like" attraction that tries to imitate what is right outside? "***Water-based recreation rides***" (i.e. water slides) and "***Extensive indoor/outdoor pools"?*** (what Mother Nature's lakes and streams aren't good enough)? A ***"rock climbing wall"*** (again, something wrong with Nature's granite mountains right outside)?

Seems we are catering to people who can't be bothered with hiking or walking or being outside (maybe the people from back east are afraid of bears?). A ***"Bowling Alley"***? (yeah got to have that, there's so much demand to bowl when you've planned a visit to enjoy the wonders of the High Sierras), and a "M***ulti-generational arcade"***! (just like Chuck E. Cheese!). It all sounds so wonderful. We are doing that valley proud. Right.

And why not go-carts, miniature golf, and a Ferris Wheel? Hey, they could even schedule travelling carnival or circus down by Squaw Creek! Gotta entertain those folks who don't like to go outside and experience Mother Nature.

Are we out of our minds to even consider all this???

7. And how is it they get a large parcel rezoned from "Forest Recreation" to "Village Commercial Core"? When asked, Mr Hosea's answer was **"there is just a sliver that needs to be rezoned"**. A sliver? I think we need to hear his definition of sliver.

He went on to say **"where the Hotel is going is the most valuable real estate we bought and we are entitled to make a profit from it"**. Pardon me? They are entitled? They can't make enough money on what they bought (as zoned) so they just move things around to suit their perceived entitlement to more profit?

8. And Mr. Hosea said (to the audience, mostly current homeowners in the Village) "you'll all make money too!" Your units will go up in value. Does he really think making a big profit is every ones goal? or the reason people bought a family recreation spot in Squaw Valley? Does he really think that more dollars in value on paper (if that ever were to materialize) will compensate anyone for the impact of a huge 12 story monolith rising up from what used to be lightly developed, mostly open space for all to enjoy? That area was zoned "to retain the general character of the forest environment"?

I'm afraid that increased real estate values are only useful to those who want to "cash out" and leave. For those families that want to continue to come to the Valley and enjoy it's beauty, increased real estate value is just something on paper. At least KSL admits it's true motive.

9. I know our County has been impacted by reduced property tax revenue, but is that a reason to approve something that would not be approved in better financial times? And how many property tax bills are currently unpaid in the present Village at Squaw, Resort at Squaw Creek and Northstar? Property owners going in to foreclosure, short sales or bankruptcy are not a good source of property tax revenue, and vacant or unfinished properties aren't either. I would think the County would recognize the economic instability this size development creates for existing property owners and local economies. Overbuilt ski areas are not good for anyone (with the exception of the promoters if they can walk away leaving the bankers and investors holding the bag).

10. And if rezoning is to occur, how can an area on the far southern edge of the commercial development be zoned "Core Village"? Doesn't "Core" mean "in the center"? Doesn't a village have the nicest esthetics when it's highest buildings are in the center, with diminishing heights as they become more distant from that center?

11. And finally, are we going to allow them to tear down all that remains of the 1960 Olympics? Shouldn't something be preserved to remember that historic event, place and time?

I better stop for now. Sorry, I couldn't figure out how to be any briefer with this.

As I write I keep shaking my head in disbelief.

Sincerely,

Norm Schlinger
P.O. Box 937
5298 North Lake Blvd
Carnelian Bay, CA 96140

cc Alex Fisch - Project Manager
Planning Services Division
3091 County Center Drive
Auburn, CA 95603

Attn: Maywan Krach, Community Development Technicial
Placer County, Planning Services Division
3091 County Center Drive
Auburn, Ca 95603

Sent by mail
And by email to: cdraecs@placer.ca.gov and afisch@placer.ca.gov

1 November 2012

From: James Peter Schweitzer, 415 Squaw Peak Rd, Olympic Valley, CA 96146

RE: Squaw Valley Notice of Preparation and EIR Preparation

Dear Sirs

It was a pleasure to attend today's meeting regarding KSL/Squaw Valley's partial proposal to develop land adjacent to the Squaw Valley Ski Area. There were obviously many comments made today, verbally, to the county, KSL/Squaw Valley and those interested parties in attendance. They are now part of the record and must be included in the EIR. I hope to not be redundant but to clarify some of the issues raised and raise new issues.

