

MAC meeting – March 2, 2015

The Squaw Valley MAC had presentations (not action items) made to them by Alex Fisch of Placer County Planning; Rich Moorehead, Placer County Public Works Manager – Engineering; and Chevis Hosea from Squaw Valley Real Estate (SVRE).

## **Parking**

The presentation that was basis of the presentation can be found at

<http://friendsofsv.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/04/MAC-Parking-Presentation-4.2.15.pdf>

The parking plan is NOT part of the Environmental Impact Report, and therefore cannot be commented as part of that public comment process. But there will be opportunities later on, as the planning department addresses approval of the Specific Plan, of which parking (like Parks & Rec) is a part.

The requirement for striped parking places comes from Village residents, day visitors (skiers, hikers, etc), retail shoppers, amenity users, and employees. The master plan anticipates that this will total to about 5,100 – 5,200 spaces with about 3,100 of these required to meet day skier demand on the 5<sup>th</sup> busiest day. This number was established in the 1983 Squaw Valley General Plan, and does not seem to have changed much in 32 years.

It is remarkable that this exact number falls out of the analysis (slide 6) of the 5<sup>th</sup> highest skier count (over 5 years), a reduction of 18% for walkers and transit riders, a vehicle occupancy of 2.2 (vs 1.7 told to us by Andy Wirth a year ago), and a 22% “churn” of vehicles throughout the day (cars coming and going). The traffic survey done on March 10, 2012 (at the end of the first of our 4 drought years) says that this churn is constant throughout the day. (“Skiers start leaving, and vacating their parking spaces, at 10:00AM”). This would imply that, with the lifts opening at 9AM, that almost 25% of the cars are leaving at 10AM on a very busy ski day. Most people observing the parking lot would say that this is not the case at any time, and especially on busy, good skiing days.

KSL did a study on the types of cars day skiers drive. They concluded that 27% are SUV’s, 33% are mid-sized vehicles, and 40% are small vehicles. And a striped space is 10’ x 20’ with an additional 150 sq ft added per vehicle for circulation.

Alex Fisch indicated at the planning commission meeting of a week ago that, were the demand to be higher than the forecast, that surface parking and structured parking spaces would be managed “flexibly”, meaning squeeze more cars in. If the peak skier day is about 12,000, this would require flexibility of 500 spaces. Chevis also pointed out that if their parking projections are low, that some of the first floor space in the new buildings could be turned into parking, as there is not sufficient plan for retail nor can the first floor be attractively used for lodging.

The total parking demand will be met with phased construction of the East Parcel parking lot and then parking structure, the current preferred parking structure, parking under the buildings in the new development, and the existing parking lots and then structured parking of one level on top of them,

KSL also discussed their plan for the parking demand generated by the Mountain Adventure Center during the winter. They said that during the ski season, they would adjust the hours of operation, utilize resident-only entry, and/or pricing to control the parking demand generated by that facility to minimize the winter parking impact. In fact their calculation showed they need allocate only 41 winter-time spaces. In the summer, they claim, parking will not be a problem.

In response to a question, Chevis did remark that it is the belief of SVRE that many of the owners of the condo units in the new development (upwards of 85%, some heard him say) will be people who have historically commuted into the valley from homes, condos, etc in the Truckee/Tahoe City area, or even from further away.

## Traffic

There was no presentation made, rather this was a verbal presentation. Traffic will be a subject of analysis in the draft EIR, so all the data collected, the projection of demand, and the resulting mitigation measures will be there for us to read.

Rich indicated that he had never worked on a traffic study which had anywhere this much raw, quantitative data. As a result, he believes the analysis of current conditions is solid, with a minimum of assumptions.

The analysis assumes that all traffic generated by the development is incremental to the existing traffic. Furthermore, it looks at the traffic after 20 years, with no

intermediate “looks”. It also looks at summer vs winter, various days of the week, and AM vs PM. The outcome is a projection of incremental traffic delays, bottlenecks, and overall impacts. The analysis will flag significant impacts on traffic on 89, in Truckee, and in Tahoe City.

Rich acknowledged that there was little that could be done to really have a significant impact on traffic, due to the limitations presented by 89 and Squaw Valley Rd, neither of which can be altered. He suggested that the measures that would be described are (i) more human traffic facilitators along Squaw Valley Rd., (ii) 3 lane coning both in the AM and PM, (iii) real time parking information availability to forestall some trips, (iv) use of mass transit and shuttles within Squaw Valley, and (v) the creation of an overall master traffic plan (whatever that is).

Overall, it was not a pretty picture.