

*These minutes are a compilation of notes taken by several members of the audience and are NOT to be construed as the official minutes of the MAC meeting, which are produced by the County.*

## MINUTES of 8/1 MAC MEETING

Fred Ilfeld, speaking on behalf of Incorporate Olympic Valley (IOV), gave an update on the incorporation effort.

- Within a month, IOV collected signatures from a little more than 50 percent of valley registered voters. This completed the first step (have a petition signed by 25 percent or more of registered voters in a proposed town within a six-month period)
- They next intend to file a finished application, including the petition, a map of proposed town limits and a plan for public services, in two weeks with LAFCO
- If LAFCO accepts the application, IOV can begin negotiations with Placer County on a revenue agreement to ensure incorporation does not harm the county financially. In conjunction, LAFCO will commission a fiscal analysis to determine if the town would be viable. According to IOV, the proposed town would be financially solvent, generating an annual revenue of \$4.3 million, with expenses falling short of that figure.
- A public meeting would follow completion of the analysis, with a recommendation report from LAFCO's executive officer prepared beforehand.
- LAFCO then has the authority to approve, deny or conditionally approve the incorporation proposal.
- If approved, an election would follow in which a simple majority vote — more than 50 percent — must be in favor of incorporation in order for it to take effect.

Then we moved onto the agenda items, all concerning the KSL Village Plan.

## Minutes of 8/1 MAC meeting

There are three parts to this summary: (1) report by Chevis Hosea on the status of the Village plan, (2) report by Alex Fisch on the status of the County review, and (3) report on the Design Review Committee by Jennifer Montgomery

To understand these notes, some definitions and explanations are required. The 1983 Squaw Valley General Plan covers all the land use in the Valley and has detailed within it the zoning of this land (eg High Density Residential, Forest Recreational, etc). This Plan created a community Design Review Committee (DRC) that is required to review all commercial developments within Squaw Valley and residential units along Squaw Valley Road. The work of this Committee is governed by the 1985 Design Review Guidelines. Similar to the Squaw Valley Municipal Advisory Council (SVMAC), the SVDRC can only make recommendations to the County planners, but does provide community input into the process

As part of Squaw Valley Ski Holdings (SVSH), Squaw Valley Real Estate, LLC and its VP of development, Chevis Hosea, proposed Specific Plan basically creates a new General Plan for the 101 acres encompassing the proposed Village. That includes rezoning of some of the land and a set of Design Guidelines for that area. An analysis of these Design Guidelines has not been done to see how they compare to the 1985 DRC Guidelines (more on this later). The Specific Plan will have a layout and conceptual designs for the buildings; but these are only one possible implementation. The Specific Plan seeks only the entitlement to build within the area, within the restrictions of the Specific Plan Design Guidelines. It does not seek the specific approval to build anything.

It was pointed out that the 1983 General Plan zoning allows the creation of up to a maximum ~4000 bedrooms within the limits of the 101 acres.

### Update on Village at Squaw Valley Specific Plan and Phase 1A Project Plan by Chevis Hosea, VP SVRE

- The major news is that they are no longer seeking Phase 1A approval – that is, the proposal to actually build Phase 1A plan has been dropped. They will focus on

## Minutes of 8/1 MAC meeting

the Specific Plan and seek the entitlements for it.

- The project is in the draft EIR development phase, and they have been saying that they intended to keep the project static (“pencils down”). But they are now proposing changes that (they hope) would have minimum impact on the review timeline or the dEIR preparation. The number of units/bedrooms (2184) has not changed. Nor has the maximum height (125’) changed (max height in current village is 60–70’). Among the changes are:
  - The creation of a park at the western end of the property (near Shirley Lake trailhead) possibly including multi-use courts, kids’ playground, PAR course, and terminus of the bike trail. They are in discussions with County Parks about this. KSL would build it and turn it over to the County. The idea of including a swimming pool was discussed with the County, but the County requires a guaranteed source of maintenance and upkeep funds. TOT cannot be used for this purpose. This subject will be discussed in future communications.
  - Squaw Creek rehabilitation changes
  - Break-up of the buildings along the south side of Squaw Creek to allow view lines (specifics still being discussed).
  - Relocation of bike trail to north side of Squaw Valley Meadows condos.
  - Covered parking in lot M with 5 fractional ownership cabins on top (number of total fractional ownership cabins is same as before)
  - Maintaining (and rehabilitating) the current snow making building, thereby allowing building F to be made smaller (3 stories)
  - Addition of a fire substation near building F (details under discussion with Squaw Valley Fire)
  - Squaw Kids building to be rebuilt in its current location, not moved to building C. Building A will be made smaller to accommodate it.
  - The BallRoom (aka conference center) is moved to the East of the current Village (opposite the current Conference Center). It will be a large open room to accommodate up to ~800 people, which can be divided into separate rooms as well. It can also be used for Village events.
  - They are surveying people about what to put in Grand Camp and how much they might pay for it (not sure who is getting them). It is possible that some