1. Ski Area as real-estate. This is similar to the concept of golf courses as real-estate and as we have seen in Truckee and around the US the inability to sell the real-estate can be disastrous to a community. A majority of their plan is to sell condo's and time shares to fund the development. Should they not be successful who will pay for the cost that homeowners normally pay? In other words if these buildings are built and not sold and KSL (or the legal entity who is actually doing the project) files for bankruptcy who will bear the economic, social and environmental burden for that failure? Grey's Crossing is a good example of this type of failure. This must be seriously addressed or the Plan must be rejected.
2. Increased snow making. KSL has greatly publicized its investment in Squaw for the last two years and for the next 3 including new lifts, etc. One of their larger investments is in new and increased snowmaking. This new snowmaking will use far more water than in the past, though that water usage is not calculated in today's water usage. In other words, historic water use 2012 and earlier is not as valuable as the metric for water use in 2013 when far more water will be used than previously. The EIR must address this greater use of snowmaking and plans KSL has to increase snowmaking in the future, which will also increase. And with global warming and less water how will that be calculated?
3. How is the calculation for water use for the new structures calculated? Will it be detailed in the EIR?
4. Phase 1 is the focus of KSL's proposal and Squaw's plan but phases 2/3/4 must be addressed now to get community support. Without more details on the later phases it is at least negligence on the part of the county to consider approval for any Phase 1 and possibly much worse.
5. The number of $100,000,000.00 in real-estate value was introduced today by KSL for Phase 1. How does that value and resulting property tax color the Placer County approval process?
6. Economic viability – somewhat relating to item 1, above. What if their plan is not economically viable, while it is on one hand the investors risk (those who invest in the project) it is also the risk that all Olympic Valley residents also have to deal with. While KSL may have substantial assets (today, we assume) we have all seen that anyone taking risks on real-estate and operations in seasonal businesses have failed at an alarming rate. How will the EIR address this situation?
7. Historic Buildings – What is Placer County's definition of a historic building?
8. Open Space – It was brought up today that the developer has a responsibility to provide new open space, parkland, etc. as a percentage of the new built space for specific uses? What is the exact requirement of the developer and where is the new "open space" going to be? It has not been specified in the current proposal. At a minimum the EIR must address this.
9. Parking – It was stated today and in the Proposal that new "offsite parking" will be created. Where is that offsite parking, how will it be accessed, who owns that land, what if that land is not available in the future, etc. There does not appear to be a comprehensive parking plan. Without one this plan must not be approved.
10. Traffic – There appears to be no traffic plan associated with this Proposal. Has there been input from those agencies who are involved with traffic, i.e. CalTrans, Sheriff's of Placer and Nevada County, Calif Highway Patrol and local police agencies? What studies have been done? The Truckee/Tahoe basin has a significant traffic problem and there appears to be no part of the Proposal that deals with this.
11. Employee Housing – While it is mentioned that this is a component it is not included as a component in Phase 1 of the Proposal. As the county requires this it seems that this Proposal as submitted cannot even be reviewed, or better said, immediately rejected until it is covered.
12. Employee Parking – Current employee parking is not well defined or controlled. With this level of construction there will be far more employee's than there are today and with less parking in the valley available. Without this issue being covered in detail and approved by citizens this Proposal must be rejected.
13. Squaw Valley Road – This road cannot handle, on many days, the current traffic load. With the increase in visitors, season pass holders, etc. the road can certainly not handle more traffic. I see no provision or discussion in the current Proposal that deals with this. Placer County, if it approves this plan, will be held liable for any disaster that occurs that is a result of no plan for traffic on Squaw Valley Road. In the absence of a traffic plan this Proposal must be rejected.
14. Changes to Project – While some changes to the project must be expected and lowering in height of one building (not yet approved for the prior height) in exchange for a raising of another two buildings (also not yet approved) is not really a tradeoff since nothing has actually submitted, and far from being approved. While some changes to the project may be done by Placer County planners, items like building height, scale, massing and some many items may not. In light of so little actual detail of what might be built this Proposal must be rejected.
15. Squaw Peak Road #1 – While much has been alluded to there have been no specifics of how this road and adjacent property of KSL will be used. As an example the hotel proposed to be built in the Olympic House area does not show any access to the building. Will it be via Squaw Peak Road? Where will access to the parking be from? Without a specific proposal to be reviewed this plan must be rejected.
16. Squaw Peak Road #2 – On the Proposal plan at the loop there is the statement "surface parking". What does this refer to specifically. While it is not a part of Phase 1 it is clearly KSL's plan to use this space for parking. What specifically are they considering? Without specific's for this Phase 1 must be rejected.
17. Lighting – There is no mention of lighting of the exterior of the buildings. When OVI was built no one considered that they would place spot lights on Granite Chief and in other areas of the site. Without a lighting plan Phase 1 must be rejected.

Sincerely,

James Peter Schweitzer

Mr. Alex Fisch, Senior Planner

Placer County Planning Dept.

3091 County Center Drive

Auburn, CA 95603

Dear Mr. Fisch:

I am writing this letter to comment upon the NOP & IS regarding the proposed Village in Squaw Valley. I have several concerns about which I would like the draft EIR to consider.

1-**Aesthetics**: The beauty of this valley is unique in the Sierras, and I would hope that the planners will take into account the significant negative impact of buildings so high as to tower over the existing village as well as to obstruct views of the adjacent beautiful mountains. Mitigation measures should include but not be limited to lowering of proposed buildings to that of those in the existing village, moving any higher buildings away from the existing village, and insuring view corridors remain undisturbed.

2-**Traffic:** Even though it has been suggested that with visitors staying for longer periods, there will be fewer cars moving in and out of the valley, I am still concerned that with over 1000 new units in the valley, there will be a constant ebb & flow of traffic on the main road into this valley from both visitors and employees such that residents will have a very difficult time entering the main road. The traffic issue needs to be thoroughly evaluated, both for skier/visitor use as well as emergency use(fire & ambulances). A possible mitigation measure could be local bus transport provided by KSL, and locating employees in housing within the valley so they do not add to the traffic.

3- **Blight:** While I understand that economic viability is not an item to be considered in the draft EIR, the blight caused by overbuilding both in commercial and residential sector could well lead to unoccupied spaces often related to supply exceeding demand and empty storefronts(businesses unable to compete with each other) as well as empty rooms/beds. One way to mitigate blight is to limit the number of rooms and retail spaces to a more "reasonable" number.

4- **Water:** We have heard a lot about verifiable water amounts and assessments of water, and I believe that there needs to be proof that there is enough water to provide for the project and that the needs of the project do not adversely affect the existing aquifers, particularly over longer periods that those involved in well testing. I am concerned that the taking of water from the mountain wells may well negatively impact the existing aquifers both in amount and quality, and there should be mandated improvements to the Creek done by KSL as well, including but not limited to altering the creek course so as to somehow wind it more aesthetically through the village and parking areas.

