



**MINUTES OF THE SPECIAL MEETING OF
SQUAW VALLEY MUNICIPAL ADVISORY COUNCIL
May 14, 2016**

Pursuant to notice given, a special meeting of the Squaw Valley Municipal Advisory Council (SVMAC) was held on Saturday May 14, 2016 in the Mountain Room at Plumpjack Squaw Valley Inn in Olympic Valley, California.

1. Call to Order

STEPNER called the meeting to order at 3:02 PM. A quorum was established.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Romack, Adriani, Stepner, Strange, Heneveld, and Parker

MEMBERS ABSENT: Lange

STAFF PRESENT: Montgomery, Kastan, and Friedman

There were approximately 300 people in the audience.

2. MAC Member Introductions

a. Introduction of new SVMAC member, Greg Parker

All members introduced themselves.

b. Recusal of MAC members

HENEVELD and STEPNER recused themselves from the rest of today's meeting due to a conflict on the action item.

3. Approval of Agenda

ADRIANI/STRANGE/UNANIMOUS

4. Public Comment

MIKE ROGY read a statement asking for more civility in the discourse.

JOE IMBACH from the Carpenter's Union spoke in favor of the proposed Plumpjack project because it puts union members to work.

ADRIANI announced upcoming trail work on the Shirley Canyon Trail. Volunteer Day is scheduled for July 9, 2016. For more information, go to trucketrails.org.

5. Action Item

- A. Recommendation on the Village at Squaw Valley Specific Plan project – The specific Plan proposes to amend the Squaw Valley General Plan and Land Use Ordinance in order to comprehensively plan development of an all season resort community consisting of up to 850 fractional ownership resort-residential and guest accommodation units with up to 1,493 bedrooms including hotels and fractional ownership vacation homes. The project would develop new employee housing for up to 300 total employees including 201 new full time equivalent employees. Commercial, retail, and recreational uses including retail shopping, restaurants and bars, entertainment and the Mountain Adventure Center, an all season**

indoor-outdoor recreation facility, would be implemented. The project would complete comprehensive stream restoration of the Squaw Creek Trapezoidal Channel and the Olympic Channel through construction of widened stream channels, sediment control features, energy dissipation, revegetation, and an open space interpretive park with a class 1 trail, stream observation deck and interpretive kiosks. The project would also construct enhanced public recreation facilities including trails and public serving improvements such as parking, and flush restrooms including one at the Squaw Valley Park – Alex Fisch, Supervising Planner – Placer County Planning Services, and Chevis Hosea, Vice President of Development, Squaw Valley Real Estate LLC

ALEX FISCH provided background of the County's involvement and the review process to this point. The draft EIR was released in May 2015 for a 60 day public comment period. There were over 350 responses and all were reviewed as the final EIR was prepared. The final EIR has been out for comment for about a month. It is anticipated the Planning Commission will hear this project at its June 23 meeting. FISCH noted a Reduced Density Alternative (50% reduction of the project) was analyzed by Placer County in the draft EIR.

The applicant CHEVIS HOSEA narrated a Power Point presentation that included the history of Squaw Valley and components of the Squaw Valley General Plan with the Land Use Ordinance and Zoning. He presented a timeline of the application process and reductions made to the scope of the project as a result of public comment and work with the Squaw Valley Design Review Committee (SVDRC). The only recommendation from the DRC that was not done was to reduce the height of Mountain Adventure Center to less than 96'. HOSEA discussed the construction schedule, saying total build out would be realized in about 25 years. He spoke to concerns and potential mitigations. For example traffic flows will be addressed by contributions to expand public transit, carpool incentives, and additional parking. Compliance levels for greenhouse gas emissions are only identified up to 2020. The State has not issued requirements beyond that time, however this project meets current standards and should meet what are anticipated to be more stringent requirements after 2020. HOSEA said there are benefits to the community, including new trails, recreation, and about \$2 million for the restoration of Squaw Creek. Additionally, the project will provide increased Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) collections, about 1400 new full- and part-time jobs, and a commitment to provide transfer fees on new and re-sales, which could total well over \$50 million. Those funds will be dedicated to environmental initiatives.

FISCH presented details of the project and land use implications. About 85 acres of the 93 available are being used for the main project. There is an additional parcel closer to Highway 89 that is earmarked for employee housing and a delivery hub. The proposed land use designations are similar to what currently exists. FISCH displayed changes made between the April 2015 Illustrative Concept Plan and the April 2015 Concept Plan that is included in the final EIR. FISCH discussed the restoration plan for Squaw Creek and showed photo simulations of various components of the project.

FISCH reviewed the environmental impacts analyzed in the final EIR per CEQA requirements, including the "significant and unavoidable" impacts having to do with cultural resources, visual resources, noise, particularly due to the extended construction period, greenhouse gases and climate change, and transportation and circulation.

Council members asked questions about the presentations, in particular clarification on the transfer fees, anticipated financing, anticipated travel times suggested by the applicant, parking, and employee housing.

The topic was open to public comment. Twenty-four people spoke, both individuals and representatives from organizations including Sierra Watch, Friends of Squaw Valley, Friends of Squaw Creek, and the Squaw Valley Homeowners Association Forum. Concerns were raised regarding the environmental impacts of the project, both short- and long-term, the scientific studies conducted, and how the project fits in with the values of the community. Four speakers were favor of the project citing proposed benefits. The gist of the rest of the comments was that the project is too large and the proposed benefits are outweighed by the noise,

environmental impacts, and general loss of “sense of place.” In particular there was opposition to the proposed Mountain Adventure Center, with one speaker saying there is enough adventure outside in Squaw Valley. There was general consensus that “finishing” the existing Village is necessary, but the scope of the proposed project is too big and the actual impacts to traffic, air and water quality, and noise have not been adequately addressed.

Public comment was closed and the Council deliberated the issue. Council members had concerns similar to those voiced during public comment on environmental impacts and the scope of the project as proposed.

The SVMAC’s motion to “recommend denial of the project as proposed.”

ADRIANI/PARKER/Motion carried 3:1. AYES: Lindsay Romack, Alisa Adriani, and Greg Parker. NO: Kevin Strange. Absent: Andrew Lange. Recused: Ed Heneveld and David Stepner.

The SVMAC’s motion to “recommend serious consideration be given to the project at a level approximately 50% or less of what is currently proposed subject to further research to support the conclusions previously reached in the draft EIR” PARKER/STRANGE/ Motion carried 3:1.

AYES: Lindsay Romack, Kevin Strange, and Greg Parker. NO: Alisa Adriani. Absent: Andrew Lange. Recused: Ed Heneveld and David Stepner.

6. Adjournment

There being no further business to come before the Council, the meeting was adjourned at 6:10 PM.

Respectfully submitted,
Judy Friedman, Recording Secretary