I hope to read a whole array of alternatives!

Potential Permits and Approvals Requested:

§ 4: My evaluation of the current Specific Plan is that it is inadequate and should never have been released in its present form. So I hope that it gets improved before if and when it makes it to the BOS. Appendix B in particular is a disaster as far as providing mandatory procedures for any actual development that might occur. As it now stands, the Specific Plan does not follow all of the direction given in the State of California document titled "The Planner's Guide to Specific Plans".

It would be good to know and publicize any hearings that are required for any one of the requested permits. Likewise for the Specific Plan itself and the re-zoning that it requests.

3/14/14

To: Placer County, Planning Services Division
Attention: Maywan Krach
From: Sally Brew, Squaw Valley Resident

Following are comments to be considered in the Revised NOP for the proposed Village at Squaw Valley:

Water: Although the supply of the water needed will not be clearly identified until the WSA study is completed, one use of water is not identified in the specific plan. That is the water needed for the Mountain Adventure Camp. The Specific Plan states that there will be many wet uses for recreation within the MAC. For instance, stated in the Specific Plan, the MAC will potentially include action river, water skiing, water slides, water falls, and a wave pool. The MAC is one of the largest features of the Village plan. The amount of space, energy, water needed should be stated in the draft EIR especially for such a major building proposed in the Village.

Pedestrian Corridors and Plazas: An important aspect of the proposed Village plan are plazas and walk ways. The draft EIR should ensure that ample walkways, corridors, plazas, and open spaces do exist. From the current plan, the buildings seem to tower over any open space.

Employee housing: Although employee housing will be provided in the east parcel for 250 employees, if the Village is fully built out, the proposed housing will not be adequate. No mention is made in the Specific Plan of how future housing needs of employees will be met.

Parks and recreation: The developer proposes to have multiple recreation amenities and attractions built into the Village environment. Such amenities would include play grounds, ice skating on central ice rink and ice trails, swim and fitness center. Included in the draft EIR should be specifics of where these amenities will be placed, potential impacts on the environment, and resources needed to provide.

Visual Impact; Throughout the Specific Plan is stated the importance of the mountain environment. The draft EIR should have evidence of how the mountain views are sustained in the Village…and not blocked. The Specific Plan states that the Village is anchored to the mountain environment through a "diversity of architectural expression, cohesive integration of lodging and new amenities with the mountain." The Specific Plan states there will be established a "robust open space network." Much is said about the mountain vistas, but the proposed plan must include ample open space to see the surrounding mountain vistas.

Sally Brew

RECEIVED
MAR 17 2014
ENVIRONMENTAL COORDINATION SERVICES

629 Benvenue Ave
Los Altos CA 94024

Maywan Krach

From: Steve Bridges <steve96158@excite.com>
Sent: Wednesday, March 12, 2014 1 54 PM
To: Placer County Environmental Coordination Services
Subject: Input from Citizen - Notice of Preparation, Squaw Valley Specific Plan

March 12, 2014

Maywan Krach, Community Development Technician
Placer County Planning Dept.
3091 County Center Drive, Suite 190
Auburn, CA 95603

Dear Placer County Planning Department,

It is my understanding you plan to review and possibly make changes to the Squaw Valley Specific Plan in considering the addition of some 1,700 bedrooms and an amusement park (water park) at Squaw Valley.

I have several concerns:

1. Long range drinking water supply. Are adequate drinking and irrigation water supplies available, guaranteed, and in place prior to approval for something like this?

2. Traffic congestion. Highway 89, especially during weekend, holiday, peak, and seasonal periods is already beyond reasonable capacity, generating unwanted and unnecessary air pollution and motorist frustration. How would these proposed developments affect existing overcrowded traffic conditions?

3. Night light pollution. One of the benefits and joys of Lake Tahoe and its surroundings is the absence of urban light pollution, enabling residents and visitors to enjoy the stars in a perspective that cannot be found in most places elsewhere in California. Let's not ruin or adversely affect a good thing with enjoying night views and unimpeded enjoyment of the stars.

4. Natural, mountainous views. The fantastic natural views in the Lake Tahoe region are legendary. Let's keep them legendary, not wreck or adversely impair them by replacing these outstanding vistas with buildings and views of buildings.

5. Impact on other infrastructure, including utilities and sewer treatment capacity. Who will pay for the cost of necessary upgrades to the area's infrastructure, including utilities and sewage treatment. Will additional sewage loads run a higher risk of unwanted and hazardous sewage spills, especially near Lake Tahoe? Will increased utility load affect existing utility capacities, reliability, safety, and rates?

Thank you.

Steve Bridges
P.O. Box 7022
Tahoe Valley, CA 96158

Thank you,

Maywan Krach

From: Paul Butterweich <pibutter@yahoo.com>
Sent: Sunday, March 23, 2014 11:01 PM
To: Placer County Environmental Coordination Services
Subject: Squaw development

Here are a few issues that I feel need to be addressed before any project at Squaw Valley is approved:
-With the current "village" rarely at anywhere close to maximum capacity, and more often than not mostly vacant, why are new hotel rooms needed? Who will fill these rooms, considering skier numbers nationwide, as well as Lake Tahoe visitation, have been relatively stagnant for decades despite numerous attempts both here and elsewhere to draw more people in while at the same time pricing most of them out?
-What effects will this have on the local North Lake Tahoe and Truckee economy, both in terms of effects on business as well as the addition of more seasonal jobs, thus more people trying to survive in Tahoe without ample work to support themselves?
-What will be the effects of construction lasting until the year 2040? Who will see this project through, keeping in mind that KSL has made no secret of their intent to one day sell out?
-How will the people that live, work and play in the area continue to enjoy this spectacular valley if views are blocked, parking eliminated, roads congested, and businesses not affiliated with KSL negatively impacted?
-Where will the water come from and where will it go?

Maywan Krach

From: Elizabeth Burch <elizabeth.burch@sonoma.edu>
Sent: Tuesday, March 11, 2014 7:05 PM
To: Placer County Environmental Coordination Services
Subject: KSL Capitol Partners NOP

Hello,
As a regular and long term tourist to the beautiful Sierras, I would like to say I am against this development. It sounds totally inappropriate for the Tahoe area.
I'm very concerned about this project for a whole host of reasons.
I do expect to see reference in the EIR to water use sustainability, traffic congestion, air quality, lights, noise and most importantly the preservation of aesthetic and natural beauty and charm that I associate with the Sierras.
Please limit unnecessary development. I don't visit your county for the development. I visit to get away from development.
Thank you,
Dr. E. Burch

Elizabeth Burch, Ph. D.
Chair & Internship Coordinator
Dept. of Com Studies, SSU

Typos courtesy of iPhone.

Spring 2014 office hours:
Tues: 12:15-2:30; Thurs: 1:15-2:45
Documents can be left at N-328

For help contact Coms office: N-330
(707) 664-2149
Testerb@sonoma.edu

For internship or dept. info see:
Www.sonoma.edu/communications

Maywan Krach

From: David Butze <dmbutze@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, March 11, 2014 3:02 PM
To: Placer County Environmental Coordination Services
Cc: dmbutze@gmail.com
Subject: Squaw NOP

Placer County, Planning Services Division
Attention: Maywan Krach, Community Development Technician
3091 County Center Drive Suite 190
Auburn, CA 95603

Mr. Krach,

I am writing as a concerned party in the development of Squaw Valley and the recent Notice of Preparation. I have a home on 1743 Christy Lane in Olympic Valley.
My areas of concern which should be included in the EIR are:

Adequate drinking water is important to all of us. Please include a comprehensive water supply assessment that takes into account long-term availability of water supplies.

Traffic is a growing concern. Please provide clear numbers on how much traffic more than 1,700 new bedrooms — and an indoor amusement park with 300,000 annual visitors — would add to Highway 89.

No one wants to lower the quality of Squaw's legendary terrain. The EIR should consider, in cultural terms, what this development would do to "The Soul of Skiing."

We all enjoy the tremendous sky at night and our children are in awe at the celestial brilliance. The EIR should calculate cumulative increases in light pollution and how it would impact the night sky.

The High Sierra view should include mountains instead of buildings. The EIR must analyze the impacts of the proposed project and its multiple 108-feet tall buildings on scenic vistas in Squaw.

Thanks in advance. I look forward to a comprehensive EIR.

David M. Butze

Village at Squaw Valley Specific Plan Project NOP Scoping Comment

Michael Carabetta
1560 Squaw Valley Road, Unit 2
Olympic Valley, Ca 96146-3531

As abutters to Squaw Valley Road, we have major concerns relative to traffic, pedestrian and vehicle safety, construction noise, air quality, impacts on Squaw Valley Road due to parking overflows as well as Village snow removal given the reduction in storage space for storm snows.

Traffic and Pedestrian Safety

Over the years the use of the "three lane road" configuration that is allowed on busy ski days has becoming an increasing dangerous situation. In the past, when this configuration was implemented, the previous Corporation posted traffic people at each intersection in order for traffic to exit local roads and/or to enable walkers to cross the street. For some reason KSL have either reduced this staff or in some cases eliminate these "crossing guards".

Further, the speeds of cars exiting the Village have increased dramatically over the years – including the days where the "three lane" configuration is deployed.

Actions Required:

It should be a requirement that whenever the "three lane" configuration is used "crossing guards" at every local road intersection be mandatory (including the entrance/exit to the Post Office).

Proper safety training and monitoring of these guards should be required (not random workers as is now the case).

A local shuttle by KSL for skiers and walkers should be re-instituted and made mandatory (both directions). Currently the shuttles between Squaw and Alpine do not stop to allow drop offs or pickups on Squaw Valley Road.

KSL should be required to plow the bike path to facilitate walking to the Village (reducing traffic at same time). This will become increasing more important when KSL moves "employee housing" to the lower valley and its "non vehicle" employees become more reliant on the path.

Several solar-powered, radar speed signs should be installed on Squaw Valley Road (both directions) to insure that the current speed limits are complied with.

As noted in the previous KSL plan, the bike path should be extended into the Village.

Construction Noise and Air Quality

When Phase One of the Villiage was being built, large construction trucks were using Squaw Valley Road very early practically every morning (sometimes as early as 6AM). Not only was noise a factor, but the dust created by these trucks was unbareable for the houses abutting Squaw Valley Road.

Further the KSL plan specifically states:

Construction noise levels could potentially exceed the daytime hourly and maximum standard of 55 and 70 A-weighted sound levels (dBA), respectively, and/or the nighttime performance standards defined by the Placer County Code.

Further.....

The project long-term operations could result in the exposure of people to long term operational noise levels and additional noise levels may exceed the applicable County noise standards.

Actions Required:

Construction Trucks, including building material deliveries, should be prevented from using Squaw Valley Road before 8 am and after 4 pm. No construction or construction delivery vehicles should be allowed on weekends and holidays.

A temporary parking lot should be built for construction workers in the lower valley (where employee housing will go) and a shuttle provided by KSL. A "No Parking" ban for construction workers in the Village should be enforced by KSL.

Every effort to reduce dust on Squaw Valley Road and Village parking lots should be taken including mandatory daily sweeping on the road and parking lots at the end of each day.

The County should not permit the construction noise levels to exceed the daytime and night time performance standards as defined by the Placer County Code.

The County should not permit long term operational noise levels that exceed the applicable County noise levels.

A phone number should be posted (by KSL and/or the County) to call - should these traffic, dust control and parking restrictions be violated. Fines should be vigorously enforced by the County.

Parking Overflows

On peak ski days (and often days when the "three lane" configuration is used) and the parking lots are filled, cars are allowed to park on the sides of Squaw Valley Road. This is a very dangeous situation – particularly for walkers. The frequency of "overflow parking" on Squaw Valley Road will increase as the day parking lots are reduced.

Action Required:

No parking signs should be posted on both sides of Squaw Valley Road from the Church (Queen of the Snows) to the entrance to the Village Parking Lot (across from Christy Hill Road). Parking fines and towing should be enforced.

The right shoulder of Squaw Valley Road where the brook crosses under the road (opposite Valley View Condos) should be widened to facilitate pedestrians. When the "three lane" configuration is deployed, the current right hand road shoulder is completely taken up by cars (heacing up the road toward the Village) and there is no room for pedestrians.

Future Snow Removal

Currently large construction trucks are used by KSL to transport "overflow" snow from the Village to the lower valley. These trucks are used throughout the night. They are quite large and the road noise is unbareable. As the new development is built, most of the current "on-Village" snow storage will be eliminated and increased use of Squaw Valley Road by these trucks is feared.

As noted in the KSL plan....

Snow storage bunkers may also be constructed within the podiums of new buildings to store snow until it can be moved to another location.

Action Required:

Adequate snow storage space for snow that is removed from the proposed parking lots and roads within the Village should be required and adequate space allocated during the review phase of this plan.

Trucks using Squaw Valley Road for "overflow" snow removal from the Village should be eliminated.

Squaw Valley Road Abutters

The KSL plan is calling for a 15-25 year construction time period. This is going to be an enormous hardship - particularly for Squaw Valley Road abutters. Abutters will not be able to open their windows in the spring, summer and fall during peak construction periods due to construction noise, increased traffic and air pollution (dust). Most abutters do not have air condtioning.

Action Required:

KSL should be required to provide Squaw Valley Road abutters with compensation in the form of free or reduced-cost season passes, daily ski and tram tickets, free use of water/pool facilities, skating, health and gym facilities during the construction period.

Date: March 24, 2014
To: Placer County Planning Services Division
3091 County Center Drive Suite 190
Auburn, CA 95603
Attn: Maywan Krach, Community Development Technician
RE: Notice of Preparation, Specific Plan, Village at Squaw Valley

The purpose of this letter is:

1. To suggest that Squaw Valley is, as per the terms of the 1983 SVGPLUO and 1983 SVGP Final Environmental Impact Report, currently at its maximum peak and year around population.
2. To object to the numerous amendments to the 1983 Squaw Valley General Plan that will be necessary for approval of the Specific Plan.
3. To object to the use of a Specific Plan process when it clearly states in the 1983 SVGPLUO that Specific Plans are not acceptable.

The 1983 Squaw Valley General Plan and Land Use Ordinance document was prepared by Placer County along with the help of a few select local residents, for the purpose of establishing a plan for growth in the Valley that would create a healthy ski area resort without adversely impacting the environment, the dramatic views and the residential community. Although the 'Plan' was generous with upper limits of development, both the 1983 SVGPLUO and the 1983 GP Final Environmental Impact Report clearly states that the projected 100% build-out was unlikely, due to a variety of potential impacts and concerns.

With few exceptions, the 'Plan' is still meaningful today. Yet, KSL has been allowed to present a plan that attempts to capitalize on the upper limits of development without any concern for the impacts on the Valley or the Ski Hill. **Not only that, the County has allowed KSL to present their proposal in the form of a Specific Plan when it clearly states in the 1983 SVGPLUO, on page 56, "Areas which were previously within a Development Reserve Zone District, which required Specific Plans or Rezoning (even if the project was consistent with the 1972 General Plan), have now been placed in districts which will eliminate the Specific Plan Process."**

The State of California's Planners Guide to Specific Plans states that, "a Specific Plan should implement general plans without substantial legal challenge to the nature of their use, and must be consistent with the adopted general plan (community plan) of the jurisdiction within which it is located."

If the KSL proposal is approved, how many amendments will be necessary for it to be consistent with the 1983 Squaw Valley General Plan and Land Use Ordinance?

The 1983 Squaw Valley General Plan and Land Use Ordinance:

On page 5, "allows growth in Squaw Valley to reach a seasonal-peak, overnight residential population of about 11-12,000".