## Minutes of 8/1 MAC meeting

of Grand Camp will be outside – not all will be inside. Max height is still 108’.

- Relooking at the location of Members’ Locker Room, previously set for eastern wing of Building B. Sounds like they are considering some of the footprint of Grand Camp (which makes it further away from the Funitel).
- Helipad is now included
- Addition of single lane road to south of Golf Course, to be used for emergency egress and shuttles. They are working on agreement with Resort at Squaw Creek owner.
- The Olympic Channel (drainage down from Red Dog) is shown.  
=> a drawing with these changes should be posted to their facebook page perhaps by Monday or Tuesday.
- The latest version of the Specific Plan was published in June 2013, and has never been distributed (except recently to the DRC members) . There is an update coming within several weeks. AND the proposed design guidelines may also change. The layout is mapped as zones, and each zone has specifics about what is proposed to be built within it. (The Specific Plan on the County website or FofSV archive uses this as well. Refer to Appendix B). The new specific plan will propose new phasing, but there is no project plan, so the phasing can change. And there will be concepts of each building, including roof lines, window treatments, and other aesthetics, but these can also change when the project plans are submitted at a later date.
- The impact on the NOP and dEIR will be discussed by Alex (next)

### Status of Village at Squaw Valley Draft EIR and Related Issues – Alex Fisch, County Planning Department (and manager of this project for the county).

- As the Specific Plan is changing and the changes have not been submitted to the County, the wheels are spinning slowly right now on the dEIR. The County is working on things that would not be impacted by the changes.
- The rationale Alex gave for why KSL has pulled the Phase 1A Project Plan is that it was getting too confusing

## Minutes of 8/1 MAC meeting

- Water assessment is ongoing, and should be presented to PSD ~ Oct (same as what we heard at PSD meeting three days ago).
- The biggest change in scope to the dEIR now that the Phase 1A Project Plan has been pulled is that it is required to be programmatic only. For example, regarding the water and wastewater assessments, they need only "assess" there is adequate water and can wait to "verify" the water only when a specific project is being proposed. But since a lot of detailed, specific work was already done by the consultants assuming Phase 1A was part of the submission, the dEIR will have a higher level of analysis and specificity than might otherwise be included.
- Included in the dEIR will be
  - An interactive 3D model (using the conceptual building designs included with the Specific Plan)
  - Parks and Recreation Plan
  - Transportation and Traffic – this is an area of big concern, and therefore will have significant details and analysis
  - Noise – also will have a high degree of detail
  - Lot 4 (opposite PSD) Options
- There will be an Addendum NOP issued covering the changes to the Specific Plan, probably in the next 8 to 12 weeks, followed by a 30 day public comment period. This Addendum will deal with changes such as
  - Stream enhancement program
  - The west end park
  - Linear park along the creek
  - The EVA/shuttle road to the south of the Golf Course
  - Lot 4 (employee housing, parking structure)
- Alex responded to a question concerning the process that would be followed when a project plan is submitted (for construction of buildings).
  - The entitlement requests would be evaluated either by the Board of Supervisor or the Planning Department, depending on the scope and compliance with Specific Plan.

