

January 18, 2014 - SVPOA and KSL Meeting

Sally Brew opened, introduced Jim Porter as mediator, Chevis from KSL and Alex from Placer County

Meeting started with an intro video from Andy Wirth.

He thanked all those who had sent well wishes and prayers for his recovery.

He stated that for the last 1.5 years “they have been listening and studying” having held over 300 meetings and had 5,000 people through the Base Camp model. This was an unprecedented amount of public comment and opinion on this proposed project. He acknowledged the first plan has been divisive.

Out of this input and dialog came 3 elements that were important to the people:

- Respect for the mountain
- Preserve the Legacy
- Protect the Valley for future generations

The project is collaboration – investments are guided by the customer. “Spirit and Soul” of the mountains resonate with Andy, having lived and worked in the mountains all of his life.

He stated he is very proud of what his team has come up with in the new version. They have also reduced the “carbon footprint” by 15%, and are focused/leading the way on transit and recycling which are irrespective of the development proposal.

He was also emphatic that the Mountain Activity Center was NOT a water park. It is to be a world class training facility in addition to a recreation and activity center for guests.

.....

Chevis spoke next with his Power Point

He stated that of the approximate 100 acres in the valley, that only 5 acres were not currently or previously developed. Those 5 acres being near the ropes courses/Shirley Canyon for the fractional ownership homes. The other 95 acres are currently the parking lot or other development (previously disturbed).

In competing Alpine ski areas the average beds per skiable acre is 1.3 beds/ski acre; at Vail (their “#1 competitor”), the ratio is 1.6 beds/ski acre. Currently at Squaw/Alpine with 1100 beds, the ratio is 0.3 beds/ski acre. Since Squaw has 6000 ski acres (including Squaw and Alpine) it should have 7000 bedrooms. So, with adding 1500 beds this will make the ratio 0.5 beds/ski acre if their new plan is approved. Note it is hard to verify these numbers due to what is counted for Vail.

The initial proposal was for 3400 beds, then reduced to 2200 beds, then in July they stopped to reflect and retool. They are now looking at 1493 additional beds.

In choosing a project designer, Hart Howerton (Alpine Designer) was the winner of the initial planning. During their retreat, they enlisted the help of Epikos and two other design firms in their peer review. We believe that Hart Howerton is no longer under contract with KSL, replaced by Epikos, who has helped with this re-design.

Some of the Basic Adjustments to the former proposed development:

- Eliminate 700 beds
- Preserve Day Skier Experience
- Reduced heights of building or eliminated buildings near current condo structures (i.e. 3 stories now near OVI views, eliminated Buildings A and O near the Intrawest Village and the Lodge)
- Members Locker and “O” house room to remain (will build a 1:30 scale model of the 1960 Olympic Venue; they will most assuredly have interior developments but functions will remain)
- Will landscape around the perimeter of the surface parking area and along main N-S parking lot drive; they will add lighting to the parking lots
- Linear park adjacent to the creek will be easier to enhance because of elimination of buildings near the creek
- Maintenance shop in Valley is now only 10,000 sf at east end; will be divided into 3 shop areas, with their heavy maintenance at far west end. Snow cats will have a maintenance facility only on upper mountain.
- A focused family and training area centered around the MAC and the Papoose lift ski area. Squaw Kids will be relocated out to that area.

Regarding the Grand Camp, now Mountain Activity Center:

- The main goal is to have something with which to compete with Lake Tahoe in the summertime and to offer après-ski activity for youngsters in the winter.
- Primary concern was that it was too big and too indoors. Now reduced from 130k s.f. to about 90k s.f. and with a building footprint of 50K s.f. Its key feature will be “bubble pool aerotraining” (as in Park City). KSL needs this “wet amenity to compete with the lake” as a summer attraction. They estimate 300,000 annual individual visits (which is 1,000 per day??)
- The outdoor pool area is planned to have radiant heat decks and heated pool to facilitate use in the winter climate.
- Some prominent athletes (including Johnny Moseley) are involved in its facility design.