On page 7, says: "In an ecologically sensitive area such as Squaw Valley, development beyond a certain capacity will damage the recreational and living experience of current and future users."

On page 25, the plan goes on to say: "**The quantity of housing units must be balances between the ski hill capacity, year around destination resort demands (including employees), and the permanent population.** At the same time the number of housing units must not exceed the ability of the environment and public facility infrastructure to accommodate the peak population. For the reasons stated earlier, the Plan does not attempt to allow for 100% of the living units necessary to support the potential day-time population of the Valley."

On page 5, it says: "maximum skier capacity would be 17,500 people per day." However, the Squaw Valley Ski Corp, on page 28, indicates an existing daily ski capacity of 15,000 skiers."

On page 36, it says: "One basic assumption of this Plan update is that no additional routes into the Valley will be constructed"

On page 41, it says: "Improved roadway connections shall not be allowed on the southeasterly side of the meadow between the Glenborough (Squaw Creek) property and the 'core' area."

On page 38, "Assuming that present types of development continue and that the Squaw Valley Road/State Highway intersection is signalized, the level of service during peak hours will fall below an acceptable "C" level before even half of presently allowable development has occurred." Build-out of either of the following would result in undesirable levels of service:

a. Approximately 1700 additional occupied residential units, **or**
b. Approximately 500,000 square feet of additional commercial gross floor area.

The 1983 SVGP Final Environmental Impact Report, on page 103, states that "there are presently 400 occupied residential units in Squaw Valley." Adding the 400 existing units to 1700 additional units brings the allowable total occupied units in the Valley to 2100. There are approximately 2050 units in the Valley today.

The 1983 Squaw Valley General Plan Final Environmental Impact Report:

On page 106, says, "Build-out of 80% of the General Plan density is assumed for residential uses. Although very large areas (80+/- acres) are designated for commercial use, the maximum likely build-out is assumed to be 350,000 square feet of gross floor area (approximately 30 acres of land). Ski area build-out is assumed to be 100% of that allowed in the General Plan).

On page 114, says: "the General Plan emphasizes and encourages the 'destination resort' concept which theoretically, could reduce projected traffic. However, the 'destination resort' management techniques suggested applies only to visitors accommodations, not to ski hill operations."

Note: In past years, there were days when the ski hill population reached about 18,000 people per day. The ski hill can handle a large number of people from time to time, but the adverse effects from those big days were:

- long lifts lines
- long wait times for services
- unsafe skier conditions on the hill
- Hours' of stop and go traffic congestion going in and out of the valley.

In recent years, the maximum skier capacity appears to have stabilized at around 14,000 skiers. There are a number of reasons for this, including the high cost of skiing and the competition from other ski areas in the Truckee and North Tahoe region.

To calculate the peak population, I have estimated 5.0 people per unit. However, I believe this is underestimating the probable existing peak overnight population. The trend in the residential community in recent years has been to either remodel existing homes, increasing their size and bedroom capacity or to tear down existing homes and replace them with large new homes with a bedroom capacity in excess of 5 bedrooms per unit. Many of the condominiums have also been remodeled, focusing on adding areas, lofts etc., that would allow for more bedroom capacity. Also:

- **The 1983 SVGPLUO states, "It has been found by the County that the total number of bedrooms in a project is a more accurate determinant of potential impacts on public services and resources than are dwelling units due to the wide variations in size of a single dwelling unit. For the purpose of calculating the number of bedrooms in a project, rooms which potentially serve as bedrooms shall be counted as such (including dens, studies, libraries, lofts, etc.)."**

As per the 1983 SVGPLUO, 'In 1972, the peak residential population in the Valley was estimated at 2800, and the ski hill peak capacity was 7,500 skiers.' Assuming about 60%, or 1680, of the resident population were skiers, then 80% of the ski hill capacity, or 6000, was used by day skiers. The resulting skier population was 7680.

In 1983, there were approximately 1200 units in the Valley and at 5.0 people per unit, the estimated peak resident population was 6000 people, and the ski hill peak capacity was 15,000 skiers. Assuming about 60%, or 3600, of the resident population were skiers, and 80% of the ski hill capacity, or 12,000, was used by day skiers. The resulting skier population was 15,600.

In 2014, there are approximately 2050 units in the Valley, at 5.0 people per unit the current peak residential population is estimated at 10,250, and the ski hill peak capacity is 15,000 skiers. Assuming about 60%, or 6150, of the resident population are skiers, and about 80% of the ski hill capacity, or 12,000, is used by day skiers, the resulting skier population is 18,150.

On page 1-2, The Village at Squaw Valley Specific Plan, January 2014, it states: "Ultimately, the SVGPLUO allows for growth that reaches a seasonal peak of an overnight population of 11,000 to 12,000 people, and a maximum skier capacity of 17,500 persons per day within the Valley. The ultimate build-out of this Specific Plan is consistent with this future growth level anticipated in the SVGPLUO.

Apparently, KSL has only read what suited their plans. The 1983 SVGPLUO does not attempt to allow 100% build-out, and the 1983 SVGPFEIR considers 80% of build-out more likely, which would be a maximum peak population of 9600 people. It's important to note here that **KSL is proposing to increase the year-around, not seasonal peak, population of the Valley**. Their plan, if approved, would increase today's residential units by 771, bringing the total units in the valley to approximately 2821. Their plan, if approved, proposes to increase the number of bedrooms in the Valley by 1757, assuming there are no studies, family rooms, libraries, playrooms or lofts, and there are no bunk beds in any of the bedrooms. Their plan, if approved, proposes 2.28 bedrooms per unit, which equates to 4.5 people per unit. At 4.5 people per unit times 771 new units, the **year around** population in the Valley would increase by 3,470 people.

- Adding the 3,470 people to the estimated 10,250 current peak resident population would increase the peak resident population to 13,720 people.

If the peak residential population is 13,720 people, and the ski hill peak capacity is 15,000 skiers, and assuming about 60%, or 8232, of the peak residential population are skiers, and 80% of the ski hill capacity, or 12,000, is used by day skiers, the ski hill is unacceptably overcrowded at 20,232 skiers.

The 1983 SVGPLUO says: "Squaw Valley is located within easy driving distance of 7 million potential skiers in the Northern California and Reno areas. It is located within a short distance of nearly a dozen other ski areas and only 6 miles from Lake Tahoe. With all of the other attractions so close, it is not reasonable to expect all visitors to use commercial and overnight accommodations exclusively within Squaw Valley. Because of this and the continuing large number of day skiers, the demand for hotel-motel units and other types of visitor accommodations in the Valley is not easily determined."

The day skier percentages were set at 80% for 1972 and were reasonably accurate in 1983. Judging from current information, the 80% is also accurate for 2014. There is no reason to think this will change. Since the adoption of the 1983 SVGPLUO, there has been significant development outside Squaw Valley. The residential population of Truckee and Northstar has grown substantially and there have been many new homes built around the North and West shores of Lake Tahoe and Incline Village. If we add to that the incredible growth in the Reno/Sparks area over the past 30 years, it is safe to assume that there will continue to be a large day skier demand, probably 80% of the ski hill capacity, in Squaw Valley.

Note: There are other areas of potential growth in the Valley that have not been included in the calculations above, such as

- Undeveloped parcels that are currently zoned for development will eventually be developed
- Undeveloped lots in the existing subdivisions that will eventually be built on
- Approved phases of large developments that have not yet been acted upon

The year around and peak population today looks and feels appropriate for the size of Squaw Valley. Placer County's first priority should be the well-being of the Valley residents and the preservation of the Valley environment. KSL will seek their entitlements, build and/or sell the 'project' and move on. Their needs are not and should not be prioritized over the needs of the residents. Placer County should not consider sacrificing any part of Squaw Valley for the potential revenue a large development like this could provide. It's their job is to protect Squaw Valley against overcrowding, not just for the residents and the visitors, but also for the delicate and beautiful place it is and should remain.

Thank you,

Judy Carini
Resident, Squaw Valley

Date: March 17, 2014
To: Placer County Planning Services Division
3091 County Center Drive Suite 190
Auburn, CA 95603
Attn: Maywan Krach, Community Development Technician
RE: NOP, Specific Plan, Village at Squaw Valley

I am a 43 year resident of Squaw Valley, and have lived on the Squaw Valley Main Road for 35 years. I have seen many changes in the Valley, from the condo craze of the 70's and 80's to the Resort at Squaw Creek and the existing Village at Squaw Valley. With all that development, a few things come to mind about our special community and our ski area.

A number of projects throughout the valley with a 2nd phase or more stalled, and the added phases were never built. A couple of examples are the Resort at Squaw Creek, the Red Wolf Lodge and Squaw Ridge. A more recent example is the Intrawest two remaining phases that may be replaced by whatever KSL proposes. Why did this happen? My thought is because the units did not sell easily, and their rental potential is seasonal.

This valley is a great place with a great ski area. It attracts many people living within a few hours' drive who have no desire to own or stay in a condo. This is a skier's mountain. When there is snow it's one of the best ski areas in the west, maybe the entire US. I have noticed that the valley is very crowded for about 20 to 25 days a year, so rentals are probably full or close to full on those days, but the remainder of the year is less busy and less crowded.

If the KSL proposed village is approved, it will not only displace all the day skiers that keep this ski area alive, but will also turn the Valley into a ghost town during the slower months, creating an unwelcome and uncomfortable environment for both the residents and visitors. The "off season" can last for 8 months out of a year, depending on the snow and the ski season. This year the "off season" will probably last for over 9 months.

KSL should consider all this before going ahead with their plan. Their proposal is still too massive for our community. With Lake Tahoe, Truckee and now Northstar, the proposed development in Homewood and the plans for development in Tahoe City. Squaw will never be the destination resort they are planning for. Their proposed waterpark may be good for 3 years, but then it will just become a maintenance and financial burden. And, the area it consumed is far more valuable as a parking lot.

Remember Blyth Arena. Ski Corp tore it down because the land was more valuable to them for parking.

Alex Cushing ran a good ski area but someome of his development ideas were not that successful, like High Camp. KSL should learn from him and realize that when they bought into Squaw Valley, they bought into the business of running a ski area. If they can't run a good ski area, their development business will not succeed.

Thank You,

William Carini
Resident, Squaw Valley
Retired 25 year Volunteer, Squaw Valley Fire Department

Cc: Placer County Board of Supervisors
Squaw Valley Municipal Advisory Committee

March 10, 2014

RECEIVED
MAR 19 2014
PLANNING DEPT.

My Comment

It was not so long ago that the nearby city of Reno Nevada lost it's gift of looking up into the night sky to see the beauty of our constellations. This is a gift for future generations, not ours alone. Please don't take that away with overdevelopement in Squaw Valley, a valley many nearby city-peoples come to in order to get a release from their city life and to enjoy nature. Please don't turn it into a mini-city so that developers can enjoy a high-high profit on their investment.

- Secondly -

It is 2014,. How much longer must we wait before acting responsibly on building on top of an aquifer. Please encourage the developers to at least build on the peramiter. In this way we will not only give our aquifer a chance... but also maintain the wonderful veiw →

corridor → all people enjoy.

Thankyou,

Liz Day
Box 2151
Olympic Valley CA.
96146
ph.# 530-583-1510

Maywan Krach

From: Kevin Dielissen <kdielissen@empirera.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 22, 2014 9:44 AM
To: Placer County Environmental Coordination Services
Subject: Squaw Valley's revised plan

Dear Placer County Planning,

I have gone to Base Camp and reviewed Squaw Valley's revised plan and also attended a presentation on the subject. I'm in favor of this plan and think it will be good for Squaw Valley and the North Lake Tahoe region. It will bring more employment, help traffic, improve housing and transportation and over all will be very good for both Squaw Valley and the surrounding communities in both Placer and Nevada counties.

I encourage you to approve this plan. I have been a Squaw Valley skier for over 40 years and I own a home in Truckee. I have been working part time at Squaw Valley for the last 7 years and have seen many good improvements in every department and I believe that this modified plan will help Squaw Valley become what it has been struggling to become for many years. The plan makes more sense than the original plan submitted, which I was not in favor of.

Thank you,

Kevin Dielissen

Kevin Dielissen, "The Neighborhood Expert" | BRE #00772759 | (925) 963-7681
Kevin@FindDublinHomes.com | www.FindDublinHomes.com

Maywan Krach

From: John Eckhouse <john@eckhouse.com>
Sent: Sunday, March 23, 2014 4:53 PM
To: Placer County Environmental Coordination Services
Subject: Proposed Squaw Valley Specifc Plan

Placer County, Planning Services Division

Attention: Maywan Krach, Community Development Technician

3091 County Center Drive Suite 190

Auburn, CA 95603

Dear Maywan Krach:

I am writing to comment on KSL Capital Partners' proposal to build a major development in Squaw Valley.

While I am pleased that the overall project development has been reduced by approximately one-third since the October 2012 NOP was released, I still feel this project is too large and will have too many negative impacts. Among them:

- The supply of adequate drinking water given repeated droughts in California.
- Traffic that more than 1,700 new bedroomswould add to Highway 89.
- The impacts of the proposed project and its tall buildings on scenic vistas in Squaw Valley.

As a condo owner in Northstar for more than 20 years, I know the positives and negatives of expansion. I think this proposal has too many negatives.

Sincerely,

John Eckhouse

Maywan Krach

From: Roy Farrow <rfarrow2@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, February 21, 2014 3:11 PM
To: Placer County Environmental Coordination Services
Subject: Squaw Village Expansion

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

We are 100% in favor

Be as honest as you can in a world where it is going out of style. Raymond Chandler

Maywan Krach

From: Renaud Gignoux / CSA <csa01@jps.net>
Sent: Monday, March 24, 2014 12:18 PM
To: Placer County Environmental Coordination Services
Subject: Comments regarding KSL Squaw village expantion

Attention: Placer County Planing services Division
Maywan Krach

As a home owner and resident of Squaw Valley (I live on Lanny Lane above the Post Office) I am very concerned by the noise generated by KSL: VERY loud Papoose music, announcements and special events, etc. and worry about future noise when the village will be over twice the present size.

I already expressed my concern to Placer County during the Wanderlust Festival and the music concerts going on way past 10:00, in fact until after midnight. Also, this past week during the National Races the loud speaker announcement were a real nuisance to me, and in some cases, against county ordinances.

Therefore I ask you to follow the ordinances and show more consideration for the local residents. Life in the Valley is becoming "Party Town" and is definitely not one would expect from a mountain village. Please keep me informed of what will be done by the county and KSL in this department.

Thank you,

Renaud Gignoux

Maywan Krach

From: hguaraglia@aol.com
Sent: Monday, March 24, 2014 8:56 AM
To: Placer County Environmental Coordination Services
Subject: Squaw Valley

As homeowners in Squaw Valley since 1984 we have seen many changes - most of them were improvements, some were failures. We would like you to consider some of our concerns regarding the KSL Capital Partners' proposal for future widespread construction.
Our foremost concerns are: An adequate supply of potable water, as witnessed the past two winters our water supply can vary drastically.
The increase of traffic due to, but not limited to, the constant flow of heavy duty vehicles, equipment and materials necessary for this type of massive construction that KSL claims to be a 15 – 20 year build out.
The traffic increase of 1700 new bedrooms, once completed, that KSL wishes to fill daily, and the daily ingress and egress of visitors to the proposed indoor/ outdoor recreational facility.
This proposal appears to be a metropolitanesque use of our outdoors for their private profit not taking into consideration that we use the outdoors for skiing, hiking and biking and have paid our property taxes to protect this interest.
We are registered voters in Placer County and request your help to minimize this impact.
Sincerely,
Raymond and Hazel Guaraglia

Maywan Krach

From: Elizabeth Hale <ehcelestine@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, March 21, 2014 11:30 AM
To: Placer County Environmental Coordination Services
Subject: Squaw Valley

The proposed building in Squaw Valley would create numerous huge undesirable impacts: huge problems re Water supply, Squaw Creek's already substandard conditions, traffic tie ups, a demise in our mountain serenity with so many more visitors, views of buildings not nature, parking shortages for day skiers, these are a few. Keep Disneyland in Southern California please.