## Minutes of 8/1 MAC meeting

- Would a supplemental EIR be required? – this would depend on whether the project plan is consistent with the Specific Plan, or is it necessary to expand on some things in the EIR that were not covered in sufficient detail
- Visual and Scenic analysis would have to be included
- Supervisor Montgomery indicated that the project plan would be submitted to the SV Design Review Committee for consideration.
- The Pool at the newly proposed west end park.
  - There are a high degree of liability and maintenance costs associated with the County having a pool, and a GUARANTEED source and flow of funds for this would have to be approved. Area 2 Parks Dedication fees can be used to develop but not maintain facilities; TOT has some discretion but Jennifer said, in general, cannot be used for this purpose of maintenance.
  - Followup discussions with Jennifer and County Parks will be held to understand the options (most likely has to be an incremental parcel tax to be approved by some ballot measure).

### The role of the Squaw Valley Design Review Committee – Jennifer Montgomery, District 5 Placer County Supervisor

- The 1983 Squaw Valley General Plan created a community Design Review Committee (DRC) that is required to review all commercial developments within Squaw Valley, all multifamily dwellings, and residential units along Squaw Valley Road. The work of this Committee is governed by the 1985 Design Review Guidelines. (See handout below)
- It is now acknowledged that the DRC should have been included as part of the process all along, so it is now being inserted. Alex Fisch will manage the DRC meetings and process, communicating between the DRC and the County.
- Jennifer read some sections from the General Plan and DRC Guidelines that surely seemed as if it will be required that the Specific Plan require the new construction to “blend in” with the existing structures (IntraWest Village); it has verbage as “compatible, “in scale”, “compliment”, “harmonize”. It is also clear that there is not enough specificity to make the DRC process straightforward.

## Minutes of 8/1 MAC meeting

- There are currently 5 members of the DRC, appointed by the County. The ability of individual members to deal with the KSL Specific Plan proposal is currently being reviewed for conflict of interest issues. This will all be settled by the first meeting on Sept 5<sup>th</sup>. Jennifer will fill any vacancies in the 5 member team, and asked for people to apply for the positions, especially those with appropriate design or architectural backgrounds.
- The June 2013 Specific Plan has been sent to the DRC members, though it will be superseded by the revised Specific Plan in a few weeks. That is to get them started on getting up to speed.

---

## Jennifer handout

### ROLE OF THE DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE

#### SQUAW VALLEY GENERAL PLAN

1. During the time that this General Plan was developed a Squaw Valley Municipal Advisory Council and a Squaw Valley Design Review Committee were formed which represent many interests in Squaw Valley. These groups have proposed the development of a long-term mechanism to ensure a high degree of "local home rule". (page 54)
2. The county commits itself to cooperating and working with the MAC and DRC to assure that no new developments within the valley are permitted without the opportunity for a full evaluation by and recommendation from the MAC and/or DRC. (page 55)
3. One of the key concepts incorporated in this 1982 Plan is the development of a set of detailed design and performance standards to guide all future development in Squaw Valley. (page 55)
4. The Plan specifically recommends the preparation of a set of "design guidelines". Such a document, although advisory in nature, should address such issues as: signing, architecture, colors, building materials, landscaping, height and other elements of design (page 55)
5. the local Design Review Committee review and County review should be conducted concurrently. Initial review of preliminary development plans would thus be submitted to the County, forwarded to the Design Review Committee, and the comments returned to the applicant. Plans submitted for final approval would be similarly reviewed (page 56-57)

## Minutes of 8/1 MAC meeting

Note on Village Commercial District — Section 220 (Squaw Valley General Plan)  
220.16 — Height Restrictions: There should be no specific height limitations in this district, but height limits shall be set for particular developments through the design review process where other developed or developable parcels are affected by a proposed building. (page 87)

### SQUAW VALLEY DESIGN REVIEW GUIDELINES (March 1985)

1. The Squaw Valley General plan requires design review for all structures and signs that are constructed or modified in any commercial, industrial or multi-family residential district or single family residential lots along Squaw Valley Road (page 1).
2. The applicant obtains the Design Review application form and fee information from the Placer County Planning Department .(page 3)
3. The Placer County Planning Department sends the project plans to the Squaw Valley Design Review Committee and other county offices for comment. (page 3)

### Note on Site Plan (Squaw Valley Design Review Guidelines)

3. Site plans should be compatible with adjacent properties and streetscape in the placement of structures and uses (page 11)

### Note on ARCHITECTURE (Squaw Valley Design Review Guidelines)

1. Building design should complement and harmonize with neighboring buildings.
2. A building or project should be in scale with its immediate surroundings and with the area. (page 21)