5- **Community:** I am concerned that there has not been sufficient analysis and thought given to what KSL can and should do for the community in which they are planning to build this project. They should be required to create open space for the residents for the privilege of building in this valley and they need to make some concessions about the length of time the community will be adversely impacted by the long term construction that is planned. The noise and dust created by some 10-15years of building needs to be mitigated!

Thank you in advance for your consideration.

I remain very truly yours,

Jon Shanser
POB 2910 & 1580 Lanny Lane
Olympic Valley, CA 96146

1064 Lanny Lane
Olympic Valley, CA 96146
7 November 2012

Mr. Alex Fisch, Senior Planner
Placer County Planning Dept.
3091 County Center Drive
Auburn, CA 95603

Here are my comments on the Village of Squaw Valley NOP/IS.

1) Objectives - In the paragraph about "a range of reasonable alternatives" the statement is made about alternative plans being "capable of meeting most of the projects' objectives". Section 1.4 of the Initial Study spells out these objectives. The only mention of size is the statement "... the SVGPLUO is intended to ensure that the area has "the capacity to serve and house the optimum number of tourists, visitors, and residents...without adversely impacting the unique aesthetic and environmental assets of Squaw Valley."" Is there anything quantitative associated with this phrase? If the development were one half the size, would that satisfy the objectives? How does one go about determining the "optimum number"? This would seem crucial to evaluating alternative designs.

2) Noise - the NOP says that the project "could generate noise that could disturb nearby sensitive land uses". That is a very strange term. Does that include the residents that live above the Village on the hillside to the north? Will the analysis take into account reflection of Village noise (eg concerts) off the high rise buildings towards these homes? Will the alternative designs evaluate changes to this noise level if the heights are reduced, or the buildings rearranged? Does the analysis include the move of the snow making equipment from its current location to the new proposed location? Does the analysis include noise from the Twister (we were told the EIR would assume the existence of the twister).

3) Shadows - I did not see this mentioned anywhere. In the winter, even in the existing Village, the low sun angle creates shadows that promote the formation of ice on walkways and roadways. With the considerably larger size of the proposed project, I would suggest that most of the project area will be in shadow for a good deal of the winter - making walking and driving around treacherous. How is this to be mitigated?

4) Employee housing - The Initial Study says that " Because existing employee housing would be removed and the demand for employee housing would increase as a result of the proposed project, replacement housing may need to be provided either within the plan area or off-site ". It also points out that this need for housing can be supplied by a rent subsidy.

But at the MAC meeting (attended by Supervisor Montgomery) in September, this subject was raised and discussed. The consensus of all concerned was that the "rent in lieu of' that was used for the current village should not be repeated, and that employee housing within the valley should specifically be considered as part of the project. Employee housing within Squaw Valley should be part of the project and should be part of the EIR. Please refer to the below link.

https://docs.google.com/open?id=0ByRSrrx460DsMUtnVkRjTlZKdW8

5) Recreation Facilities – On page 2-55 of the Initial Study, it states that recreation facilities must be added under the Placer County General Plan. But recreation is not one of the items listed on page 6 of the NOP. What happened to it? Was that an oversight, did I miss something, or will it just not be covered. The Placer County General Plan requires that 5 acres of improved parkland and 5 acres of passive recreation or open space be provided for every 1,000 new residents. This must be included in the EIR and, to analyze this, the project plan should include how this is to be achieved, which it does not seem to.

6) Economic Viability – I know the Board of Supervisors has stated that economic viability is not an explicit consideration for approval. But in analyzing this project, it would seem a travesty not to consider the fate of Ritz Carlton at Northstar, Old Greenwood, Grey's Crossing, or even the existing Squaw Village. Therefore, the EIR should include a scenario in which Phase 1 of the new Village is all that is built. Perhaps this should be one of the alternative designs considered?

7) The Existing Village and Other Condo (eg Squaw Valley Lodge) buildings – It would seem that the county has some obligation to the residents who bought units in the existing Squaw Village. Their purchases were made with the expectation that the Village would be built to completion, and therefore not left as the island it is today. These units are proposed to be surrounded by buildings more than twice their size – cutting off their views, shadowing their walkways, vastly increasing the noise and trafficking – with very little input. It would seem fair that the NOP should address their situation as a special case.

8) Historic Buildings – the NOP says "Additionally, several buildings located in the plan area and proposed for demolition as part of the proposed project were constructed for the 1960 Winter Olympics and could be considered historical resources. These issues will be evaluated in the EIR". While the existing buildings are not listed as part of the California Historical Resources", will the EIR analyze whether they should be? Or even if they should be a Historical Landmarks? Or a Points of Historical Interest?

9) Construction – Section 1.5.6 of the Initial Study says 'The proposed project is projected to be built-out over 12-15 years". The residents of Squaw Valley are therefore being asked to tolerate construction noise and traffic, disrupting their lives, and potentially affecting their property values over an extend period of time. Other than noting the county code to be applied, and the potential significant impact (to be analyzed), there seems to be no consideration of the length of time over which this impact will occur. We would hope the EIR would consider mitigation such as widening Squaw Valley Rd, restrictions on construction traffic to time and number, or even better, that a ring road (as originally envisioned in the 1983 General Plan) be constructed so that the existing Squaw Valley road only sees one-half the traffic?

10) Water Resources of Phase 1 versus Entire Buildout – Water availability has always been the biggest question mark concerning any construction in Squaw Valley. This proposed development, with its MACC, will be a significant consumer. From what I understand, the EIR calls for a verifiable water supply for Phase 1, but only an assessment for the remainder of the project. It would seem, considering the nature of the issue and the consequences of an error in the assessment, that this EIR should contain a verifiable water supply for the entire project.