Sent from my iPad

Maywan Krach

From: Andrew Hays <squawllyhood@yahoo.com>
Sent: Sunday, March 23, 2014 11:26 PM
To: Placer County Environmental Coordination Services
Subject: Attn: Maywan Krach Squaw Valley development comments

Almost ten years ago I set off, searching for my first real home to call my own. There were no limitations, like generations before me, I set out West, free to settle myself where I found fit. As so many others have, I was captivated by the favorable weather, scenic splendor and rugged outdoors of Lake Tahoe and its surroundings. It is as such that I came to call Placer County home. It is also as such that I am filled with great alarm concerning the proposed development by KSL partners in Olympic Valley. I feel as if it threatens the very aesthetics and ideals that brought me to this enchanting place that I am proud to call home.

In the short period that I have resided here there have been dramatic changes in the ski resort landscape, including the vast development at Northstar and its subsequent acquisition by Vail. Combined with Vail's consolidation with Heavenly and Kirkwood, Squaw Valley's sale to KSL and its purchase of Alpine Meadows. Of course there is also the pending development in Homewood. With all this volatility, and rapid expansion, I question, are we moving too fast? Should we take a step back? Should we give a company with limited, er.., no ski resort development experience cart blanche to build their very own sand castle in the sky? How many amusement parks can one destination really sustain? To what extent does that really benefit the community at large?

Further giving me pause is the dismal snowfall of the previous three winter seasons. It stands as a reminder that all the development money in the world can't fix the weather, aside from snowmakirg, and alas Squaw Valley's capacity is inadequate. Despite all the glossy brochures, all the glowing sales pitches, a base development project will never draw people to the mountain. It can successfully *compliment* a mountain. Intelligent and responsible development can most certainly *compliment* the experience at Squaw Valley, but it will never be the purpose for it to exist. It will forever be a ski area in nature. The more development the more capital is required for operation. In a terrible ski season such as this, it is hard enough for the resorts to get by, but imagine the same season combined with the crushing debt of construction. Shinny new hotel rooms and condos are not going to convince people to come to a mountain with no snow. Hopefully next year brings a bountiful season but in this industry nothing can be taken for granted. I am not adequately convinced that an investment group who typically manages golf resorts in the desert fully grasps the extent of mountain weather instability.

Anyone who has ever visited Whistler Blacomb will tell you that their base development is done as well as can possibly be done. It is the gold standard by which all others attempt but fail to replicate. It is the finest example of ski resort development, and the village at Whistler went bankrupt. What does this really say about this strategy of development. There are obvious short term financial rewards, but are those rewards sustaining? Do they carryover to the local community? Does the real possibility exist that the local residents will be stuck with a development they never desired long after KSL has packed up and left town? If this is the result will the local economy be in better or worse shape than where it stands now?

As someone who is employed by a small family owned business on the North Shore I have grave concerns of development on this scale's effects on surrounding communities. I see clearly how a large investment group from Denver benefits here, but what about the local businesses? Are we not just creating a funnel diverting tourist dollars away from Placer County, and directly out of state? KSL takes every opportunity to point out that by increasing the on mountain lodging it will negatea large portion of any traffic concerns, as visitors will be parking their cars and staying directly on site. On the other hand they lay claim that local businesses won't be hurt as they predict an increase in visitors which will naturally frequent the surrounding communities. Which one is it though? Less traffic because they are all at the mountain, or more visitors to Tahoe City? Is it really in Squaw's best interest to build this enormous development and then have everyone go out to dinner in Tahoe City? The village at Whistler went bankrupt and it was the only game in town. In this scenario there are multiple mountains in close proximity to each other, in fact the whole point of visiting Lake Tahoe is the ability to ski multiple world class mountains, to just stay at Squaw or Northstar would really be to miss the point altogether.

I save my final concern for last perhaps because it just seems to be so obvious. The scale of this development is just too big. Had KSL come to the table as the new players in town and presented a reasonable and appropriate plan for expansion I would not automatically be opposed. This plan is so overreaching and misses the mark by so far I truly question the merits of the development team as a whole. An adventure center water park? I used to ski at a resort that built water slides for the summer time…Guess what? They don't have water slides anymore because it was a bad idea. Do they want to have an Adventure Center water park, or is it an entire company built on people from marketing backgrounds who want to *say* that they have an Adventure Center water park. Is this a theme of their whole operation? (as someone who lives here the answer is yes.) This is a small rural mountain community. Massive condominium complexes looming over the valley floor does not meet this criteria. In their revised plan they reduced the building height by an average of one story. Virtually anyone who lives here would agree these buildings are *a lot* too tall, not just a little. In fact, the project suffers from a great dearth of creativity. Working with such a beautiful and in the truest sense open slate, should net inspiring results, instead KSL just presents another tired redux of a twenty year old concept on mountain development. In this area land is our most valuable commodity and we should expect more out of our one opportunity to develop this for the future.

In a final note about building height it should be remembered that KSL provided a model for public viewing that in fact was constructed with a skewed scale to minimize the height of the buildings. Just think about that again for a second. They thought it was a good idea to build a purposely deceptive model. Is our future in safe hands? I have my own grave doubts. I would prefer in such a forum to be as diplomatic as possible however, as a service to those who reside at more a distance I must be blunt, the KSL management team does not know what they are doing. As someone who deals with their operation on a daily basis it must be said that every major decision they make misses the mark. They lack a clear picture of their market and continually waste resources on failed attempts of bad ideas. Being handed a large check is no substitute for genuine experience and knowhow Inexperience is clearly the factor here. If you had to have your appendix taken out would you voluntarily chose the doctor who was attempting his first procedure? Perhaps we should slow things down before we mortgage away our communities future on a reckless and short sighted development strategy.

Andrew Hays
8755 River Rd
Truckee, Ca 96161

Placer County Planning Department
Maywan Krach, Community Development Technician
3091 County Center Drive
Auburn, CA 95603
edraces@placer.ca.gov

March 24, 2014

Subject: additional comments to the revised NOP for the proposed Village at Squaw Valley development

Dear Maywan Krach,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the NOP for the proposed Village at Squaw Valley. As much as I have posted two prior comment letters to the original NOP, I wish to add the following concerns to this revised NOP such that proper EIR analysis can evaluate the impacts and alternatives to the proponent's Specific Plan January 2014 http://www.placer.ca.gov/departments/communitydevelopment/planning/villageatsquawvalleyspecificplan

I question the decision by Placer County not to issue a new Initial Study particularly regarding impact evaluation of Lot 4 which was not mentioned in the first IS/NOP. Yet this area will be heavily impacted and needs detailed analysis of not only these acres but also impacts to the immediate neighborhoods.

Ch 1.3 bullet 5 "In planning…an optimum balance…and inter-relationships of various segments of the Truckee-Squaw Valley and Tahoe area economics should be encouraged". Well, more than encouraged, this EIR should detail the economic impacts of this development proposal in the context of the local community as well as regional economy. What will be the impacts of proposed commercial development (not defined by this specific plan, but should be)?

Ch 3.2 Goal LU-2 sensitivity is warranted regarding "views of the mountains." This specific plan contains only one possible illustrative scenario as to what this development could look like. The EIR must produce built specific visualizations (story poles, 3-D simulations, photographic depictions) of what impacts the built out village will have on such views. Alternative simulations must be made available for proper assessment of this important impact.

Ch3.3, page 3-5 and figure 3.1 describe a request to change existing zoning of Forest Recreation and Conservation Preserve to V-HC (Village Heavy Commercial) to locate a mountain maintenance facility. This extremely sensitive area, adjacent to the creek and the start of Shirley Canyon) would be worrisomely impacted by noisy industrial operations involving hazardous waste and heavy machinery. Please let the EIR explore and find a better location for this highly impacting facility.

Ch 5 circulation and parking: 5.1 and 5.4 Far East Bridge is to be "preserved" (but apparently improved as it has been previously found deficient by County engineers in the past) and will be replaced in phase 2. That decrepit bridge has been the subject of much past concern to the County and the community. IntraWest proposed to replace it 10 years ago with their development phase 3&4 which, of course, was never built. Now SVRE is pushing this improvement back to phase 2 which may never be built. Yet it is the "first entryway" route to access most of the new village core and is a constraint on Squaw Creek functionality. Please explore the alternative of moving this warranted improvement of bridge replacement to phase 1.

Ch 5.2 Policy CP-6 discusses the Class 1 bike path. The current routing of the bike path west from the stables and north of the Meadows Condos does not meet the definition of a class 1 separated path, in fact, it terminates east of the Meadows complex. Further, Placer County DPW has challenges with snow storage at the roadside here given the nearness to the road. This plan suggests (5.3) routing the bike path north of the Meadows. A preferred alternative would be to route the path to the south of the Meadows condos to enter the village adjacent to and on the north side of Squaw Creek. This would be particularly attractive in the winter to avoid snow storage issues, increase safety of pedestrians and bicyclists, and improve the experience of users.

Ch 6 Public services and Utilities. Sections 6.1 and 6.2.1 discuss the possible creation of a new VSVSP water company. The economic, social, and scientific implications of this need detailed analysis. A third water company in the valley not only threatens existing users water supply but, worst case, could end up with adjudication. Being in our 3rd drought year with limited water recharge, having a corporation controlling and pumping its own water from a sole source aquifer, and envisioning conflicts of interest as to pumping priorities (my hot tub or their snowmaking, my lawn or the golf course, our creek or their water park), one can quickly see legal arguments and the specter of adjudication as discussed in the 2007 State Water Board hearings on Squaw Creek. The formation of such an independent, apart from community, water company needs complete justification and extensive impact analysis.

Ch 6.1 Policy PU-3 describes an unacceptable impact on expected well pumping that "does not substantially diminish flows in Squaw Creek". In 2007, the SWB expressed concern of already diminished flows in Squaw Creek. Such existing conditions cannot be made worse. The EIR must look for alternatives that achieve the goals of the TMDL, the State and Lahontan Water Boards, and local community expectations.

Ch 6.8 Parks and Recreation. An additional concern is getting employees from Lot 4 East Parcel to the Village. A class 2 bike lane is planned. Fig 6.7 shows main road crossing mid-road, directly across from the fire station. This would be extremely dangerous and nearly impossible for pedestrians and bicyclists without a stoplight. Consideration of exiting the western-most aspect of planned parking lot would minimize main road exposure and get users nearer Squaw Creek Road and have this be the crossing intersection. A roundabout or a flashing light system should be considered here for safety of bicyclists and pedestrians. Also, consideration of a class 1 separated path should be evaluated along the frontage of this parcel. (I understand this is a requirement of Placer County DPW or Planning for development along the main road.)

Ch. 6.8 Previous promises by the developer have identified a trail to run along the south side of Squaw Creek along the new East Parcel. This should be documented in this Specific Plan and studied as part of the EIR.

Ch 6.8 Please identify what and where are the "World Cup Trail" and the "Thunder Mountain Trail".

Ch 7.3 The Squaw Valley General Plan clearly calls for a 200 foot corridor (100 feet from centerline) along Squaw Creek. This plan calls for 150 to 200 feet width. Please explore alternatives that will not conflict with the existing rules for these setbacks.

Ch 7.4 Biological Resources: Yellow legged frogs have been seen in upper Shirley Canyon and the headwaters of the north fork of Squaw Creek. Please address this potential endangered species in the setting of this development, particularly as it encroaches on Shirley Canyon.

Ch. 1.3 and others: A general concern about increased population as a result of this proposal: SVGP&LUO limits the overnight population in Squaw to 11,000 to 12,000 people (and maximum skier capacity to 17,000). The SVPSD estimates it serves 25,000 customers in its MDD (maximum daily demand). This plan calls for an additional 1493 bedrooms, plus 264 bedrooms in the East Parcel, for a total of 1757. What is the multiplier for a count of the actual number of people? The Mountain Adventure Center is hoping for 300,000 visitors per year or almost 1000 people per day (verbal communication from Chevis Hosea SVRE). An accurate population number needs to be clarified in the EIR to help understand the capacity of the Squaw Valley community.

Further to this point is the concern of wildland fires. We are a cul-de-sac valley with limited egress and are located in a fire hazard area. With this population growth combined with concerns of climate change, the EIR should analyze our wildland urban interface and explore how to minimize risk.

Appendix B is worrisomely non-specific and I look forward to robust public discussions with the SV Design Review Committee and Placer County and the applicant to develop guidelines that will set the parameters for a successful village.

Please incorporate by reference my complete agreement with comments made by Sierra Watch and the Friends of West Shore (attached).

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this proposal.

Respectfully,

Ed Heneveld

Ed Heneveld
589 Forest Glen Road
PO Box 2488
Olympic Valley, CA 96146

March 21, 2014

Public Comments on Notice of Preparation, Squaw Valley Development plan

I would like to address many important issues and ask many specific questions in regards to the current Squaw Valley General Plan of development during this open comment time in regards to the State Historical Resource Designation of Squaw Valley.

Historical Designation

Why hasn't the entire historical designation of Squaw Valley not just the remaining historical buildings being addressed in accordance to CCR Title 14, Chapter 3, 15064.5; Determining the Significance of Impacts to Archeological and Historical Resources?

Squaw Valley itself, the mountain peaks, the meadow, and Squaw Creek, are some of the historically designated resources that will be negatively affected by this project, environmentally and ascetically. These state registered resources should be freely accessible for anyone during any season. The Squaw Valley development's overall plan is designed to eliminate or greatly reduce such accessibility through purposeful limited parking access at build out of the current plan.

Squaw Valley is a California State designated Historical Resource that all Californians and other visitors should be allowed to experience freely and to enjoy in its entire splendor as originally intended by the State Historical Resource officials.

How do the owners plans to create this 'destination resort', allow free access to this State Historical Resource, including automobile access, and comply with all of the regulations set forth in the California Environmental Quality Act, including regulation 15064.5?

How does this development plan assure free and unlimited access to this area as a historically designated resource?

What resources will be made available by county officials to pay for the needed increase in public transportation capacity if there is going to be limited automobile access to Squaw?

There are many families that have owned second homes in the area for decades and future generations that will be ever discouraged from visiting Squaw Valley due to the plan to try and re-make Squaw into a destination resort for distance travelers, when historically; Squaw has always been a day or weekend use resort for Northern Californians.

The original authors and submittors of the historical preservation documentation for Squaw Valley were intent on preserving Squaw and it's surroundings for its scenic beauty as well as it's historical relevance in California's skiing and Olympic history. How does this development project protect and preserve the scenic beauty of Squaw Valley? I don't believe the authors of the original historical designation could foresee such a monstrous development that does not conserve resources in any way shape or manner.

How does this development project plan to mitigate light pollution at nighttime? How will this project affect scenic view of the night sky and surrounding peaks as protected in the historical designation for scenic beauty?

Economic and environmental impact, failure or success?

