

Notes from CAC Meeting - 2 Aug 2013

The meeting had three parts - (i) showing of new model incorporating all of Squaw Valley and Alpine Meadows ski areas and surrounding terrain, (ii) review of changes in proposal and process that were disclosed at the MAC meeting the night before, and (iii) presentation by Dave Griffith of the status of the transportation plan.

The model:

It is impressive to see the two areas laid out like this. The model is still being finished, and will open in about two to three weeks. Andy Wirth pointed out the portions of the two areas that are private and forest service owned. He discussed a little about the connecting lift between Squaw and Alpine, and said the discussions with Caldwell are ongoing. It is true that, when seen in this scale, the proposed village is quite small, but that is not really the point.

Andy did say they are working on getting more non-stop flights to Reno. More on this later, he said.

The Changes to the Proposal and Process:

A more complete discussion of this is in the Summary of the MAC meeting. But there was some (at least to me) new information provided

- The reduction in the size of the Village that occurred late Fall was driven by concerns about water and sewage. The current proposal (~1000 units, ~2000 rooms) was felt to be the maximum that these resources would comfortably allow.
- While they initially had an intense focus on speed of approvals, the demands from the County for detailed information about the Phase 1 plans caused them to be making decisions on buildings faster than the market research was providing direction. In a Board meeting within the past month, it was decided to withdraw the Phase 1 plan, so that market dynamics and building planning would be more at the same time.
- They confirmed that there will be a re-noticing the NOP, due out in 8-12 weeks. This will be followed by a 30 day public comment period. They did comment that

while there was a tremendous number of letters, etc on the first NOP, there was a lot of duplication. The concerns centered on a very few, oft repeated, items.

- Market research is now telling them that while there is reasonable demand for condo units in the \$1–\$1.5M range, there is also improving demand for product in the \$3–\$5M range. This may lead them to scale down the number of units in Building A, but make them bigger and more luxurious or provide a mix of the two.
- Market research continues to tell them that the fractional ownership units will be very popular, and they are seeking the flexibility to possibly turn other buildings into that format, away from condo-hotels.
- Olympic Park (at the west end) will need some organization to provide maintenance \$\$ if it is to be a Squaw Valley resident or other private park. Otherwise, it will be given over to be a public park. (DES – this still confuses me, and I will have a call with Andy Fisher of the County Parks Dept to try and understand it.). It is a phase 1 project.
- OVI has perpetual rights to park in lot M so it could not be included in KSL's plans. So, in return for some easement concessions, KSL agreed to build a parking structure over lot M, and OVI allowed them to build 5 fractional ownership units on top. They were unable to get the desired 27 fractional ownership units to fit on the 4 acres of undisturbed land originally designated for these units.
- They will most likely retain Children's World in its current location. Since this impinges on Building A on one side, they pushed it bigger out the other. This impinged on the Ballroom, so it was moved ("DD" on the image).
- No chance of Building "O" being accelerated since it is at the heart of Andy's mountain rehabilitation plans, and it will be the temporary home of some units whose locations are being moved.
- Grand Camp survey is underway (I got it today). Results expected in two months, and Chevis will share with CAC. Asking about indoors vs outdoors. Thinking is that it will wind up about 80–90,000 sq ft, but they will go for full entitlement.
- There is still interest in the Olympic Athletic Center – and Andy Wirth is driving this. It is being evaluated as part of Grand Camp.
- Building F is smaller as they are retaining present lift maintenance and snowmaking buildings. Added a fire substation and helipad/parking structure.

In response to a question, Chevis replied that they do not have any plans to limit the amount of time an owner can spend in their unit. Their previous history is that owners make so much money not occupying their units, that they self-limit their stays. The average over their properties is about 30 days per year. They will be including some units, probably in "H" and "J", that are extended stay (~ one week). These are designed more for full-unit rentals than for lock offs and more comfortable for 1 to 2 week vacations.

They still intend to submit a phase 1 centered on the "snow-beach" buildings. It would provide about 700 rooms (aka "keys") in addition to the 300 in the current Village. They would accelerate the approval of phase 1 by submitting a bond or at-risk letter committing them to the improvements required. Their experience with other Counties is that this has been found to be attractive.

In a conversation about the Members' Locker Room, Chevis asked if having Valet ski & boot handling would be an acceptable scheme versus a ski locker. He was commenting on the space the meeting area and lockers take up. There did not appear to be many Member Locker Room members present, but Ed and I said it would not work, as the skiers all come in within a short period of time and the staffing would be difficult. Comparisons to Vail, Deer Valley, Sun Valley and others are not too relevant.

The lot across from the PSD building is to provide housing for 216 employees (50% of the additional Full Time Equivalent employee additions) and 494 employee parking spots (for all employees). It could also be used for overflow day skier parking, but not clear how that works if employees are parking there.

The proposed EVA road is in phase 1.

Transportation Plan

This got badly crimped for time, so not sure we got the full message. Their plans are driven by mitigating the impacts that will appear in the DEIR. They are bringing on (multiple) consultants to help them work it all out. This is still a works-in-progress.

They have done a detailed survey of Squaw Valley Road, mapping it in detail, learning who owns what, and where easements are or should be. They might propose that where they can, they will make Squaw Valley Road a full time 3 lane road for turn lanes, traffic separation, etc, And where they cannot it will be double. It would still be coned triple lanes on the busy days, and (they say) the narrower sections slow the traffic down.

They are evaluating the transportation plan in 3 zones.

Zone 1 is intra-Village. They envision jitney-types running around above ground, and perhaps rail or other means running around on the podium level.

Zone 2 is Squaw Valley and Alpine. They envision perhaps 3 routes. The first is the current Squaw-Alpine interconnect bus line. With the EVA road, this would stop at the Resort and then go to Alpine, and vice versa. And then there would be two routes serving the residences in Squaw Valley - one route going to the East of Hidden Lake. And the other servicing to the West of Hidden Lake. The buses would go on a regular schedule (perhaps every 20 minutes) during peak hours and perhaps on-call at other times.

Zone 3 is outside Squaw Valley. They appear to have abandoned the idea of having parking lots in Truckee and Tahoe City and busing people from there. Instead they are focusing on providing bus service to where there are clusters of people - for example, large condo complexes (eg the Boulders near McD in Truckee). We talked a bit about Tahoe Donner, and Dave G will try to contact the HOA there for ideas on how to get them out of their cars.