In addition it would seem reasonable that the water analysis include all water sources currently in use, such as the Mutual Water Company pumping their horizontal wells from the north side of the valley, the PSD pumping from the south ridge, and the Ski Corp pumping and purveying water to Gold Coast and High Camp from wells they have on the upper mountain.

11. Alternative Designs – It would seem that many of the environmental objections that the public has raised concern the height of the buildings in close proximity to the existing village and the other condo buildings (eg Squaw Valley Lodge). The other focus is size and breadth of the MACC. I would propose an alternative be evaluated that has three characteristics: (1) that all new Village buildings in close proximity to existing buildings start out at the same height, and build up as they step back, (2) that the MACC be moved away from the "snow line", thereby recovering some snow line residential space, and move it more into the interior (may fall out of phase 1), and (3) that the tallest buildings be along the creek, and not up front, thereby minimizing the shadowing and view impacts. The "ski-in, ski-out" aspect loss can be mitigated by including extensive locker space in the ground floor of the buildings along the "snow line" for residents and guests (and hopefully, outsiders who want lockers).

12. Additional Water Storage – It is highly likely that the overall development may require construction of a 1,000,000 gallon domestic water storage tank according to information from the Mutual Water Company. It would be very close to being the size of the existing PSD tank (1.13 million gallons) at the end of Washoe Drive's extension. It would require excavation and would have some visual impact. If such a tank is required, and the water supply analysis should spell this out, then this tank should be part of the EIR.

13. 100 yr flood plain and podium parking

The IS (and NOP) state that parts of the phase I area are in the flood plain. Originally, the flood plain was used by the Developer in their presentations to justify "podium" parking structures and then mounting the buildings on top of these. We do not believe that the statements about the 100 yr flood plain are valid. And perhaps so does the developer, since lately the argument has been that the podium parking is needed because storm waters would go through the village. This perhaps is only partly true or perhaps not true at all. The 1997 storm was probably a 100-yr event, and the waters from the South Fork of Squaw Creek overflowed at the right-angle bend above Alex Cushing's house and inundated Squaw Valley Lodge and swimming pool and other places in that general area. But the waters did not reach the area of phase I. There is perhaps no justification for the podium parking except for cost. As eliminating it and requiring subterranean parking like the present village would further mitigate the esthetics issues, I believe the requirement should be investigated and be evaluated as one of the alternative designs.

Thank you

David Stepner
1064Lanny Lane
Olympic Valley, CA 96146

From: David Stepner
To: Placer County Environmental Coordination Services;
Subject: NOP comments
Date: Sunday, October 14, 2012 3:55:56 PM

Hi Maywan

One more issue that I see.

On page 2-55 of the Initial Study, it states that recreation facilities must be added under the Placer County General Plan. But recreation is not one of the items listed on page 6 of the NOP. What happened to it? Was that an oversight, did I miss something, or will it just not be covered. The Placer County General Plan requires that 5 acres of improved parkland and 5 acres of passive recreation or open space be provided for every 1,000 new residents. Is this project exempt since the population is transient?

Thanks

David Stepner

From: David Stepner
To: Placer County Environmental Coordination Services;
Subject: NOP comment
Date: Thursday, October 11, 2012 5:19:51 PM

Hi Maywan

I have read the NOP and Initial Study documents and have the following comments.

1) Noise - the NOP says that the project "could generate noise that could disturb nearby sensitive land uses". That is a very strange term. Does that include the residents that live above the Village on the hillside to the north? Will the analysis take into account reflection of Village noise (eg concerts) off the high rise buildings towards these homes? Will the alternative designs evaluate changes to this noise level if the heights are reduced, or the buildings rearranged?
2) Shadows - I did not see this mentioned anywhere. In the winter, even in the existing village, the low sun angle creates shadows that promotes the formation of ice on walkways and roadway. With the considerably larger size of the proposed project, I would suggest that most of the project area will be in shadow for a good deal of the winter - making walking and driving around treacherous. How is this to be mitigated?
3) Employee housing - The NOP says that "the proposed project would require additional employees, necessitating construction of employee housing, which the Olympic Valley or in nearby communities". The Initial Study also points that this need for housing can be supplied by a rent subsidy. But at the MAC meeting (attended by Jennifer Montgomery) in September, this subject was raised and discussed. The consensus of all concerned was that the "rent in lieu of' that was used for the current village should not be repeated, and that employee housing withing the valley should be considered as part of the project. There does not seem to be any element of the project plan that addresses this explicitly, except for the "motherhood" statements. How is the EIR to evaluate this if the Project includes no plan?

Thank you.

David

Placer County Planning Services Division
3091 County Center Drive, Suite 190
Auburn, Ca 95603

Tony and Caroline Vertongen
1850 Village South Road # 408 W
Olympic Village, Ca 96146

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

November 7, 2012

Dear County Planning Department,

We have been condo owners since 2003 at the Squaw Village and very much enjoy the beauty and tranquility of the valley. We have reviewed the subject application for the new Squaw Valley Development and its additional project of the "Timberline Twister" and are deeply concerned about the proposed plans for the Village.

First of all, we are concerned about the environmental impact this massive project described as "high density resort residential neighborhood with active tourist related uses" is going to impose on the existing natural habit of the mountain area, the river and wetlands.