What assurances are if any, that if this plan is approved in its entirety and without having greater regard to its historical resource designation, this resource will not be negatively impacted by a similar scenario of over exuberant development plans whose known risk is a high probability of economic failure, i.e. foreclosure, excessive energy consumption and environmental blight?

Recent history has shown that these types of developments in the local area have proven more failures than successes. Witness the Ritz-Carleton Hotel at Northstar and Grays Crossing in Truckee both of which have been though Chapter 11 bankruptcy and both developed by well capitalized companies that assured us 'they knew what they were doing'. When I asked Mr. Hosea at the January 2013 public meeting at Olympic Village Lodge, the question of how will KSL Capital partners and Squaw Valley Development company be successful when others who have entered into similar developments have not proven success, his answer was "because we are financially disciplined", did nothing to address the question specifically and was merely an attempt of minimalizing the question with the use of a talking point.

How can we be assured this next phase of development will be financially successful when there are still unoccupied and available units for sale in the existing Squaw Village many that are foreclosed and in distressed sale? How does the creation of more units solve the problem of vacancies and unsold units in the current village? How does this proposed development assure financial solvency and success?

How do such development failure scenarios create goodwill within the community after destroying or depleting environmental resources while shallow promises made for local prosperity haven't come to fruition?

The idea that real estate development through increased lodging along with global marketing and novelty amusements will create a four-season destination resort is flawed in its logic when being applied to such a unique and scenic mountain environment such as Squaw Valley. With nearby Lake Tahoe historically being a major vacation attraction to millions of visitors a year, especially in summer, how can a hotel and condominium development alone compete to lure visitors away from such a renowned natural resource?

The Resort at Squaw Creek promised a year round destination resort when proposed. It features an 18 hole championship golf course. It has not been a success in regards to its original plan and has a high level of unoccupancy, year round.

Procurement of the original filed historical designation documents from 1960 should be accessible and made public in regards to the designation of proposed plan area and relation to CCR Title 14 Chapter 3, 15064.5 because of the obvious negative environmental impacts the plan has on this resource. There are many unanswered questions about Squaw's Historical Designation and what area may or may not apply. This may not be required to precede the Notice of Preparation, but procurement should precede any dEIR or fEIR for the specific plan.

Wise and Efficient use of Energy and fossil fuel reduction, reliance on renewable energy.

What specific energy mitigation measures are proposed to reduce excessive energy consumption during construction, including construction vehicles to comply with CEQA 15126.4, in accordance with the CEQA guidelines Appendix F, under the SV general plan?

What specific energy mitigation measures are proposed under the CEQA to reduce excessive energy consumption for operational duration under the SV specific plan?

What specific renewable energy resources will be applied to the project under CEQA Appendix F guidelines under the SV specific plan?

Appendix F specifically states in regards to energy conservation; " The goal of conserving energy implies the wise and efficient use of energy. The means of achieving this goal include: (1) decreasing overall per capital energy consumption, (2) decreasing the reliance on natural gas and oil, and (3) increasing reliance on renewable energy sources. The CEQA requires that EIR's include a discussion of the potential energy impacts of proposed projects, with particular emphasis on avoiding or reducing inefficient, wasteful and unnecessary consumption of energy.

How does this project in its scope and design comply with these energy regulations? How will wise and efficient use of energy be achieved after build out when there is a high probability of unoccupied units of such typical developments that exist in already great numbers as witnessed as examples in the current Squaw Village and at Northstar and Heavenly Resorts? How does this in fact reduce per capita energy consumption when units are unoccupied or unsold or in a distressed state of ownership?

Though there is public mention by Placer County officials of potentially great tax revenue to be gained by the county in property tax and fees from this development, what assurances are there those tax revenues will not be completely stripped from the exploitation of this local resource and sent down the western slope of Placer County?

Will these tax revenues be utilized for supplying renewable energy and reducing the consumption of fossil fuels on this project according to Appendix F of the CEQA?

Will these tax revenues be spent locally on physically deteriorating local schools and infrastructure, community programs and the like?

Traffic mitigation and increased highway capacity.

What will increased traffic and carbon emissions be as this development is planned to take 12 to 15 years to construct? What are the projections, what are the proposed mitigation to these issues?

When the now defunct Intrawest Corporation laid plans for the first development phase of Squaw Village, there were promises of widening improvements to the single lane tunnel on highway 89 in Truckee that were never completed. How does this new project propose to alleviate congestion at this junction of highway 89 with all the increased construction vehicle traffic and increased consumer traffic after buildout?

Noise Pollution

What are the proposed mitigation measures to reduce the associated noise pollution associated with this project for the 12-15 year duration?

Sewer capacity along highway 89 corridor into Truckee.

What are the sewer capacity requirements going to be along the Truckee river corridor when this project is complete and at full capacity once the Homewood Mountain village project has been completed prior to the proposed Squaw project? What are the projections of this needed capacity? What entity, public or private will be responsible for the costs to upgrade to the existing public system? Who and where will the funding come from for this upgrade?

Water supply and ensuring water quality

Where is the potable water going to come from to support such a large project? With limited available water already in the Squaw Valley Municipal Water District wells, and much of that surface water contaminated with hydrocarbons, used for snowmaking in drought years to attract visitors and support skiing, how will this project conserve water use in a worst case scenario such as a prolonged drought period that California is currently experiencing? How does this project protect and conserve the limited water supply in the underground aquifers in Squaw?

How does this project ensure that this water supply is available for fire suppression needs if a wildfire engulfs existing single family residences in the surrounding area of Olympic Valley? Where is the study and projections to provide ample water in these scenarios?

How does the re-alignment of Squaw Creek protect the surrounding proposed village development and surrounding area from flood? In late December of 1996 there was an extreme weather cycle that caused Squaw creek to substantially overflow its banks and flood many existing structures west of the proposed development. What preventative measures will be in place in case of a similar scenario if Squaw creek is realigned within the footprint of the new proposed development? What measures will be in place to ensure this pristine water supply to Pryamid Lake will not be contaminated in a flood scenario? Is there a study proposed for the dEIR that addresses this issue?

What agencies will approve such an environmental change to the proposed re-alignment of Squaw creek? Will the Lahontan Water Quality Board in Nevada be involved in this approval process as any changes to Squaw creek ultimately affects the Truckee river which eventually terminates into Pyramid lake in Nevada?

Conclusion

The construction of a grossly unneeded, redundant for the area, oversized luxury resort that is currently planned, that provides no substantial proof or guarantees of future economic success, or environmental protection and which currently does not meet all regulations in regards to its historical designation, creates excessive use of energy and could irreversibly harm this unique and valuable resource should require far greater scrutiny from public officials and agencies on all of the potential negative impacts to the environment, historical resource designation, energy use and community prior to moving forward. Is the potential reward of tax revenues and hollow promises of local prosperity worth the risk of irreparable harm to this unique and valuable resource?

Though the landowners/developers have the belief they have a right to develop the land as they see fit, we as Californians have every right to protect any historically designated resource from irreparable environmental damage that greed and capitalism undoubtedly causes.

This project should not be approved by Placer County officials in its present state until greater in-depth, long term studies are undertaken and submitted to the Placer County planning commission to determine if this project is economically sustainable, properly environmentally protected and all considerations are evaluated with regards to the State Historical Designation for energy conservation and the use of renewable energy resources under the CEQA and Appendix F, to undertake in its present scope before any approval is issued.

Your attention to these issues and how they are addressed in regards to the Squaw Valley Development plans are of great importance to protecting the environment and establishing the legacy of Squaw Valley as a registered historically designated site for many future generations to enjoy.

Thank you for the opportunity to present these concerns about the Squaw Valley proposed village plan.

Respectfully,

Dan Hikel
Truckee, CA

Maywan Krach

From: Steve Hoch <shoch58@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, March 11, 2014 9:08 AM
To: Placer County Environmental Coordination Services
Subject: For Squaw Valley NOP / EIR Process

Re: Squaw Valley NOP / EIR Process

Dear Maywan / Placer Planning Team –

I am a Placer citizen living at Alpine Meadows, a stone's throw from Squaw Valley. The revised NOP moves in a direction more consistent with community realities, but there are several areas that need much more information, data, analysis and discussion:

- **Water** – The comprehensive analysis of water demand and supply needs to be completed. Based on hard data, plans can be developed based on the Squaw aquifers as well as the possibilities based on Lahonton.
- **Transportation** – With a presumption that the proposed development will bring many more visitors (and residents) into Squaw, transportation needs to be substantially enhanced. The access road cannot be significantly widenec, so getting people out of their cars is more important than ever. What is the plan and investment for transportation?
- **Parking** – The revised NOP allows for more parking in current lots, but this needs a more complete analysis based on presumed larger crowds. Parking needs to be addressed for max days, not average.
- **Mountain** – Although somewhat secondary to the village development per se, what is the plan and commitment for increased and enhanced capacity and mgt. on the mountain? What new / replacement lifts? How will critical safety bottlenecks (e.g. at bottom of Headwall) be addressed with increased crowds? Uphill capacity figures need to be adjusted for the fact that many of Squaw's lifts are actually transport vs. downhill (e.g. Tram, Funitel, Squaw Express, etc.); this will demonstrate that more uphill capacity actually needs to be developed.

I look forward to a robust public process.

Thanks,

Steve Hoch

Maywan Krach

From: Bruce & Libby Hutchinson <gybe@jps.net>
Sent: Monday, March 24, 2014 12:16 PM
To: Placer County Environmental Coordination Services
Subject: Village a Squaw Valley NOP

Dear Ms. Krach: March 24, 2014

Thank you for accepting these comments on the revised "NOP" of an "EIR" for the Squaw Valley Village Specific Plan. We are current residents and 45 year property owners in Squaw Valley.

Squaw Valley is one of nature's unique marvels in the Sierra Nevada. It is a fragile ecosystem that must be preserved. The valley and the community of residents are impacted by any development in the area. The following are specific concerns that we and many others have that must be addressed in the NOP and EIR:

1. Increased density of buildings and people will degrade the beauty and the quality of Squaw Valley's natural environment, particularly the meadow and the creek.

2. The water supply and water quality might be threatened by this increased density. (Bringing outside water into the valley is not an option. Any development should be planned with sustainable use of the local water supply.)

3. Air quality is of great concern. Already smoke pollution in the valley adversely affects people with asthma, allergies, and decreased pulmonary function. Construction dust has the same deleterious effect on public health as does silica dust from excessive road traffic over sand and salt.

4. Shirley Canyon is perhaps the finest granite canyon north of Yosemite in the Sierra Nevada. It is already being degraded by heavy usage. The canyon deserves to be preserved for current and future generations. The proposed development and subsequent overuse threatens the entire canyon.

5. Squaw Valley is a small box valley that is already built out to near any reasonable limit, the 1983 Master Plan notwithstanding. Certainly no variances or zoning changes granting increased density should be considered. The goal should be to preserve what is left of this unique place.

6. Comments made by Sierra Watch are hereby incorporated into this letter.

Sincerely,

Bruce and Elizabeth Hutchinson
P0 Box 3707

143 Tiger Tail Rd
Olympic Valley CA 96146

March 23, 2014

Placer County Planning Services Division

Attention: Maywan Krach, Community Development Technician

We have been property owners in Olympic Valley since 1958. This is our response to the NOP for the proposed Squaw Valley specific Plan.

1. The EIR must include a comprehensive water supply assessment that takes into account long term availability of water supplies.

2. The EIR must provide clear numbers on how much traffic more than 1,700 new bedrooms and an indoor amusement park with 300,000 annual visitors would add to Highway 89.

3. The EIR must consider, in cultural terms, what this development would do to "The Soul of Skiing."

4. The EIR must calculate cumulative increases in light pollution and how it would impact the night sky.

5. The EIR must analyze the impacts of the proposed project and its multiple 108 feet tall buildings on scenic vistas in Squaw.

6. The EIR must include a study of noise pollution both construction noise and the noise fully occupied buildings make--heating, air conditioning, cars, people, delivery trucks, pets, entertainment , garbage collection, and more.

7. The EIR must consider the impact on the quality of life of the current full time residents of Olympic Valley

Thank you for your consideration.

Charles and Mary Jones

Maywan Krach

From:	mary jones <mkjonestruckee@gmail.com>
Sent:	Monday, March 24, 2014 4:58 PM
To:	Maywan Krach
Subject:	Comments on the Village at Squaw NOP
Attachments:	MK Jones NOP Comment Letter part 1 plus rev last page.pdf; MK Jones revised last page of NOP Comment.pdf

Attached please find my comments to the NOP

Summarized here:
1. I don't think the numbers used in increased commuter miles are realistic.
2. In regard to air quality I think the plan area has to be increased to include the Tahoe Basin and Martis Valley as the commuters will be going to from those areas....that brings in the TRPA and effect on Lake Tahoe Clarity
3. In regard to parking...not feasible for day skier population and residence. The picture is a perfect representation of the potential problem with day skiers and village guests; no room to pass.
I sent a letter Saturday, the copy is attached in two parts.
Thanks
Mary K. Jones

Mary K Jones
POB 3909
Truckee CA 96160

March 22, 2014

Placer Co. Planning Svcs. Div
Attn: Maywan Krach
3091 County Ctr Dr, Ste 190
Auburn CA 95603

RE: Village Expansion
NOP Comments

Dear Maywan Krach:
Below are my comments to the NOP on the Village at Squaw

1. Air Quality - The increase in day use commuter miles caused by the expansion will negatively impact the air quality of the Tahoe Basin, covered by the TRPA and the Sierra Valley/Truckee Basin.

A. Additional units increase Commuter miles
Increase of commuter miles to and from Squaw Valley Proposed project need to be calculated considering the following factors
1) increased number of day commuter miles by new employees
2) increased number of daytrips by guests staying in additional units based on max occupancy

2) historical day use of visitors, and 3) current low use of public transportation.

B Increased number of shuttle bus miles

Currently there is no employee shuttle bus service from the proposed employee parking area and overload parking for day use skiers.

This increase in shuttle bus miles must be included in the scope of the project

C. Increased public transportation miles

The project must include a realistic public transportation component that hooks up with the existing routes on a timely basis and includes regular service to Truckee beyond the existing schedule. Historic low use of skier shuttle directly related to failure of shuttle to tie into public transportation route schedule.

The subsequent increas in public transportation then must be added as commuter miles to determine the impact to the basin and connected valleys.

D. TRPA Air Quality Standards

The TRPA Air Quality Standards for the basin are not being met. This proposal calls for a significant increase in commuter miles that will affect the Tahoe Basin.

Approval by Placer County, therefore, opens up both the TRPA and Placer Co. to fines, civil and possible criminal litigation.

Non-compliance with existing air quality standards prevent mitigation as nothing can compensate the residents, visitors, business, for the negative impact to human health caused by poor air quality.

2. Effect on Clarity of Lake Tahoe

Particulate pollution is scientifically linked to emissions from wood stoves, vehicle exhaust, heating and cooling systems exhaust and has a negative impact on the clarity of Lake Tahoe.

3. Effect on human health

This project by its increase in visitors and employees to the area, increase in number of buildings with heating and cooling systems that will ~~emit~~ create additional emmissions of particulates in the air that I breathe. Particulate pollution is tied to adverse effects on human health

4. Parking

Parking is already a problem at the resort. I feel as a day use skier I am being totally disregarded. The

skier shuttle service was awful.
I tried to use it and had significant problems. I do not see how the Ski resort can accommodate the day use skiers in this plan because the plan's assumption that day skiers will be replaced by the visitors staying in the proposed lodging is unrealistic.