The new architecture ties into the existing Intrawest Village design and pathways.

New buildings that are further from the current Village will have up to 7 stories (6 above 1 podium parking). Those buildings or portions of buildings, within 50feet of the current Village can be no higher than the current Village.

Lot 4 aka East Parcel:

- Employee (ee) bedroom housing for about 250 employees and there will be 1000 parking spaces in a (perhaps) 3 story parking structure (max 35 feet height)
- Will have a shipping and receiving + dry storage facility

Park and Rec commitment: \$1.5M

- Proposed west end park had more concerns than support and has been removed

Will work with County and community on best use use of \$\$ required by the County to be set aside for parks and rec - The Day Skier: It was never the intent of KSL to imply that the day skier was not important to their business. On the contrary, it will always be at the core of their mountain revenue. For example, on some future busy day, they expect some 16,000 skiers. If all bedrooms in the current base area (~1000) and new Village (1500) are occupied, that will add (at 2 per) 5,000 skiers. The remaining 11,000 skiers are the current day skiers. They will aggressively go after the destination skiers, but not at the exclusion of the day skiers.

Benefits:

- More than 300 New full time jobs (essentially 2X current employment)
- >\$20M new tax revenue
- 2000 construction jobs
- Permanent commitment >\$1M annually to fund ongoing environmental issues (coming from a 1-1.5% perpetual transfer tax on sale and re-sale of units in the new Village; Money is allocated to a 501C fund for security). Note \$1M per year would require \$100 Million in transactions.

.....

Alex Fisch – project manager for Placer County - Program EIR

Specific Plan = Planning document with goals, policies & implementation measures to systematically implement the General Plan.

(Alex had a lot of information that is included in the intro to the Specific Plan info on-line)

Alex went on to explain the relationship between the Specific Plan and the Squaw Valley General Plan and Land Use Ordinance (SVGPLUO). This was not understood by the note takers so Alex later clarified. Here is the point he was making

The Specific Plan, if approved, would govern project development and land uses within the project area BUT in order to be adopted it must be found to be consistent with the goal and policy framework of both the Placer County General Plan and the Squaw Valley General Plan.

It is often the case that a project of this type may require slight policy adjustments to achieve consistency. Placer County's goal is that the Specific Plan proposal require as few amendments as possible to the County General Plan and/or Squaw Valley General Plan policy framework, with a goal of none.

Adoption of the proposed Village at Squaw Valley Specific Plan would require approval of an amendment to the Squaw Valley General Plan General Plan in order to incorporate the zoning and land use designations of the proposed specific plan project and to adopt the project development standards (Appendix B and other appendices). Board action to amend the Squaw Valley General Plan and to adopt

the Specific Plan would occur concurrently (including any amendments to policies) and by that action the Specific Plan would become consistent with the Squaw Valley General Plan and the County General Plan.”

Note that adoption of the specific plan by amendment does not mean that the specific plan will become a part of the SVGPLUO document, but instead it will be incorporated by reference (map, resolution and ordinance) into the SVGPLUO. For this reason it is correct to state that the Specific Plan is subordinate to the County General Plan and the Squaw Valley General Plan. After all, the use of a specific plan is to "systematically implement the general plan".

General exercise periods are 20 years for Specific Plans (SP)

The SP will be able to detail major infrastructure needs such as roads, water, sewer, etc. Whereas individual plans might not include the global needs of the site.

The SP is being evaluated at the Programmatic Level = broader eval of land use. Also may be able to better assess the cumulative view of the entire proposal i.e. as additional phases are added in by same or different developers how does it all function together.

The EIR will have technical analysis of the Specific Plan. It also provides the legal agency to implement program-wide mitigation effects.

- Revised NOP = due late winter/spring 2014. Will be circulated by County for 30 day review and comment period.
- Draft EIR = expected fall/winter 2014 = will have 45 day review period including hearing for public comments
- Entitlements hearing and consideration of the Final EIR to be held approximately 90 days after the close of the dEIR comment period.