Secondly the more we discover the details of this project, the more we are convinced that the people who represent the Squaw Valley Holdings Company are no nature lovers; therefore, do not understand that projects such as the Timberline Twister and the Mountain Adventure and Aquatic Center (MAAC) are not appropriate for Squaw Valley. People come here to enjoy nature, air quality, and peace. We do not want buildings replacing trees, we do not want air pollution, and we do not want noise.

Originally the plan was proposed as "improvements" to make the village more sustainable and more attractive, but this project is looking more like a wild attraction park with hotel and other rental accommodations that will change the Valley forever.

This project will have a tremendous impact on our natural habitat and its wildlife, due to the removal of trees, the grading and excavation of the hillside, the increased traffic (not only visitors but also heavy construction trucks), the increased pollution, the noise….etc. We are not environmental experts but we are well aware that projects like this will use hazardous materials, produce hazardous green house gases, which cause climate change; will impact the quality and availability of our natural resources such as fresh water and clean air; will require wider roads to facilitate traffic and circulation; will cause erosion and perhaps most importantly will change the serene beauty of the mountain. This no longer sounds like an improvement, but rather a destruction.

We are thanking the members of the Placer County Building Planning to give citizen an opportunity to express their concerns and we are hoping they will consider the preservation of Squaw Valley's beauty for many generations to come.

Thank you,
Sincerely,

Caroline Vertongen

Maywan Krach

From: Alexander Fisch
Sent: Wednesday, October 31, 2012 2:48 PM
To: Maywan Krach
Subject: FW: comments regarding Squaw Renaissance Project
Attachments: Dear Municipal Advisory Committee.doc; ATT00001.txt

Please add these to the NOP comments

Alex

-----Original Message-----
From: Jennifer Montgomery
Sent: Wednesday, October 31, 2012 2:47 PM
To: Alexander Fisch
Cc: Steve Kastan
Subject: FW: comments regarding Squaw Renaissance Project

Alex, FYI for your files.

Steve, can you please send to the SVMAC members per Ms. Vertogen's request?

Thanks to both of you,

Jen

-----Original Message-----
From: Caroline Vertongen [mailto:hermantje@aol.com]
Sent: Wednesday, October 31, 2012 2:42 PM
To: Jennifer Montgomery
Subject: comments regarding Squaw Renaissance Project

Dear Supervisor Montgomery,
As a condo homeowner at the Village of Squaw Valley we would like to express our thoughts regarding the Squaw Renaissance Project. We live in the Bay Area and will not be able the attend the MAC meeting tomorrow November1, 2012, but feel it is important to we contribute and provide our input during this important decision making process. I have attached the letter and will be sending you the original in the mail.
Please feel free to present our letter at the meeting

Dear Municipal Advisory Committee,

Our family has been a condo homeowner of Station 22 4-408W since 2003. We live in the Bay Area and love the healthy and active outdoors atmosphere of the village and the valley. We love hiking, biking, and most of all the skiing in Squaw Valley. The valley restores the tranquility and family time that is often disturbed by the busy and stressful lives in the Bay Area. We love the area and would like to keep it that way.

We also have seen the changes in the Village over the years and agree that the village could use more amenities to make it more attractive and more vibrant as well as more financial sustainable, but we do not think that the Squaw Renaissance Project is the right concept.

We are deeply concerned about the environmental impact that this gigantic development proposal will cause and how that will alter the "down to earth", low key attitude that makes this village so special. We are not so sure that the Village is ready to change into " a world class recreation based all season resort" as mentioned by Chevis of the Squaw Real Estate LLC.

We are opposing the proposed height of the new hotel and other proposed buildings. It ruins the magnificent view for the current homeowners and demonstrates a lack of respect for the existing village experience so many locals and visitors enjoy. We are deeply concerned that the future infrastructure needed to accommodate the "resort like atmosphere" will change the character of the village and the valley.

We are pro improvement, but against the magnitude and ideas of this proposed plan because these investors do it for their own profits and care less about the environmental impact their plan will have on the quality and character of the mountain, the village, and ultimately the valley.

From: Alexander Fisch
To: Maywan Krach;
Subject: FW: Squaw Valley Development--public response
Date: Monday, November 05, 2012 8:41:40 AM

Please add this to the NOP comments.

Alex

From: wendy wood [mailto:wendylwood@earthlink.net]
Sent: Saturday, November 03, 2012 3:01 PM
To: Alexander Fisch
Subject: Squaw Valley Development--public response

Mr. Fisch:

I have attended several of the public meetings regarding the proposed KSL development of Squaw Valley.

The density is far too much considering the egress and ingress, a ring road or other form of transportation must be included. My family has skied at Squaw Valley for the past 50 years, we are not opposed to responsible development however the density proposed without consideration to the peak use times is irresponsible and doomed to failure. We built a home in the Hidden Lake area of Squaw Valley, we have since sold it and moved on to Lake Tahoe in one of two solar homes we built in 2007. We understand responsible and tasteful development in Tahoe, we are full time residents.

I have also noticed over the years that most massive developments in Squaw Valley have failed miserably, it is usually the second or third owners that have the financial basis low enough after some form of bankruptcy or credit write down, to have the project reasonably succeed..i.e. The Resort at Squaw Creek and The Intrawest Village. Financial viability is not the County's issue however it is the fall out that those of us who are left with a failed commercial concern have to think about in advance.

I suggested also to the developer at the meeting on November 1 that the design was cold and commercial. Perhaps if some more improved design elements are used, people vehemently in opposition would warm up to the project more. It is easier to accept a massive project if it has some appealing design elements—the current renderings are very unattractive and clearly maximizing all available space with the least amount of expense.