The resort cannot accommodate the day skiers in this drought year.

5. Snow Storage

Inadequate for heavy snow years and does not accommodate for the impact of winter rains

6. Drainage - water

The project drains into Squaw Creek. There are federal laws that require permits. I don't believe this project can get the federal permits it needs.

I request that the County institute a contingency in the plan process implementing a hold on this project at the county level until the developers obtain the federal permits prior to this plans approval.

Conclusion

I personally see adverse effects on 1. Human health, 2. air quality, 3. Lake Tahoe Clarity, 4. Water Quality in the Truckee River Watershed and lack of accuracy and consideration of numbers in increased miles driven, and parking.

I feel it is an abuse of discretion for Placer County to go forward in this process until the developer obtains the necessary federal permits and approval of its plan by the TRPA.

These are my comments on the NOP. I advise county counsel to review my concerns and recent Supreme Court decisions in regard to developer's rights. I would not want the developer to feel vested in the development of this plan due to acts of the County. It also seems prudent for the County to put the developer on notice that federal permits must be obtained prior to the vesting of any development rights in this project as well as approval by TRPA.

Mary K Jones

By fax and by email

March 21, 2014

Placer County, Planning Services Division

3091 County Center Drive Suite 190

Auburn CA 95603

Attn: Maywan Krach, Community Services Technician

Environmental Coordination Services

Community Development Resource Agency

RE : Comment on Village at Squaw Valley Specific Plan Notice of Preparation of 2/21/2014

Dear Supervisors/Placer County Planning Services Division,

We are Village at Squaw Valley owners on the south side of 22 Station East over the Village creek. While we are proponents of a more robust mountain village with more amenities and lodging, we have continuing concerns about Squaw's proposed plan.

In particular, we are disturbed by the proposed heights of the buildings for several reasons. First and foremost, they will block sunlight in a resort that is known worldwide for its sunshine. The tall buildings will create dark corridors and shaded areas that won't allow for areas to sit and relax and they will be more prone to dangerous icing conditions.

Furthermore, unlike the Intrawest Village, no view corridors have been delineated by the Squaw development team. The view corridors that the current Village buildings create increases the enjoyment of the views of Squaw's six peaks for all guests, even if they never head up the mountain and are just walking around the Village. The shape of Squaw's proposed phase 1 looks a lot like Northstar's Village, but the difference there is that there are no majestic peaks to see at the Northstar location. This is certainly not in keeping with honoring this special place.

And finally, the heights of the phase 1 buildings, in particular, and the phase 2 wing of building 1A will affect the view corridors of existing Village owners. That is especially true for the southeast views of Snow King and Juniper Ridge as they are not as tall as the peaks to the southwest. And the phase 2 wing of 1A will do the same for many 22 Station East & West owners of their Red Dog and KT22 views. This will create a loss of valuation or our real estate and therefore, less revenue to the county.

We urge you, the Board of Supervisors, to act to limit the heights of the buildings to that of the existing Village and also require more variation in heights creating peek views and allowing in more sunlight.

Thank you and sincerely,

Gurinder Kalra

Homeowner

Unit 5206, 1750 Village East Road

Olympic Valley CA 96146

Email : gurinderkalra2000@yahoo.com

Maywan Krach

From: Jack Kashtan <jkashtan@prodigy.net>
Sent: Thursday, March 13, 2014 7:03 AM
To: Placer County Environmental Coordination Services
Subject: Squaw Valley NOP

KSL needs to identify specifically how guests will reach the resort. It needs to identify the size, location, and impacts of all off site parking and the means of transport between those lots and the resort. Specific goals for the use of transportation other than single family cars should be set and the means for reaching those goals identified. The transportation plan for any shuttles must include the types of vehicles and fuel, the frequency of trips, and the hours and dates during which trips will occur. Transportation options for guests staying at the resort to reach surrounding towns like Truckee and North Lake Tahoe should be identified. The sources of transportation funding--be it the resort, riders, or both--should be identified in order to properly assess feasibility, and if public transport is to be utilized the specific funding for this should be identified, and commitments from identified public agencies must be documented. The developers' proposal relies heavily on a justification of reduced traffic impacts and environmental benefits, specifically on the promise that guests and residents of the village will not use private transportation during their stays and that public transportation to the resort will reduce day skier vehicle miles. Given the emphasis the developers place on being eco-friendly, vague assurances are not enough--a very specific plan must be presented--as comprehensive as the site plans and and architectural renderings.

A number of resorts I have visited--including Whistler-Blackcomb, Jackson Hole, and Chamonix--rely heavily on public transportation which is much more frequent and runs for longer hours than public transportation in the Truckee-Tahoe area and is much more heavily used. Approval of KSL's EIR should be dependent on the developer demonstrating how Truckee-Tahoe public transport is to be brought up to this international standard. Failing that, any claim of environmental benefit should be rejected as mitigation of the projects environmental impact.

Lori Kelley
lkelleyl@sbcglobal.net

March 24, 3014

Placer County, Planning Services Division
Attn: Maywan Krach, CD Technician
3091 County Center Drive #190
Auburn, CA 95603

Sent via emai: cdraecs@placer.ca.gov

Re: Comments – Squaw Valley Specific Plan Environmental Impact Report (EIR)

To whom it may concern,

Below are comments I am requesting be considered for the Village at Squaw Valley Specific Plan EIR.

Traffic: How will traffic safety and noise be mitigated?

Local Business/Economic Impacts: How would this large scale proposed project negatively impact existing businesses and how would this be mitigated? How would this large scale project negatively impact existing property values and quality of living? This large scale project warrants an economic/business impact study.

Cumulative Impacts: What are the cumulative impacts of this proposed project and how would they be mitigated?

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Sincerely,

Lori Kelley
Lori Kelley
lkelleyl@sbcglobal.net

Maywan Krach

From: billyk74@gmail.com on behalf of Bill Kelly <bill@kellybrotherspainting.com>
Sent: Tuesday, March 18, 2014 6:29 PM
To: Placer County Environmental Coordination Services
Subject: Please balance the development in Squaw.

Maywan,

I 'm writing you in regards to KSL's development in Squaw Valley. The amount of people, cars, and impact that KSL is proposing to the Valley is far greater than what it can handle. This area is precious. If you have ecer spent a busy day at squaw you know how crowded it gets, So to add more attractions and rooms will only make it busier. We love the natural environment and it's surroundings.

The amount of air, noise and light pollution will increase. The traffic will increase.

Please don't over develop, everything in balance.

Thanks
B

Andrew Lange
P. O. BOx 2846
Olympic Valley, CA 96146
530-583-3402
Langeclp@aol.com

March 21, 2014

By Email to: cdraecs@placer.ca.gov and by U. S. Mail

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

Re: Village at Squaw Valley Specific Plan Project Revised Notice of Preparation - Proposed Development of the "East Parcel"

Dear Ms. Krach:

I request that the Draft and Final EIR include an analysis of the following:

1. The impact of locating the employee housing at the East Parcel rather than in Tahoe City or Truckee. Currently KSL uses the East Parcel for storage of snow removed from the parking and other open areas within the Project. The environmental impact of transporting snow to locations further from the snow removal areas than the East Parcel by earthmoving trucks should be covered.

The developer needs to identify where snow removed from the parking, open areas, and walkways will be stored so that the above analysis can be studied.

2. The advantages to the economy of Tahoe City of locating the employee housing in or nearby Tahoe City.

3. The effect of travel by residents of employee housing between the East Parcel and Tahoe City, Truckee and beyond for shopping and entertainment (including alcohol consumption), particularly during non-employment hours. While travel from the East Parcel to the developer's job sites would be shorter, the employees' travel to Truckee, Tahoe City and beyond for grocery and other shopping and non work hour entertainment may result in greater net travel at worse times and at greater risk of accident and injury. Existing and anticipated bus service from Tahoe City and Truckee to Squaw Valley would be available to such employees.

4. The negative impacts on neighboring housing, a) north across Squaw Creek on Trails End, b) west on Indian Trail Road, c) east to the already approved housing subdivisions off Creeks End Road, and d) south across Squaw Valley road of Squaw Valley Academy and the Tavern Inn condominiums of the proposed uses of the East Parcel [i) parking, ii) housing, iii) propane storage, iv) shipping and receiving, & v) commercial and retail uses] should be studied. These impacts include noise especially during early morning hours, risks of hazardous products, noxious smells and increased traffic interactions between the access points and Squaw Valley Road.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

Very truly yours,

Andrew Lange

Maywan Krach

From: Barbara Larson <barhlar@suddenlink.net>
Sent: Sunday, March 16, 2014 5:13 AM
To: Placer County Environmental Coordination Services
Subject: Squaw Valley Proposal

I am horrified at the plans to expand Squaw Valley,and the impact it will make on our still beautiful Tahoe area. When part of the charm of the Lake Tahoe area is its natural beauty, hiking trails, wildflowers, streams and lakes for fishing and swimming, to think you are considering having an amusement park is a violation of what the Lake Tahoe area represents to most people who come to visit, and esp. for those who already have chosen to live here because of the surroundings. Already the night sky is less black due to the urban development in Reno.

What if we continue to have draught conditions during the winters? How much water did Squaw use to make snow most of the winter?????
Water supplies ARE limited .

Please reconsider the monstrosity and abhorent results that passing the Squaw Valley development would bring. Let's keep the real reason Tahoe living and a vacation destination for visitors is so meaningful. It is the natural beauty that draws us here!!

Barbara Larson
Truckee Resdent

Maywan Krach

From: Ann Lyman <annhlyman@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, March 11, 2014 10:11 PM
To: Placer County Environmental Coordination Services
Subject: Squaw Valley Development

Dear Placer County- As someone who retired up here because of clean air, less traffic, clean water and a simpler lifestyle we hope you won't approve the addition of 1700 more units in Squaw Valley. Construction and traffic will be a nightmare for many many years and damage to the environment irreversible. The only time it is even crowded over there or really any of the ski resorts or commercial areas along the lake is on holidays. Please keep Tahoe quaint and special. Fix up with we have and don't bow to corporate pressure! Ann Lyman

Sent from my iPad

Maywan Krach

From: Kathi Mall <kathimall@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, March 19, 2014 2:01 PM
To: Placer County Environmental Coordination Services
Subject: Proposed Development in Squaw Valley

For the past year we have been following KSL Development Plans and Revised Plans. We feel that as time has passed and we have been able to digest the New Plan - we still feel it is far to big a foot print for our small Valley.

We cannot help but wonder where the water is coming from for the new residences and Waterpark. We are currently being asked to conserve water without any new development. There is only so much water in our aquifer. More wells are just going to draw from the same source. The idea of having water piped (via 8" pipe) from Martis Valley is ludricious. With all the new development proposed for the Truckee area, Northstar, Martis Camp, Lahontan, Railroad Yards, Coldstream (300 homes) , Joeger Ranch, Canyon Springs (177 homes) and Pollard Station (126 units). I am not sure the folks in Nevada County are wanting to share their water with us.

I am also concerned about the parking for Day Skiers - a busy day this year had people parking all the way to the Post Office and we need Day skiers for major revenue.

Is their really a need at this time for building out this area? Will the people come and buy or will we just have a lot of empty buildings as we do now for much of the year?

We must seriously consider drought/global warming and how this will affect the Ski Areas in the Sierras in the future.

As for the WaterPark it does not seem to be a needed addition to Squaw Valley when we have such a beautiful natural playground right outside our door.

We must also consider the quality of life for the next 5 to 10 years of construction for the residents and visitors of Squaw Valley. The noise and traffic will be reverberating through our hills for much of the year.

Please carefully consider what this very large development will do to our environment in the future. KSL will move on (they are primarily a Development Company - not a management company. We will be left with this overbuilt resort that will certainly diminish our quality of life and add nothing to the beautiful environment we all love and cherish.

Donn and Kathi Mall
Squaw Valley

Maywan Krach

From: richard mamelok <mamelok@pacbell.net>
Sent: Wednesday, March 05, 2014 10:06 AM
To: Maywan Krach
Subject: Subject: RE: comment on NOP for Squaw Valley specific plan

I am an owner at Christy Hill Condominiums in Squaw Valley. I think part of the plans should include a controlled crosswalk from Christy Lane across Squaw Valley Road to the planned parking lot of the ski area. The road, especially on weekends, is dangerous to cross. Cars go quite fast, rarely stop for pedestrians who are waiting to cross and pose a hazard to those who do want to cross. Getting on to Squaw Valley road, especially to turn left from Christy lane is also very difficult.

Richard D. Mamelok, MD
364 Churchill Avenue
Palo Alto, CA
94301-3601

Tel: +1 650 853 1445
Mobile: +1 650 924 0347
mamelok@pacbell.net

This email (including any attachments) may contain material that is confidential and privileged and is for the sole use of the intended recipient. Any review, reliance or distribution by others or forwarding without express permission is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender and delete all copies.

Maywan Krach

From: Romolo Marcucci <romolo.marcucci@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, March 24, 2014 4:29 PM
To: Placer County Environmental Coordination Services
Subject: Squaw Village Proposal feedback

To Whom it may concern:

I have numerous concerns about the proposed and revised plan for the Village at Squaw proposal project. They are as follows:

-Traffic: Contrary to what KSL proposes, increased infrastructure will actually increase car counts and traffic delays during peak travel times. SV road and Highway 89 are already a complete mess during peak travel times, and horrible during bad weather. This will only be exacerbated by increasing lodging units. Housing more people does not solve the problem of everyone having to return to work on Jan 2nd.

-Reduced property values and tax revenues. Eastern Placer County already has a glut of vacant commercial space, hotel beds, and second homes. Another blighted development only serves to further reduce county revenues in the area

-Development is completely out of scale and touch with current, historic, and future norms of size and scale of development in the Valley, Eastern Placer County, and the Tahoe region in general. This is a rural area, not a city.

-Just because KSL chooses to ignore climate change does not mean Placer County should. This winter serves as fair warning to what the future of skiing in the region looks like. What will a ski village look like at an elevation that is already marginal for skiing in ten or twenty years. Once KSL has come and gone, this will be the county and taxpayers burden to clean up the empty blight.

-Increased burdens on County services: This type of development will create mainly minimum wage jobs. These workers will need additional services from the county.

-No low income housing: Where are all of the minimum wage workers going to live in an area that is completely out of their price range

-No associated transit plan

-Dropping of the water table due to extensive water pumped from PUD wells and its effect on the health of Squaw Creek and the meadow

Thank you,
Rom

Maywan Krach

From: Bryan L. Martel <bryan@environmentalcapitalgroup.com>
Sent: Wednesday, March 12, 2014 4:16 PM
To: Maywan Krach
Cc: Erika Martel Martel; David Butze; MCSabarese@aol.com Carol Sabarese
Subject: Squaw NOP

Placer County, Planning Services Division
Attention: Maywan Krach, Community Development Technician
3091 County Center Drive Suite 190
Auburn, CA 95603

Dear Mr. Krach,

We are writing as a concerned party in the development of Squaw Valley and the recent Notice of Preparation. We have a home on 1587 Squaw Valley Road in Olympic Valley.

Our areas of concern which should be included in the EIR are:

The air pollution in Squaw Valley, mostly caused be traffic dust, already accumulates all over our counters and furniture (and thus in our lungs) and needs to be cleaned up every week? How will the increased traffic and years of construction dust effect our health? The increased traffic will also increase diesel particulate matter, how will this be addressed in the EIR? Additionally, we are concerned the snow grooming fleet will increase in size, and this also will increase the particulate matter, and the same goes for all the new standby diesel generators.

