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
j.riessen@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 greatest 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. SWPSD 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