There will obviously be some development in Squaw, please attempt to see that it is done with taste and long term vision. Good luck, we all hope you take this job seriously. We too just wrote a five figure property tax check to the assessor.

Wendy Wood
PADI open water instructor
#264726
EFR Trainer
MSDT Instructor

Scoping Meeting Summary

Scoping Meeting Summary

Date:	November 1, 2012	**Time:**	10:00 a.m.
Location:	The Resort at Squaw Creek (400 Squaw Creek Road, Olympic Valley)		
Subject:	Village at Squaw Valley Specific Plan and Phase I Project		
Attendees	Placer County (Lead Agency): Alex Fisch and Richard Leary Squaw Valley Real Estate (Applicant): Chevis Hosea, Adrienne Graham, Forrest Haag, and Martino Ditto Ascent Environmental, Inc. (EIR Consultant): Gary Jakobs and Sean Bechta Public and Agency attendees: See attached sign-in sheet		

MEETING PURPOSE

The purpose of the scoping meeting is to inform interested parties about the proposed project, and to provide agencies and the public with an opportunity to provide comments on the scope and content of the environmental impact report (EIR) to be prepared for the proposed project.

SUMMARY OF COMMENTS

Speaker	Summary of Comment
Alex Fisch, Placer County	Mr. Fisch opened the meeting and presented the project background. The County has received an application for the proposed project, and has determined that an EIR will be prepared. A notice of preparation (NOP) has been released with an accompanying Initial Study (IS) that describes the proposed project's potential environmental impacts. This is a public information meeting to solicit comments on the environmental impacts of the proposed project. Oral comments can be submitted following the presentation and written comments can be submitted until November 9. Mr. Fisch summarized the location and description of the proposed project.
Chevis Hosea, Applicant	Mr. Hosea noted that the project team has met with a number of individuals, local homeowners associations, and the County regarding the project and has gathered a lot of input. One of the biggest concerns has been the building heights on the snow beach. In response, the applicant proposes revising these building heights from 10 to 6 stories and others in the Village from 6 to 4 stories. Other adjustments are proposed to reduce the overall scale. The loss of stories on some buildings would be compensated for by increasing the number of floors on other buildings. Details are still being worked out.

Speaker	Summary of Comment
David Stepner, Squaw Valley resident	Mr. Stepner stated that this project continues a trend across the country of turning ski areas into real estate markets. There is no interest by the County to look at the project's economic viability. There is evidence around us of what happens with this approach—Old Greenwood, Ritz Carlton, Greys Crossing, and others—have not been built as planned or have not been as big. The EIR should look at what would happen if only the Phase I Project were built. At a MAC meeting 2 months ago, it was clear that people wanted employee housing provided in the Valley, and not outside of the Village or "rent in lieu." Recreation facilities are discussed in the IS but not in the NOP. The County guidelines for providing new recreation facilities are 5 acres of active and 5 acres of passive use for every 1,000 residents. How does one evaluate the environmental impact of destroying a historic building? Does the evaluation focus on the presence of hazardous materials or something else? Residents of Squaw Valley are being asked to put up with 15 years of construction vehicles on a winding narrow road. Is there an alternative? Should the road be widened to 4 lanes, or have a ring road (as described in the 1983 General Plan)? How can we mitigate 15 years of dump trucks on Squaw Valley Road? The environmental impact of the Twister project may be mitigated by the proposed height of the new buildings in the Village at Squaw Valley Specific Plan.
Alex Fisch	The Twister project is a separate project with its own environmental review process.
Dave Brew	Mr. Brew noted several long-term environmental considerations that may not already be emphasized in the NOP and IS. He endorses all the questions raised in the NOP and IS. All concerns are regarding infrastructure for the whole Valley for 50 years. The 20-year scope of evaluating impacts is too short. The trapezoidal channel severely affects the health of Squaw Creek. The project (which would remove the trapezoidal channel) is an opportunity to restore the sinuosity of the original creek and enhance the creek's environment, and would benefit the lower reaches of the creek. Squaw Valley Road is a single, two-lane road that provides ingress and egress to the Valley. It is a potential hazard, is not sufficient for emergency response, and is too narrow. The traffic impact is likely to be underestimated. He suggests a one-way cross creek road that connects to Squaw Valley Creek Road. Widening the existing road would not address this issue. Climate change has not been considered well enough. We do not know what the changes in precipitation patterns or amounts will be. If there are significant changes, it may be necessary to manage Valley water resources in a different way. He suggests that the developer dedicate all project wells to the public services district (PSD) so that there is one manager for all water resources in the Valley. Finally, when preparing the EIR, please do not hide behind the term, "best management practices (BMPs)." BMPs are a way of covering up things that might be of potential impact.
Nicole Lutkemuller, Alpine Meadows resident	The NOP/IS left out the project's potential traffic impacts on Highway 89. The NOP/IS seemed to imply that the nature of the project would mitigate any potential impacts on traffic (e.g., pedestrian access, busses, people drive in and stay). Lake Tahoe is not in the Village, and Squaw Valley visitors will not stay in the Village just because there is pedestrian access and extra parking. Visitors will still want to travel to Lake Tahoe from the Village. The EIR should evaluate the project's impacts on traffic, especially between Truckee and Tahoe City.