Adequate drinking water is important to all of us. Because of climate change, more and more snow making will need to be installed and this may drastically impact water needs. Please include a comprehensive water supply assessment that takes into account long-term availability of water supplies.

Traffic is a growing concern. Please provide clear numbers on how much traffic more than 1,700 new bedrooms — and an indoor amusement park with 300,000 annual visitors — would add to Highway 89. Our children walk home after skiing, we are very concerned how the increased traffic is going to effect the safety of pedestrians. Please do address these issues. We already have trouble getting into and out of our driveway, as we directly connect to the main road in Squaw Valley, Squaw Valley Road. How will the increase in traffic effect us being able to get in and out of our driveway? And another, how will all the increased headlights going in and out of the valley effect us during the night as they shine in our windows? There is also going to be a lot more foot and bike traffic flowing through the valley roads and paths as the development grows. One of KSL's plans is to put a foot and bike path about 15 feet behind our kitchen table windows. How will these increases in all forms of traffic be addresses?

Noise pollution is a big concern of ours, as we already hear the snow making guns all night long. How much worse is the noise going to get as development gets bigger and more man-made snow is required due to climate change? Also, the new maintenance facility is planned to be located right next to our home. How is the noise from this facility going to impact the tranquility of our peaceful home?

Climate change is likely king to impact the precipitation at Squaw Valley. How is the new development going to take into account the changes in precipitation to changing climate. How will this effect water storage? How will this effect flooding in the valley? The new development, as planned, is in a designated flood plane.

No one wants to lower the quality of Squaw's legendary terrain. The EIR should consider, in cultural terms, what this development would do to "The Soul of Skiing."

We all enjoy the beautiful night sky. The EIR should calculate cumulative increases in light pollution and how it would impact the night sky.

The High Sierra view should include mountains instead of buildings. The EIR must analyze the impacts of the proposed project and its multiple 100+ feet buildings on scenic vistas in Squaw. Also, new facilities (mostly maintenance) are going to be located right next to our home, how are these going to impact our view of the Squaw Valley mountains?

Flora and Fauna - We wake up almost every morning and see Coyotes running across the meadow and hawks perched in the meadow trees. The development as currently planed will tear up part of the meadow right next to us. We live right on the meadow, how will the huge development impact the grasslands, trees, and wild life of the meadow?

Snow removal. Currently, Squaw Corp. piles huge mountains of dirty and oily parking lot snow right in front of our home, blocking our views of the mountain and meadow. As this snow melts all of the sediment and oil runs right in to the Squaw creek. How is the new development going to deal with all this dirty snow in a responsible manner?

Trash. We already have problems in the valley with collection (or lack of collection) during the storm season. How is trash collection going to be handled when thousands of new home owners move into the valley?

Thanks in advance. We look forward to a comprehensive and readable EIR.

Bryan and Erika Martel

Maywan Krach

From: Muschott, Alan <AMuschott@frk.com>
Sent: Friday, February 21, 2014 1:36 PM
To: Placer County Environmental Coordination Services
Subject: Village at Squaw Valley Specific Plan Project NOP Scoping Comment

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

To whom it may concern,

In regard to the proposed development at the Village at Squaw Valley, I believe that the plan should include some sort of a safe pedestrian crosswalk, or other safe pedestrian access, to cross Squaw Valley Road at Far East Road (the eastern most entrance to the village), for pedestrians coming from the residential neighborhood north of Squaw Valley Road. As it exists today, it is already a dangerous crossing for pedestrians to make with the current level of traffic into and out of the village during the day, and is especially dangerous after dark. With an expected increase in traffic, as well as the purported dedication to increasing pedestrian access to the village, it is imperative that this pedestrian crossing situation be addressed. Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Alan Muschott
1609 Christy Hill Lane #A7
Olympic Valley, CA 96146

Notice: All email and instant messages (including attachments) sent to or from Franklin Templeton Investments (FTI) personnel may be retained, monitored and/or reviewed by FTI and its agents, or authorized law enforcement personnel, without further notice or consent.

Dear Sirs,

I am writing this letter in opposition to the plan for further development of the Village at Squaw Valley,

PSPA 20110385, State Clearinghouse Number 2012102023.

In particular, I am opposed the placement of a parking lot behind the Squaw Creek Condominiums on Squaw Peak Road. I am a resident of Unit #10 of that building and my objection is based on three concerns.

The first concern is that the parking lot will be placed at a significantly higher elevation than the swimming pool behind those condos, and it seems inevitable that run off of hydrocarbons and residue from the cars in the parking lot will wash into the pool and contaminate it. The residue will probably wash into the creek below the building and contaminate the water supply in that area as well.

My second concern is the significant danger to residents and their children by the increase of traffic as potential parkers circulate in the area. Squaw Peak Road has a hazardous series of sharp, 90 degree turns that make it almost impossible to see oncoming traffic and pedestrians, who often have to walk in the road because of the high snow banks on either side of the road. This is a danger that is well known by the residents of this area, and they drive very slowly, at 5-10 mph around those turns because they can easily hit someone and, when the road is icy, it is also possible to lose control of your vehicle when turning so sharply. Since the road becomes one way at the end, all traffic would have to travel that route and inevitably someone is going to be hit by a motorist that is unfamiliar with the road. One mitigation would be to have the parking area accessible only from the east end with a widened two way entrance so that no traffic would flow through the condo area, and I recommend that if the project is approved. By bringing traffic into that area and because of the limited amount of parking, I am also sure that the amount of illegal parking around the buildings in that area will increase dramatically.

My final concern is that the western end of this area consists of an avalanche zone, and in fact an avalanche did happen in that area which hit the last condo building while I have been a resident there. The former Poulson ski lift that was there early in the history of Squaw was destroyed by an avalanche, and that is why it was removed. By taking down the trees that are above the condos to put in a parking lot, I think the natural flow of the periodic avalanches that occur in this area toward the west might be disturbed and the tree divergence removed. This would increase the probability of other buildings being hit or destroyed in the next avalanche, including the one in which I live.

In summary, I would strongly recommend that the proposed parking lot should not be approved.

Sincerely,

Walter Price

Maywan Krach

From: Alexander Fisch
Sent: Thursday, February 27, 2014 2:34 PM
To: Maywan Krach
Subject: FW: Information request regarding the Squaw Valley development

Please place this correspondence in the NOP comments file. Thanks

From: Valerie Puscasiu [mailto:vpuscasiu@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, February 27, 2014 2:32 PM
To: Alexander Fisch
Subject: Information request regarding the Squaw Valley development

Dear Alex,
As a resident of the Squaw Valley, I am concerned about the proposed project as it seems that there is a big emphasis on bringing more residents and I do not see any improvements in overall commodities and infrastructure.
- Would the road be wider?/ Is there any plan to accommodate an increase of traffic?
- Is there any plan on bringing food/ grocery shops to avoid driving in increased traffic towards ?
- will Squaw ski resort increase capacities to bring people up the mountain/ open new terrain and lifts?
- Will there be more "real life" outlets to the Village or is it to extent was it today a very artificial lifeless area?
Squaw Valley is right now one of the most depressing "village" I've encountered regarding after ski life. It is brain dead in the summer and outside weekends.
What is the plan to bring real town life to it?
Nothing in the proposed plan gives any hope or details about what is going to happen to the Valley beside more residential housing (I've only had access to the PDF download).
Thank you for giving me more information,
Sincerely,
Valerie Puscasiu

ps: I've also been contacted by the group of interest lobbying for the incorporation of Squaw Valley and I do not know if you are affiliated with it. They were asking for donation but decline to provide any information

Jerry Riessen
PO Box 2875
226 Hidden Lake Loop
Olympic Valley, CA 96146
jriessen@comcast.net

March 24, 2014

Placer County, Planning Services Division
Attn: Maywan Krach, CD Technician
3091 County Center Drive #190
Auburn, CA 95603

Sent via email: cdraecs@placer.ca.gov

Re: Notice of Preparation (NOP), Village at Squaw Valley Specific Plan Environmental Impact Report (EIR)

To Whom It May Concern:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the NOP for the Village at Squaw Valley Specific Plan EIR.

My first concern is for traffic as it may impact all the homes to the north of Squaw Valley Road and to the west of Russell Road. I am concerned that when traffic on Squaw Valley Road becomes slow, traffic will turn off and use neighborhood roads to come and go from Squaw Valley ski area. Specifically, the roads that could become backup routes include Lanny Lane and possibly even Sandy Way, among others in the neighborhood.

What will the impacts be of this increased neighborhood traffic? Safety is certainly a concern. Increased wear and tear? How can these impacts be mitigated?

What other impacts will the neighborhoods to the north of Squaw Valley Road experience? Increased noise? Increased light pollution? Increased

difficulty entering and leaving Squaw Valley Road from our neighborhood? All these impacts must be studied.

Sincerely,

Jerry Riessen

J. Peter Schweitzer
PO Box 3477
Olympic Valley, Ca 96146

20 March 2014 Sent by email and US Postal Service

Attn: Maywan Krach, Community Development Technician
Placer County, Planning Services Division
3091 County Center Drive, Suite 190
Auburn, Ca 95603

RE: NOP Response to KSL Plan for the proposed "Squaw Valley Specific Plan"

Dear Ms. Krach:

I am a resident of Olympic Valley (i.e. Squaw Valley) California and have the following comments and concerns regarding KSL's plan for the development of Squaw Valley.

1. Re Zoning – The proponent is asking for a great deal of rezoning. One specific area of concern is the westernmost area north of Squaw Creek. This area is currently zoned Forest Recreation and Conservation Preserve. KSL is proposing to make this area Heavy Commercial meaning heavy vehicle maintenance will be done there along with the storing of fuel and other toxic chemicals. This is a critical part of the Squaw Valley watershed and must not be disturbed. Further rezoning is being requested in to the north of this area for residential in Forest Recreation and Conservation Preserve, this area should not be developed for residential or hotel use. There are other significant rezoning requests. No rezoning should be allowed. KSL knew the zoning when they purchased the company and should propose to build within existing zoning.
2. Water – There is insufficient water in the valley to accommodate KSL's plan. The Squaw Valley Public Service District (a Placer County Special District responsible for water in the Valley) has publicly stated that there is only enough water available for 100 additional single family homes. This was based on years prior to this one where the drought is having a greater impact and water rationing will be imposed in Squaw Valley. Since there is not enough water for current residents and visitors at historic levels there is certainly not enough water for additional development.
3. Water Park/Amusement Park/Grand Camp/Multi Activity Building/Etc. – KSL says that 300,000 people, or more, will use this facility on an annual basis but they propose only 39 spaces. The Squaw Valley General Plan requires one space for 300 square feet of commercial (this is surely commercial) space. This means at least 400 new spaces on the property of the buildings use. They are completely deficient in parking for this structure. We do not know the exact size of the complex but between indoor and outdoor facilities it is projected to be over 125,000 square feet. Dedicated parking for this facility must be required.
4. Traffic – Traffic is already a problem in Squaw Valley and to Tahoe City and Truckee. Adding over 1700 bedrooms and an amusement/water park that will handle 300,000+ annual visitors will compound the already dreadful traffic. In addition the Performing Arts/Ballroom will add additional traffic. No cash mitigation can be acceptable as a way to deal with this. There is no public transit plan to ease congestion and there is no way to widen the roads between Truckee,

Squaw Valley and Tahoe City. At a minimum the dEIR should directly analyze and address the traffic issue.

5. Public Recreation Areas – Placer County requires that a proposed development such as this must have 10% active recreation areas and 10% passive recreation area. This equates to approx. 8.5 acres of each. I cannot see any area in their NOP that proposes these uses. This must be addressed in the dEIR and Placer County's requirements enforced.
6. Building Heights – The proposal by KSL calls for buildings that are at least 108 feet high, virtually double the height of any other building in the Village. This is too tall and will not only block mountain views that are a great deal of the beauty of Squaw Valley, but also create massive shadows which will be particularly devastating in the winter. In addition podium parking under buildings will add 21 feet to each building.
7. Light Pollution – Buildings this massive and with so many of them light pollution will be a critical problem. The dEIR must address the cumulative effects of this massive project.
8. Performing Arts Building/Ballroom – This building will hold over 800 people and be used for, according to KSL, Performing Arts, Conferences, Weddings, Meetings, Banquets and other uses. It is not stated how many people will use this facility on an annual basis. Certainly as business they will want to maximize its use and profit. They must state the number of annual users. One issue is parking; KSL has proposed no parking for this facility though it is required to under the current Squaw Valley General Plan. I estimate at least 250 additional parking spaces would be required. Additional traffic will also be a result of this building and must be analyzed in the dEIR.
9. Mountain Safety – One day this year Squaw Valley broke its own record for on mountain accidents. The mountain is already used to capacity. Since there will be no limitation on current mountain users, i.e. pass holders, day ticket purchasers, etc. and with the addition of more than 4,000 daily skiers/snowboarders staying in the new construction the danger to skiers/snowboarders will only increase. This must be examined in the dEIR and safety of all mountain users must not just be maintained but improved. Without this analysis, and properly done, KSL and Placer County will be accepting additional liability.
10. Transportation – KSL has repeatedly said they would create a transportation system. There is no mention of public transit in their NOP. It must be analyzed and be a part of the dEIR.

Sincerely,

J. Peter Schweitzer

March 23, 2014

PLACER COUNTY, PLANNING SERVICES DIVISION
c/o Maywan Krach
3091 County Center Drive, Suite 190
Auburn, CA 95603

RE: Squaw Valley Expansion Proposal

Dear Maywan,

I am a native of the Bay Area and was first introduced to Squaw Valley by my mother and father, forty-one years ago. Both were non-California natives (Midwest and east coast transplants), overwhelmed with the beauty of the Valley and spectacular natural amphitheatre of mountain tops. This attraction to the Valley lasted their entire lives and was the impetus of my lifelong affinity for the outdoors and appreciation of nature.

I am now passing this trans-generational love of nature to my six year old daughter, Natalie. With my wife, Christy, we spend all four seasons of the year at our second home which is located in the Valley. From this base camp, we are cultivating in Natalie both the appreciation of the Valley's natural beauty we are blessed to enjoy as well as our roles to be good stewards of this gift to insure its preservation and sustainability for prosperity.

In the summer, we spend most weekends hiking Shirley Canyon, enjoying the family festivals in the Village, fly fishing on the Truckee and riding bikes into town. This winter was Natalie's first year in the Mighty Might Ski Team program. She counts off the school days during the week, until she is able to "come home to the mountain" as she says, during the weekend. We are continually introducing new families to this wonderful natural treasure.

With this perspective, knowing we all have an huge opportunity to generously share this "borrowed experience" with the rest of the world, and as a Placer County tax payer, I am bewildered by how the proposed expansion of the Valley to improve both the all year around enjoyment and visitor capacity has been so re-directed by a small group of vocal and well coordinated opponents. Preserving what we have been blessed with and enhancing the way in which we experience nature through newer, smarter and sustainable development strategies should be viewed as not a choice, but an obligation. Specifically, nowhere else in the country, in these days of global warming, is it advisable to have massive surface parking lots, acting as a collection agent for both heat and

automobile oil run off into Squaw Creek. New, sustainable developments are being directed and in some cases, mandated by cities, to underground parking functions. To remove this visual blight from this majestic Valley should be a number one priority.

As for the preservation of non-historical and shoddily constructed structure like the locker room, it's just not logical that this limited use building should impair the greater opportunity for sensible redevelopment. Functions housed in this dilapidated facility can be housed in new, aesthetically attractive ADA, Title 24 compliant structures that blend much better into the natural surroundings.