.....

Q & A

1) Public vs Private funds: will try to avoid a Mello Roos (Community Facilities District Bond) assessment on the new homeowners, but will leave that option open. Always work to fund projects internally. In no case will the property of current homeowners or condo owners in the Valley be included in the Community Facilities District if one is created.

2) Infrastructure: Propane tanks

KSL leading the charge to bring natural gas to the Valley, but it is a long term solution. Plan A) place propane tanks underground at Lot 4/East Lot with a pipeline to the project. (editorial: this is unlikely to happen, and more likely the propane tanks will be at the maintenance facility at the west end. The county believes that the technology is extremely safe and represents no hazard).

3) Snow removal: Current design plan has parapet roofs to collect snow and melt it into the natural drainage systems but now with scaled back buildings, more parking lot snow removal and storage will be

needed Roofs can collect 10'-15' of snow. Also, snow storage easements by roadways. i.e at lot 4 = 75' setback = snow storage possibility. As well as continuing to use north hillside across from ski park lot. (this was not to be part of snow storage per SP)

4) Specific Plan: Is a Policy/Code framework., a concept, yet Chevis and Alex said that there will be specific computer-generated images of what the build out would look like.

Development Standards + Policy Framework has to be crafted so it states some of the finer points for design standards (ref. Appendix B)

Form-based building standards = Functional relationship of buildings to others, view, etc. Alex stated they are "on the path" to Form Based Standards. Key elements will have to show up in Development Standards (i.e. ice rink).

5) EIR must take into account the entire development, regardless of the build out time horizon as well as any other projects envisioned within that time horizon.

Unit Count, heights, etc are spelled out in the Development Agreement, which "cements-in" (per Alex) other parameters such as payment of fees, etc. This Development Agreement document is then "partnered in" with the Specific Plan.

6) Traffic question: traffic study will be published w/DEIR. Chevis stated that they do not want to create an improvement to Squaw Road that would encourage increased speed. Possible traffic directors at key intersections on peak days? The 3-laning is permitted by an "encroachment permit" by the County, under request from mountain manager, Mike Livak.

7) C.U.P . = Conditional Use Permit

This is required AFTER the Specific Plan process in order to build anything. This is the permit to build, and also has some discretionary public process. As Chevis said, this will be another public opportunity for "a bite of the apple"; he hopes some of the "core" will be left for SVRE.

8) "Greed vs. need" Chevis did not directly answer the reasons behind "why this big?". Last year we heard 2200 bedrooms were needed; now the number is 1500 (+ 250 employee BR). He has previously stated that 500 bedrooms were needed to attract "incentive groups". (In comparison, Whistler, which is dynamic year round, has 8600 bedrooms.

9) Benefit to Valley residents:

- Critical Mass = things to do, people bring energy and \$.
- Vibrant village
- Increased property values

10) Changes to Zoning: +/- 35 Ac. Going from "commercial" possibilities/developable to remain parking lot, etc. About 5 Ac going from Forrest Rec, etc. to maintenance yard + ee housing.

Water: There will be a water supply assessment in the documents for the DEIR.

=====

Two 1:1 conversations

1) Water - a conversation with Mike Geary

He said that the aquifer is at the lowest level on record for this time of year (e.g., January), although the aquifer always get much lower during the late summer. He further said that the years that they will be using in the WSA for dry years are 90-91, even though these last few may be drier. The data is just not available soon enough. He also said that the requirement is to analyze drought for only two years.

2) Appendix B – Alex and Chevis

Alex and Chevis agreed (separately) that App B in the Specific Plan is (as Ed pointed out) way to general and needs to be revised. Chevis said it was rushed. The problem is the lack of definition vs the detail of the illustrative concept. Alex wants a picture, with the understanding that there may be some changes, but one that is very close to what they plan to build.