Speaker	Summary of Comment
Alexis Oller, Executive Director of Mountain Area Preservation	Ms. Oller stated her concerns with the scale of the project. The 1983 General Plan claims to have struck a balance between conservation and resort and community development, but it has been nearly 30 years since the General Plan was completed. A project of this scale could have lasting impacts on the unique environmental and scenic resources and community character of Squaw Valley. The project warrants a full review in a General Plan update process. The process now is a piecemeal General Plan amendment process. The NOP/IS indicates multiple significant impacts due to the Phase I Project. The EIR is supposed to evaluate the entire project; however, the project description has not been completed for Phases 2–4. The NOP alludes to amending the General Plan without stating the actual amendments. This should be included in the EIR as well as an evaluation of the impact of amending the General Plans of Squaw Valley and Placer County. The NOP/IS also noted inconsistencies with the Squaw Valley and Placer County General Plans. The General Plan has not been updated for a long time, even though the California Supreme Court has emphasized the need to keep general plans up to date. The Governor's Office of Planning and Research (OPR) requires general plans to be updated every 8 years. Has the County received a letter from OPR regarding this issue? The County is urged to prepare a complete project description that could then be recirculated and scoping comments solicited. Without a complete project description, an EIR cannot be prepared.
Mike Syiek and Deborah Dafoc, on the Board of the Squaw Valley Lodge	Mr. Syiek and Ms. Dafoc represent 218 units adjacent to the proposed development. The County has not solicited or discussed the Board's concerns. The Board's major concern is traffic coming into the area and passing by the Lodge. The Board's second concern is water supply. The Board is happy to work with KSL, which has already drilled wells, but is concerned about effects on the watershed. The third concern is the height of the building next to the Lodge. Six stories is the new reduced height, but it is still unacceptable. The Board meets on Monday and invites you to attend and discuss these issues with the Board. The Lodge is composed of 2- and 3-story buildings right now. Also, there is little space for the proposed entry to the new building. The Board is concerned about the noise impact of the new building entry being so close to the Lodge. People and cars will be coming and going all night, creating noise impacts for Lodge guests. The Board would prefer that the project be done in phases, especially to appropriately address the traffic issue. How can the whole project be approved, when we are not discussing all the details of the whole project yet? We are only discussing the first phase.
Alex Fisch	It won't be discussed in detail here at this scoping meeting, but there is a Specific Plan, which in planning vernacular is equivalent to a Community Plan, that would include all the project phases. We are not only addressing Phase I in the Specific Plan.
Anthony Cosentino, property owner and representative of Squaw Peak Condos Board	Mr. Cosentino stated that he lives in Marin County, works in San Francisco, and recreates in Squaw Valley. He has been a property owner in Squaw Valley since 1961, and has owned a condominium in Squaw Creek Apartments for 40 years. He is here as an elected member of the management of the HOA. Traffic is a big concern, and he supports what preceding speakers have said on that issue. The HOA is very concerned about the proposed parking structure in the cul-de-sac on Squaw Creek Road, and the traffic problem that will create will be tremendous.

Speaker	Summary of Comment
Jack Kashtan, Truckee resident	Mr. Kashtan stated his concern about offsite parking. The Phase I plan mentions 541 parking spaces in an offsite lot. Where is that lot? It is not on the maps. If there will be additional offsite parking proposed in subsequent phases, that is a concern as far as paving land and runoff into the Truckee River watershed. What happens when I-80 closes and traffic is in a gridlock during a storm or a holiday weekend? That is a serious threat to public safety. The EIR should include a traffic management plan for traffic leaving Squaw Valley during storm conditions when I-80 is closed or nearly closed. Mr. Kashtan proposes holding people where there is food, shelter, heat, and water, rather than having them stuck on the highway.
Judy Carini, Squaw Valley resident	If we approve the concept of the Specific Plan at this time, then we are approving a plan that will be built in 15–20 years that will be based on a guideline that was drafted 50 years prior to that time. Ms. Carini supports what Alexis has said re: the need for a General Plan update. The NOP did not address fire hazards appropriately; specifically, it did not establish a plan for escape from Squaw Valley should that be necessary if there were a fire in the Valley or at the Valley's entry. An escape plan for the whole valley should be established. Under the current fire plan, the existing parking lot is the fire safe zone. That option would be gone if this development goes forward. A new plan needs to be established. She suggests that the NOP comment period should be extended to address the revised project description (i.e., changes in building heights), as well as the comments mentioned today re: items not included in the present NOP.
Peter Van Zant, Field Director for Sierra Watch in Nevada City	Sierra Watch's focus is land use in the Sierra, specifically, large projects proposed in environmentally and culturally sensitive areas. Sierra Watch pursues the goals of preserving what is good in those areas, in conjunction with neighborhood groups and other conservation allies. Those conditions exist here in Squaw Valley. There are 17 chapters or issue areas in the IS. The number of potentially significant impacts is staggering. That will make a long EIR. Of the 17, there are 7 that deserve close attention: 1. Aesthetics: Impacts to the viewshed, especially with the proposed height and massing of buildings. 2. There have been frequent project changes, including some occurring today. How can the project be evaluated properly? 3. Air quality and greenhouse gasses are an issue, particularly with the number of buildings. There should be plans for green construction and green operation. 4. Hydrology and water quality, particularly the effects of global climate change on the aquifer and precipitation patterns. 5. Land use planning: Agree with what Alexis said re: need to update the General Plan. Program EIRs are "not a pass." They require study and providing information to the public about what the impacts are going to be. 6. Employee housing and commuting issue needs to be fully addressed. 7. Transportation, traffic, and public safety are knitted together in this proposal. Judy mentioned an evacuation plan. That plan should look at the fact that this is a fire-prone area, not just the Valley but the whole Sierra. Also, regarding traffic, impacts should be evaluated from Truckee to Tahoe City and the Y.