Finally, the Village and the Valley are at an economic crossroads. Every year, my family wonders which of the local operators of the shop space will have to fold due to a poor winter season and non-existent summer, spring and fall business. We want the Village and the Valley to thrive and be a beacon to people around the country and the world to come and visit Squaw Valley and enjoy its natural splendor. This can't happen given the current, one season window for these operators to cover expenses, make a living and provide jobs, mostly to young people trying to cover college costs during school breaks. The Village, in its current scaled back configuration is hanging on by its financial fingernails. Expanding the Village and enhancing its vibrancy is critical to all of us-current home owners, visitors and our future grandchildren's.

Please not only support the pending development proposal, but re-think how much better we can make it by pursuing common sense, sustainable development practices like underground parking and focused density hubs.

Thank you for your continued interest and work in the preservation and sustainability of the Squaw Valley experience for the grand audience it deserves.

Rob Shannon
1995 Olympic Valley Road,
Squaw Valley

Maywan Krach

From: Jon Shanser <jonshanser@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, March 24, 2014 7:31 AM
To: Placer County Environmental Coordination Services
Subject: My comments on the SV Revised NOP

To: Placer County, Planning Services Division, Attn: Maywan Krach, Community Development Technician, 3091 County Center Drive Suite 190, Auburn, CA 95603

From: Jon Shanser MD, 1580 Lanny Lane, Olympic Valley, CA 96146 3/23/2014

Re: Village at Squaw Valley Specific Plan Project Revised Notice of Preparation

Dear Ms. Krach:

I am writing this letter in an attempt to comment upon the Revised Specific Plan and proposed illustrative concept put forth by SVSH and KSL. It is extremely difficult to comment on what I perceive as the most non-specific specific plan that I have ever seen. That an applicant would put forth a plan like this for a proposal of its potential size is inappropriate. None of what has been put forth by the applicant binds them to any actual project and Appendix B contains few real guidelines from which one can understand what is truly being planned. What is more, the NOP refers to the previous plans when all it should be referencing is the current proposal which should be judged solely on its own merits, if there are any. I would suggest to you that this NOP is so lackluster and inadequate that Placer County should require the applicant to submit a new more detailed Specific Plan and that the NOP should be completely redone.

As far as details of concerns I have, I believe that there is no **need** in this valley for an additional 1757 rooms and that the applicant's interests are simply a disguise for their real estate **greed**.

There are concerns about water supply and the tremendous drain on an already stressed aquifer from which the applicant will further draw water which the community would otherwise need & use. The latter problem is compounded by suggested plans for an indoor/outdoor aquatic center which would apparently use upwards of 15000 gallons of water daily. I am concerned that building heights would be higher than the existing village and not harmonize with the existing village, as well as cause obstructed view corridors in the new village. I am particularly concerned about the applicant's continued use of the word "restoration" as regards Squaw Creek; while there may be "improvements" proposed, there will never be any true restoration of the original course of the Creek. It is disingenuous, to say the least, to call what has been proposed by the applicant, "restoration"! Furthermore, I am concerned that the "cumulative impacts" of the proposed project and it's 20-25 year construction timeline will be much greater than can be garnered from the details or lack thereof in the Specific Plan and/or the NOP. There are significant impacts on air & water quality, environmental degradation, water supply, sewage, storm drainage and snow removal, transportation and traffic that I have deep concerns the potential mitigations for which would be inadequate &/or insufficient.

In conclusion, I would hope that the EIR will examine alternatives to the proposed illustrative concept because as it stands now, the NOP does not even suggest any alternatives that might result in fewer impacts on the environment.

--
Jon D Shanser MD
1580 Lanny Lane
Olympic Valley, CA 96146
jonshanser@gmail.com

Maywan Krach

From: Ashley Sommer <ashleymariesommer@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, March 24, 2014 3:37 PM
To: Placer County Environmental Coordination Services
Subject: Village at Squaw Valley NOP comments

Hello,
My name is Ashley Sommer. I am a resident of Incline Village, NV and frequent the Squaw Valley area for both recreation and (occasionally) business. I have concerns regarding the level of analysis proposed in the EIR and the level of initial analysis discussed in the Initial Study relating to Recreation.

From the language in the NOP, it does not appear as though Recreation will be a resource that is analyzed under the EIR. Recreation, especially in the Tahoe area, should be considered as a resource to by analyzed. The analysis should include more thought than the two items listed in the initial study
1. Would the project: Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?
2. Would the project: Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

This level of analysis fails to take into consideration multiple facets of recreation use and impacts to recreation. The analysis should include a full complement of impacts to recreation values, such as (but not limited to):

- A full description of the existing type and character of existing use for developed and dispersed recreation activities (i.e. miles of trails through which types of environments, developed recreation areas such as picnic areas and overlooks, dispersed recreation activities such as wildlife viewing, bird watching, etc. and the levels of solitude that currently exist. What opportunities are available for free, parking available for these activities, etc)
- How will the proposed plan impact existing recreation opportunities (more than just whether they are eliminated or added to). How will the experience change? Will the quality of any remaining activities be reduced and to what degree?
- Will access to the existing activities be improved or reduced? Will people who don't pay a fee still be able to participate in dispersed activities?

An EIR must take into consideration all relevant impacts to the environment, including impacts to locals and the community. Without this analysis the effects will not fully be disclosed as to the impacts of the project.

Regarding the transportation/traffic analysis, it is not apparent to me whether the cumulative effects of increased development on surrounding communities and roadways will be evaluated. As part of the cumulative effects analysis of the project, impacts from the proposed developments in the Northstar area on SR 89 and 28 in Lake Tahoe should be evaluated (i.e. capacity, service levels, maintenance, etc), as well as cumulative effects from any other expansion projects in the Lake Tahoe area. While Squaw Valley is located outside of the Lake Tahoe Basin, any expansion in the area would have direct impacts on the roadways within the Lake Tahoe area. These impacts should be analyzed and disclosed.

Also, the existing condition at the Squaw Valley Road/SR 89 intersection should not be used as a baseline for possible negative effects. It should be the goal of the project to improve this condition because currently the

existing condition is unsafe and inefficient during busy periods. Similarly, the impact on thru-traffic on SR 89 should be analyzed.

As a general statement, development in Tahoe favors the wealthy and the non-residents at the expense of residents and the community experience. The tourist economy is what supports the community, however it should not be a choice between selling your (community) soul or fading from existence. Please take these comments into consideration when analyzing the impacts from the Village at Squaw Valley project. Feel free to contact me if you have any questions or clarifications regarding my comments.

Best,
Ashley Sommer
557 North Dyer Circle
Incline Village, NV 89450
612-730-5464 cell

Maywan Krach

From: msparks457@aol.com
Sent: Monday, March 24, 2014 4:02 PM
To: Maywan Krach
Subject: Village at Squaw Valley Specific Plan Project NOP Scoping Comment

To: Placer County Environmental Coordination Services
Cc: tomesparks@yahoo.com
Subject: Village at Squaw Valley Specific Plan Project NOP Scoping Comment

Dear Ms. Krach,
I have just learned of the deadline for comment on this massive plan for Squaw Valley development.
My specific concern is with the proposal to transport much needed water from Martis Valley to an already overdeveloped Squaw Valley. I have owned property and have spent both summers and winters in the Martis Valley area for more than 40 years. During that time Squaw Valley developers have gone far toward spoiling this magnicent scene with no other object than to line the pockets of those who care nothing for Squaw's natural beauty..
The time has come to stop this horrid scheme to ruin one of California's most naturally magnificent areas.
With water on the minds of everyone who loves the mountains and whose greates: fear is the continuing draught with its devastating aftermath, how can an intelligent human being even contemplate such a massive "project."
Please do not allow this Plan to be approved.
Sincerely,
Margaret Sparks
1407 Oxen Run
Truckee, CA.

Placer County, Planning Services Division
3091 County Center Drive Suite 190
Auburn, CA 95603
Attention: Maywan Krach, Community Development Technician

RE: Village at Squaw Valley Specific Plan Project Notice of Preparation Scoping Comment

Dear Ms. Krach,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Notice of Preparation (NOP) of a Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the proposed Village at Squaw Valley Specific Plan (Project). My husband and I are long-time skiers at Squaw Valley; my husband started skiing at Squaw in the 1970's. Skiing and recreating at Squaw is an important aspect of our life. We understand that some development will occur at Squaw Valley, but request that any development maintain Squaw's skiing heritage and "The Soul of Skiing."

Squaw Valley Public

Squaw Valley, with its Olympic heritage, is primarily a ski mountain and as such any development should keep that focus in mind. Large, sprawling commercial and residential development in close proximity to the ski mountain is not in keeping with that primary focus. One of our many concerns is with parking and access to the ski lifts. Our family has owned property at Northstar since the early 1970's. Ever since I could drive, I began skiing at Squaw because of the exceptional ski terrain and ease of access to the terrain. With the recent development at Northstar, access to the lifts has become very difficult. Skiers are forced to walk thru a large commercial development to access the ski lifts. Because of this, I stopped skiing at Northstar and returned to Squaw but as this seems to be the intent of this proposed development I will need to re-consider my allegiance to Squaw.

One of the primary draws of Squaw over Northstar is the excellent access to the ski lifts, primarily the Far East chairlift. From looking at the Figure 5.18 of the Specific Plan it appears that the Far East chairlift will be completely surrounded by a condo development. This needs to be noted in the EIR as the Far East chair is currently the main access to the mountain for many daily skiers and hindering access to the lift would impact the access of Squaw Valley to the skiing public. If anything, future development of Squaw Valley should improve access to the mountain, not reduce it.

Of personal concern to us, is the continued focus by the proposed Project on "resort visitors" who would park quickly and stay at the resort, with little focus or consideration of day skiers/visitors. By continuing the focus on resort visitors, the proposed Project is effectively alienating many long-time skiers and visitors. Although changes have been made to the proposed Project, such as retaining some day-use parking at the base, it is unclear how such parking would be connected to chair lifts. Funneling day skiers to focal points such as the Funitel or Tram does not improve public access to the mountain. Development should concentrate in efficiently providing direct access from public parking areas to the ski lifts. Surrounding existing chairlifts (Far East) with private condo developments effectively cutting them off from public access should not be allowed as this is in direct conflict with the interests of the skiing public. Thus, the EIR must fully analyze circulation, including circulation of day skiers.

Aesthetics

Driving up Squaw Valley Road (a County-designated science roadway) and coming upon the view that is Squaw Valley is awe-inspiring. As indicated in the Initial Study (IS, p. 2-4) "even with modified slopes, the valley and mountain viewshed is visually appealing," however, the proposed Project may result in adverse effects to scenic vistas. In particular the maximum proposed building height is 108 feet (approximately 10 stories). Buildings of this height will destroy the viewshed from Squaw Valley Road, the base of Squaw Valley and from existing residences, and are not context sensitive given the existing development. The EIR must fully analyze these impacts.

Transportation

Traffic on Highway 89 getting to Squaw Valley can take hours from Truckee on powder days. We have personally experienced traffic which has backed up all the way down Highway 89 to West River Road and then down West River Road almost to the intersection of West River Road and Bridge Road in Truckee. With additional housing units, and more concentrated parking for day use skiers, traffic and circulation have the potential to become even more impacted. This will not only have adverse effects on the Highway 89 level of service, but will continue to impact the community of Truckee, as well as public and emergency services. Therefore, the EIR must carefully and thoroughly analyze impacts to traffic and circulation.

Further, the EIR must accurately state the current public parking capacity and compare it with the proposed public parking capacity. Parking that is "preferred", "VIP", or only for tenants of the development must be identified as such. The projection of 3 persons per vehicle in order to allow parking for 10,663 day skiers seems too high. An average of 2 persons per car is a more accurate which would allow for approximately 6,000 day skiers. The EIR must fully evaluate parking capacity, and provide information on how the number of day skiers per vehicle was calculated.

Water Supply

A water supply assessment must be prepared for the proposed Project. The proposed Project plans the use of groundwater wells. The depletion of groundwater, and groundwater recharge could have long-term adverse effects on water supply in the valley. This could impact not only the flows in Squaw Creek, but also other sensitive resources such as wetlands, and the plants and animals dependent on surface flows.

Additionally, the SVPSD is currently evaluating a water transfer from Martis Valley to the SVPSD. If available water supplies of the SVPSD are inadequate to meet the demand of the full build out of the proposed Project without the Martis Valley water, the water transfer from Martis Valley must be evaluated as part of the Project, and fully analyzed in the proposed Project's EIR, not as a separate project.

Please continue to provide us notice of the progress this Project. Please address all future notices regarding the progress of this Project to:

Tom and Amy Sparks
1430 Arch Street

Berkeley, Ca 94708
forestguru@yahoo.com

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment on the NOP.

Respectfully,

Tom and Amy Sparks

Maywan Krach

From: Kevin Starr <kmstarr@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, March 21, 2014 9:16 AM
To: Placer County Environmental Coordination Services
Subject: Attention: Maywan Krach

Hello,
I'm writing in regard to the Squaw Valley village expansion. I am concerned with the scope and size of the current project and would like to know, how they are going find a suitable water supply without stealing it from an adjacent community? I would also like to know, how they are going to mitigate traffic impacts on an already congested HWY 89? And lastly, where are the facts and numbers proving justification for expanding the Village when the current Village sits vacant for most of the non-winter months?
Regards,
Kevin Starr

Maywan Krach

From: Rick Stephens <stephens@zks.com>
Sent: Monday, March 24, 2014 5:20 AM
To: Placer County Environmental Coordination Services
Subject: Squaw Valley Specific Plan

Dear Maywan Krach, Community Development Technician,

I live in the Placer County of Truckee. I have NO objections to the density and proposed additions to Squaw Valley. I support additional development in Squaw Valley, especially if the parking is moved underground. That huge expanse of blacktop parking lot is a giant eyesore. Again I support the new specific plan.

However, as a resident of Martis Valley, I am concerned about Squaw Valley Public Service District's need for a "Redundant Water Source" for its current customers and future customers from the new specific plan. SVPSD is looking to take water from Martis Valley and pump it to Squaw Valley in order to give KSL a "Will Serve Letter". Martis Valley ground water is the sole source of water for all of the residents of Martis Valley. There may be sufficient ground water in Martis Valley to "share" with Squaw Valley; however, with global warming will the ground water be sufficient to provide for Martis Vally "overlayers" and provide water to "outlayers" like Squaw Valley? Will SVPSD lower the water table causing Martis Valley wells to have to be deeper? Will Martis Valley "overlayers" be forced into a Adjucation lawsuit to protect its water source. Water is my serious concern to this Master Plan.

Rick Stephens
7975 Lahontan Drive
Truckee, CA 96161
530-550-8309

To:
Maywan Krach,
Community Development Technician
Placer County, Planning Services Division
3091 County Center Drive Suite 190
Auburn, CA 95603

Fr:
David Stepner
1064 Lanny Lane
PO Box 3005
Olympic Valley, CA 96146
6 March 2014

The following are my comments on the revised NOP issued by Placer County on Feb 21, 2014 in reference to for the Proposed Village at Squaw Valley Specific Plan.