Speaker	Summary of Comment
Marianne Salas, daughter of property owner	Ms. Salas' parents built a home in 1957 on Sandy Way. Ms. Salas lives in downtown San Jose, which is a better place for high-density development, and delivery of services, and noise, and treatment of water. Squaw Valley is not the place for that sort of development. Ms. Salas is in agreement with preceding comments, especially those concerning water quality, traffic, noise, construction, and dust. We are in a 13-unit complex, so we are a small group. We have not been approached by the County. She provided scoping comments to the County via email.
Charlie Pindrall, Squaw Valley resident on Granite Chief Road	Planning appears to be on the backs of the developers. When looking at the entire area, especially with the Homewood project that is also coming up, the County should look at models like Aspen, Colorado for public transit that is really effective, connects the communities, and provides transportation for employees as far down as Carbondale. Placer County needs a transportation plan that includes all other projects in the area, not just this one.
Laura Hanley, resident of Intrawest	Ms. Hanley lives in the Village full-time. Her family enjoys the current views and quiet in Squaw Valley, the coyotes crossing the snowed-over parking lot, and jackrabbits on the hillside. The project's cultural impact on the Valley would be substantial.
Sally Rule, longtime resident of Squaw Valley, representing the Friends of Squaw Valley	In response to the NOP and other projects in the area, a group has formed called the "Friends of Squaw Valley." On December 1, there will be a Squaw Valley property owner's association gathering, and Alex, Jennifer Montgomery, and Chevis will be there. The Friends of Squaw Valley is an organization of concerned citizens formed in response to the Squaw Valley Olympic Village Specific Plan. It is a forum whose mission is to advocate for environmentally sustainable, economically viable, and aesthetically compatible development in Squaw Valley while preserving its community character.
Ed Heneveld, Squaw Valley resident	What is involved with an NOP comment period extension?
Alex Fisch	Typically, an NOP comment period would be extended because a new environmental issue that was not previously disclosed and is of importance to a Trustee or a Responsible agency was raised during the comment period. Or there was a substantive change to the project that could change an impact to an area of one of those agencies' responsibilities. Typically when a developer is making a change that is within the scope of the project, there is not a need to extend the NOP comment period. This issue has come up as recently as yesterday. At this time, it is the Agency Director's determination that the NOP comment period will not be extended. At the December 1st property owners meeting, that I will be attending, County staff will record all comments and will include them in the project administrative record.
An informal question and answer period was initiated. Members of the public, rather than approaching the podium, remained in their seats and raised hands to be recognized for questions. Names of speakers were not formally provided or recorded.	
Unidentified speaker	With the modifications that have been proposed today to Buildings A, B, and C, will there also be changes to the number of units or the square footage?
Alex Fisch	Those adjustments to the project description are within the scope of the already identified environmental impacts. Those adjustments will inform the EIR analysis so long as Mr. Hosea and his team produce the documentation supporting those changes. The revised project will be analyzed in the EIR. Throughout this process, you will see adjustments to the project, including adjustments made in response to comments received. As long as the changes do not result in a new impact or enhance an

Speaker	Summary of Comment
	already identified impact, the changes would not necessitate additional public scoping.
Unidentified speaker	What is podium parking?
Alex Fisch	Podium parking is structured parking located beneath a building or outdoor plaza area. It is part of the foundation system for the building. It would also be located beneath outdoor plaza areas. When you walk around the Intrawest Village right now, you are actually standing on parking structures in several locations. It is partially below grade and predominately above grade, but below buildings.
Unidentified speaker	The IS states that some buildings would be 10 stories and then podium parking could add up to 14 feet to that. So some of it has to be above ground, how else would it add 14 feet?
Alex Fisch	It is partially above grade. The metrics that we use to address height is something that the County and applicant are still working through. The County has processes in place for how we determine height. The applicant has proposed a variation to that as part of their project description. We are still discussing with the applicant the best way to define building height so that it can be a commonly understood development aspect of the project.
Unidentified speaker	A physical model of the project, similar to the one that was done for the 1960 Olympics and also for the Village, would give us a better idea about this podium height.
Alex Fish	What you are referencing is a 3-dimentional touchable model replica reduced scale of the project. Chevis and the County have discussed this and Supervisor Montgomery has brought it up. It is my understanding that Chevis is planning on having an architectural model prepared. The County encourages this to be prepared in the near-term, as soon as possible. We have been waiting for the project description to settle down a little bit because it has been going through an evolution in its concept. We are always cautious about putting out information prematurely, but at this point the project is relatively fixed. And we would encourage the applicant to prepare that. There will be a virtual model that will be utilized to produce the photographic simulations of the project that will inform the EIR.
Unidentified speaker	Can the physical model include areas that are not a part of the project, like the Red Wolf Lodge? The Red Wolf Lodge is a 2-story building with 2 giant building proposed next to it. Or the Squaw Valley Lodge?
Alex Fisch	In my role as a project manager for the County, there are some application materials that I can clearly require and some that I cannot. This is an in-between area. It has been requested and to my understanding it is being produced.
Debbie Dutton, Onsite Manager of Squaw Peak Condos	Is there a possibility of placing an overflow parking structure by the church past the Squaw Valley Lodge? There is a loop there with all those trees. Is that a possibility in a future phase?
Alex Fisch	Future phases are conceptual right now. The County has asked if any parking is anticipated back there. Our understanding at this time is that there could be surface parking, but no structured parking, as part of a future project phase.
Unidentified speaker	Will you have a 3-D model? When?

Speaker	Summary of Comment
Chevis Hosea	Yes, probably in 3 to 4 months.

Close of the NOP scoping meeting