My comments related to these areas:

1) Visual Resources;

The Squaw Valley General Plan and Land Use Ordinance (SVGPLUO) says
"*Natural features--primarily the mountain slopes, the peaks, the meadow and adjoining area, and the watercourses-provide the key identifying characteristics of the valley. These features are easily discernible. The degree to which they may be altered by man without adversely affecting their aesthetic value must be considered in reviewing each proposed development project.*"

While the illustrative drawing in the Specific Plan states very clearly that it is but one concept and therefore cannot be considered to be the actual plan, it does give some view into the developers' thinking. In that regard, they violate this element of the SVGPLUO. Addressing specifically the Village Commercial Core area, the buildings tend to be oriented east-west at heights at 108' maximum. This orientation offers minimal view corridors to the mountains to the south, the buildings cast huge shadows (up to 1.7X their height at the winter solstice), and blocks the views to the mountains from Squaw Valley Rd and potentially the homes in the hills to the north.

Alternative layouts should be considered that minimize this issue, ideally by having N-S be the principal orientation, which would minimize all the stated issues. The issue for the developer is

that the views from the rooms will be less ideal, but that should not provide the rationale to violate the SVGPLUO.

2) Population, Employment, and Housing;

The SVGPLUO says "*To develop this potential, this Plan proposes an integrated and balanced set of policies and standards for land development. The plan allows growth in Squaw Valley to reach a seasonal-peak, overnight residential population of about 11-12,000; maximum skier capacity would be 17,500 people per day.*" This limit is cited in the Specific Plan.

There are perhaps 650 homes, 317 non-hotel condo rooms, and perhaps 920 hotel-condo rooms, making for a total of ~1900 dwelling units. Many of the smaller units (eg in the current Village) have made modifications to sleep additional people in lofts, for example. And many of the homes have multiple bedrooms and are used as ski leases. As a result, during the busiest periods (eg Christmas, MLK, etc) it is reasonable to assume that perhaps 80% of the units are occupied and 5-6 people (including kids) average might be in residence. This alone would bring us close to 12,000 limit. Add in 750 units more, with multiple bedrooms and/or lockoffs and the limit will definitely be reached.

There should be some effort made to canvas the affected region to assess if this limit is already being breached.

3) Land Use and Forest Resources and Hazardous Materials and Hazards

One of the zoning changes being requested is a change a section of land from CP and FR to V-HC in order to construct a maintenance building. This facility will be the location of vehicle maintenance and potentially propane tanks. As this parcel is surrounded by residential units, both existing and planned, careful analysis of noise and hazardous leaks should be carefully and explicitly analyzed.

4) Noise

The Specific Plan states "*Construction noise levels could potentially exceed the daytime hourly and maximum standard of 55 and 70 A-weighted sound levels (dBA), respectively, and/or the nighttime performance standards defined by the Placer County Code.*" And further it states "*The project long-term operations could result in the exposure of people to long term operational noise levels and additional noise levels may exceed the applicable County noise standards.*"

The Placer County Code clearly states " *Unless exempted under Section 9.36.030, it is unlawful to create noise which exceeds the sound level standards in Table 7.5, as measured at the at the property line of any affected sensitive receptor, or to exceed the ambient sound level by five dBA; whichever is greater*".

There is no reason why the developer should be granted an exemption or that there should be any need to exceed these limits. This fact should be especially sensitive given that there is only one two mile road into the development area, and for its entire length it is bounded by long standing residential units.

5) Traffic

The County code states "*These conditions are expressed in Placer County Minute Order 90-08, and include the following requirements:*
Construction noise emanating from any construction activities for which a Grading or Building Permit is required is prohibited on Sundays and Federal Holidays, and shall only occur Monday through Friday, 6:00 am to 8:00 pm (during daylight savings); Monday through Friday, 7:00 am to 8:00 pm (during standard time); and Saturdays, 8:00 am to 6:00 pm. Construction equipment must be properly maintained, and vehicle staging areas shall be located as far as possible from existing noise-sensitive uses."

During the construction of the current Squaw Valley Village, these time limits (apparently) were followed, but the impact on the residential units closely abutting the development site was horrendous. In view of the fact that there is only the one access road into Squaw Valley, it would seem appropriate for the County to issue a specific modification of these hours for the proposed development – for example, "Construction Trucks, including building material deliveries, should be prevented from using Squaw Valley Road before 8 am and after 4 pm. No construction or construction delivery vehicles should be allowed on weekends and holidays." Furthermore, consideration should be given to construction vehicle access along Squaw Valley Road in winter time when substantial snow might be on the road. The potential for a horrific accident on the narrow, two lane road is high. No construction or construction delivery vehicles should be allowed on the road until it has been effectively plowed (including shoulders) down to the pavement level.

6) Quality of Life

While not specifically stated as a heading for the dEIR, this could be a substantial factor for the residents of Squaw Valley in terms of traffic, noise, dust, etc and the potential for loss of property values in view of the 20 year construction horizon contemplated by the developer. It may be a desirable place to buy or build once the development is complete, but it surely will not be during all the disruption.

The County should insist that the developer compensate the residents (full and part-time) of Squaw Valley in terms of free access to developed amenities, shuttle buses for transport to the ski mountain, perhaps passes for the ski mountain, or other forms of "showing appreciation".

Thank you
David Stepner

Maywan Krach

From: Cindy Stewart <alohadonner@msn.com>
Sent: Monday, March 24, 2014 4:07 PM
To: Placer County Environmental Coordination Services
Subject: Village at Squaw Valley Specific Plan Comment

Placer County
Planning Services Division
Attn: Maywan Krach

Dear Sir/Madam,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed development by KSL in the Village at Squaw Valley. Our family has owned property on the Truckee River along Highway 89 for close to 100 years and we have watched development increase throughout the region. Our family is opposed to an increase in development in the region for several reasons directly affecting us as well as reasons that may not specifically have an impact upon us but the environment in general.

We own a home and two parcels approximately within 1 mile to the entrance of Squaw Valley and access Highway 89 from Bridge #8. The increased traffic that this development will create is a concern as we pull out and turn off of Hwy 89. My grandfather used to tell us about when he rode a horse & buggy on the dirt road which is now Hwy 89. Now you are often risking your life when you turn due to the high rate of speed that traffic travels. Even though the speed limit is 55 mph, traffic often flows faster that this. We witnessed several accidents near Bridge #6, #7 & #8 this past summer. Visitors seem to still think they are on a major freeway after exiting from Hwy 80 to Hwy 89 and are not aware that homeowners along the river often pull out onto and need to slow down to turn off of 89. We believe that the increase number of visitors to the area and this limited access from Hwy 80 will only create a more dangerous situation for homeowners along the Truckee River.

An increase in vehicle traffic due to an increase of visitors to the KSL development will also create an increase in noise and will directly affect our quiet enjoyment as property owners.

Another concern is the limited supply of water that is available in the aquifer that supplies Squaw Valley homeowners and the current businesses. Since the aquifer extends approx. 1 mile from the center this may impact the water supply of the residents in the area and along the Truckee River. Currently, many cabins rely on springs or wells for their water. Also if the proposed "8 mile pipe" is implemented and is built along Hwy 89 this will impact homeowners along the Truckee River during the construction phase with noise and traffic. Also relating to the water supply would be the increase fire danger due to an increase of visitors and buildings in the area.

Another concern that we have as homeowners along the Truckee River is the possible increase in sediment/pollution flowing from Squaw Creek into the Truckee River. We highly recommend that all steps are taken to prevent this as well as steps to preserve the Squaw Creek watershed and increase the BMP requirements to ensure excellent erosion control. As a homeowner that has seen many floods, the stormwater management is an integral concept of high importance when considering this project.

For these reasons above, I represent our family and the homeowners in the nearby cabin associations in opposing any development proposed by KSL in the Squaw Valley Specific Plan.

There are many other reasons that our family is opposed to the development as well. The scale & intensity including the number of rooms and footprint of the whole project is too immense for this small condensed valley. Also, some features such as the water park are unnecessary and are out of character for the type of guests that come to Squaw Valley. The energy consumption that will be needed before, during & into the future will be immense as well. For these reasons it should be "mandatory" to check all the energy saving requirements & not just "recommended" in the list shown in the Specific Plan. All options such as alternative energy, solar, water recycling, green building, etc. should be a requirement for this project. Also, the increased number of visitors will reduce the enjoyment of skiing/snowboarding due to increased numbers of riders on the mountain.

For these reasons above, we recommend that this project be denied. If it is not denied, please consider specifications that will address our concerns.

Thank you for your consideration.

Cindy Stewart & family
PO Box 3025
Olympic Valley, CA 96146

Kris Thomas
10339 Jeffery Pine Rd
Truckee, CA 96161
(530) 414-1149
SkiWithKris@Gmail.com

RECEIVED
MAR 19 2014
ENVIRONMENTAL COORDINATION SERVICES

Placer County, Planning Services Division
Attn: Maywan Krach, Community Development Technician
3091 County Center Drive, Suite 190
Auburn, CA 95603
(530) 745-3132
cdraecs@placer.ca.gov

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing as a full time twelve year resident of Truckee and as an individual who has committed his life to a passion for spending time in the mountains and sharing that passion with thousands of visitors to the Lake Tahoe region as a ski instructor at Squaw Valley, I am writing to express my concerns over the proposed development in Olympic Valley by KSL Capital Partners. For the record, I would like to see a more economically stable reality for full time residents in the Tahoe area, but after my review of the proposal from the developers, I feel that the risks involved with this plan far outweigh the potential economic boost that KSL promises but fails to prove. My concerns revolve around preserving the existing environment and culture that make Olympic Valley a desirable place to do business. I am worried that the developers are blind to the long-term effects of the project lowering the general quality of life in Olympic Valley.

My initial concern is regarding the availability of clean drinking water for the valley as a whole. California is in drought conditions now, and I am unsure that there is enough water in the Olympic Valley Aquifer to provide for the proposed developments currently or in the future. Building this project based on a future promise of transporting water from 20+ miles away is irresponsible planning. If the existing system will not support the development independently, it must not move forward. Lets take the cues from our environment on how and when to develop. The EIR must include a comprehensive water supply assessment that takes into account long-term availability of water supplies.

Next, getting around the Tahoe basin is already time consuming during most weekends and holiday periods. I am worried that the developers have failed to fully address the traffic flow problems that: a) increasing the room count and subsequent amenities will create, and b) years of construction will cause to our daily commutes. These developers do not live, work, play and commute in this area and they fail to address these issues in the literature I have been privy to. This project promises to deliver 300,000 additional visitors to Olympic Valley yearly and the EIR must provide clear numbers on the traffic effects on people's daily lives and the environmental impacts of this many more cars driving through the CA-89 corridor.

Finally, I have chosen Truckee, California as my home because of the pristine environment, quiet night skies and majestic vistas during the day. The EIR needs to take into account the problems that this much development will create for the fragile squaw creek environment, and downriver to the Truckee River. Mistakes regarding hazardous materials will be made during construction and the effects on our mountain environment could be disastrous. The EIR needs to consider how the protection of our ecosystem will be ensured during and after this project's scope. One thing that helps bring and retain visitors and residents to Olympic Valley is the amazing night skies we experience regularly. It is necessary that the EIR directly addresses the levels of cumulative light pollution this project will create to maintain the majestic night sky that we currently enjoy. Olympic Valley has one of the most remarkable views found in any ski town, with the drastic contrast of a stunning rock face jutting abruptly out of the bottom of a beautiful meadow. The view alone is an element that keeps people coming back to our beautiful valley from all over the world. It would be a shame to corrupt that view with even more view obstructing buildings. The proposal to create new buildings that stand over 100 feet tall above the bottom of the valley is also cause for concern. The EIR must analyze the impacts of the proposed project and its multiple 108 foot tall buildings on scenic views of Squaw.

I write about these topics fervently because I plan on spending the rest of my life making a living, raising children, skiing, mountain biking, hiking, and generally loving my life in one of the most beautiful places in California. I am a proponent of creating a more viable economy for residents of Olympic Valley and the surrounding communities. The risks involved with failing to consider the total effects of this proposed development threaten to compromise the ways that residents and visitors alike experience this amazing place. I urge you to move forward with an eye towards preserving this amazing environment we are so lucky to be able to enjoy. Please do not let KSL steamroll their plans through so they can make money on our beloved slice of the sierra without executing the proper diligence in examining their proposals and the effects on our environment and community. John Muir would urge us all to handle any development in the sierra by using "Not blind opposition to progress, but opposition to blind progress..."

Sincerely,

Kris Thomas

Maywan Krach

From: Denise Wall <denisewall@mac.com>
Sent: Sunday, March 23, 2014 9:46 AM
To: Placer County Environmental Coordination Services
Cc: Jennifer Montgomery
Subject: parking and water

Although KSL cut back on the size of their expansion they have not left enough parking for us residents and day skiers.

We had a repeat of the overflow parking again this winter forcing many many cars to be parked on Squaw Valley road all the way down to Victor road. Last year the police ran out of tickets when tagging them. I don't know if they ran out this year but the parking area that KSL has designated in their plans cut down the day parking by half. That area is not sufficient for residents and day skiers.

California is in its 3rd driest year and we do not know what lies ahead. For the last decade we have been encouraged to save water especially with landscaping. Many of us have not planted grass and other plants, etc, to conserve water. How can KSL justify their water use when we have been rationing ourselves for many years. Some one is pulling the wool over our eyes!

Sincerely,
Denise Wall

24 March 2014

To: Placer County
Planning Services Division

Reading that so few people commented on KSL's development plans for the Village at Squaw didn't surprise me: the information available is a slick marketing effort with very few details. How can one comment?

As a 20 year property owner in the valley and living through the truncated development of the village by Intrawest, I will express my concerns with the proposed 20-25 year development of the village. First, a lot can happen in the next 20 years to change things, just look at the previously approved development plans as well as the changes in KSL's plans over that last 5 years of their commitment of capital to the resort. Additionally, one cannot ignore the weather and the changes in our climate. There is no guarantee to "build it and they will come". It also has to be really asked if this will be a four-season development or something that will just strain the resources 6 months of the year?

I welcome the scaled back plans of the development with the number of units, beds, building heights and initial "beach"-adventure park. However do you really need to develop the area where the existing ropes course is and where so many people access the Wilderness? Despite the desire to make Squaw a destination resort, it is a "locals" mountain, one for day trip and bay area weekend visitors, and it is nice to see they will continue to welcome this group with surface parking. Also, kudos to providing employee housing and maintaining the heritage of the area by incorporating the existing Olympic House and Members Locker room, but when looking at the interactive map, the size of the area to be developed has really spread things out and are they expecting access to be purely pedestrian?

However, what is not addressed or discussed is what matters to me as a resident and the benefits that should be accrued to those of us in the valley with a development anywhere near this size. So much of the specifics of the plan is working with what is currently available and not improving the necessary services in the community:

-Natural Gas being brought into the valley and developed/delivered into the different neighborhoods
-Updating infrastructure for High Speed internet and underground cable. DSL is antiquated and Suddenlink incurs lengthy outages in storms.
-Traffic on the main road; it is a 2 lane road and there will be increased traffic regardless of any shuttle or use of traffic cones for a "3rd" lane. Have you ever tried to cross Squaw Valley Road to go in the opposite flow of traffic let alone to cross on foot on the weekend or during peak traffic flows?
-Demands on the aquifer- I do not want to loose my pure artesian water

I understand that the EIR will begin to address the above but benefits to the existing residents should be part of the overall plan, not just an element of what is necessary to gain approval. I love my mountain neighborhood, the close access (albeit necessary with a car) to a skier's mountain and the wilderness beyond; development can be positive and I only ask that you not just look at the impact of the size of this development on the valley but also on the viability of the size of this development – no one wants a ghost town at the end of the road.

Natalie Wilson
1050 Russell Road
POB 3058
Olympic Valley, CA 96146