

(NOTE – Kerry’s completed Site Score Card attached to the above email could not be legibly displayed here due to format conversion issues)

From: Marguerite Sprague (mshtahoe@gmail.com)

April 21, 2017 2:01:29 PM

To: jfriedman, j pang; scottzumwalt; d.wilkins; Ron Treabess;

Subject: This morning and Schilling Lodge

Dear Judy, John, Ron, Dan and Scott: Good morning and I am sorry for the last minute communique: it was only this morning that I was made aware that you are considering the Schilling Lodge project at the Tahoe XC center today; I had previously understood that would take place in June, and I am out of town. Hence my last minute note. This is an exciting project! A gift of a historic building is significant, as is the opportunity it presents.

Please don’t approve putting it by the high school. Up front I’ll tell you that I live extremely close to that location, so it impacts my family and neighbors very directly. But even if I lived miles away I would encourage you to locate it elsewhere because it makes more sense. If this area were undeveloped, the high school location could seem ideal for many of the reasons the Tahoe XC board noted in their survey and at their public meeting. But in reality, this is an established residential area that has been there for decades. It does not include a sizeable recreational business with a vision of 365-day-a-year operations that bring in good sized crowds.

The established Tahoe XC location has been operating successfully for at least two decades with success in good winters. You can easily anticipate the impacts of increased traffic, including problems for the school activities that currently use Polaris Rd. for pedestrian activities, from cross-country teams to elementary class field trips on foot. That doesn’t include the local residents who regularly walk that route with pets and children.

The high school currently fields calls about speeding students and acts upon those calls immediately. It is unlikely a XC ski facility would be as responsive or have as much authority over their speeders. But there are two larger points. One, why develop a new site, which requires permanently removing forest when you can make use of an already-developed site? There will always be pressure to develop our natural basin lands, as long as there is money to be made. Enough of them have been eliminated, it is a worthy task for us to carefully evaluate the benefit of more natural lands loss vs. what will replace it. Is it really worth it?

That brings the second larger point: people who have been studying the Tahoe basin for many years have pointed out the impacts of climate change are already here and increasing. They tell us that we can anticipate, despite this epic winter, that the majority of winters to come will not feature snow at the lake or Highlands level and precipitation that falls there will mostly be rain. It does not make sense to develop a new center based on something that is not likely to happen.

I76-13
cont.

When I asked the Tahoe XC board member about this, he smiled and said gently, “we prefer to believe we’ll continue to have good winters.” Heck, we’d ALL prefer to believe that, but we are fools if we assume it is fact, especially when TERC and other researchers tell us it ain’t so. They are not making this up. At least, it means it makes more sense to put the new building where the old building has been so as to keep more forest intact. Then if we aren’t seeing more epic winters, at least we have not destroyed more forest. Please put the new Schilling Lodge building where the current buildings are and preserve as much of our beautiful forested land in our area as possible. Respectfully yours,
Marguerite Sprague

Note – At the 21 April 2017 Board Meeting, TCPUD provided TCCSEA/TXC a dedicated Agenda Item for a presentation on its project that consisted of forty-six (46) Powerpoint slides.

From: Roger Huff (huffmtry@aol.com)

April 21, 2017

To: Cindy Gustafson; Ron Treabess; Judy Friedman; Terri Viehmann

Subject: THANK YOU

Good job on another well-run meeting, even though there were fewer comments than some expected. This might have been due to Cindy’s “peace initiative” lead-in, or perhaps folks realizing we have come almost full circle back to the original 2014 site options. Moving forward, I ask the TCPUD to very carefully consider the following three questions:

1. Do you believe that all of the parties have thus far acted honestly and kept their promises, without taking unfair advantages of others?
2. Do you believe that the information presented today is complete, accurate, and unbiased enough to avoid a GIGO (Garbage In, Garbage Out) decision?
3. Do you believe Public Trust has been damaged at this point, and if so, what should be taken to repair it? I am not comfortable that the normal CEQA process adequately addresses Public Safety issues, and would also like amplification on the “Ownership Decisions” bullet on the What Else Happens After/During CEQA slide in today’s presentation.

Thanks again, Roger

From: Paul Niwano [paul@4propertysales.co.uk]

April 22, 2017 6:21 AM

To: Cindy Gustafson

Subject: Schilling Lodge concerns

Good afternoon I am writing to you concerning the Schilling Lodge selection process as I am unable to attend the meeting to offer my opinion in person. There are several points I wish to raise, as follows. - Why is the TCCSEA/TXC given such preference over the wider community? Is such an enlarged structure with parking facilities really beneficial

I76-13
cont.

for the local area or simply for the club's advantage? - The perceived traffic impact score appears to completely neglect that Polaris Road is the most heavily travelled road in the Highlands neighbourhood. Surely such a fact should be of utmost importance when considering possible traffic implications of Site D. - Polaris is also regularly used by physical education groups and walking children to/from school. Also surely should be considered as highly important when considering Site D? - Likewise, score for Site D does not take into consideration that Polaris Road west of Heather is the only emergency evacuation route for middle and high schools. - Shouldn't the implications of alcoholic beverages possibly being on the premises right next to said schools also be carefully considered? - Finally, the site scoring team appears to be nearly completely composed of TCCSEA/TXC members, hired consultants or other individuals which share its agenda. I would also like to request that the TCPUD continues to oversee this process considering that it is on TCPUD land and will also have major implications on TCPUD voters and tax payers. Thank you and I hope you will take all of the above into consideration.
Kind regards, Paul

From: Robert Olson

April 21, 2017 12:59:47 PM

To: paul@4propertysales.co.uk

Subject: TXC: public comment

Hi Paul, thank you for your comments, unfortunately I was already at the meeting and my phone was off this morning and just started checking my mail now. Please see notes at the end of this email from Terri at the TCPUD, where she walked another member of the public through access to the board meeting that took place. The TCPUD board did vote in favor of proceeding with Site A, Site D and no-project into the CEQU process. There is still plenty of time to hit on these concerns and address them properly.

Thanks again and yes, I take everything into consideration.

Robb Olson o l s o n - o l s o n e n a , llc. Gallery PO Box 7949. Tahoe City, CA,

From: Debbie White [debbie@mrooms.co.uk]

April 27, 2017 4:24 PM

To: Cindy Gustafson ; Terri Viehmann ; Bob Bolton

Subject: Schilling Lodge follow up

Cindy et al I am following up in consideration of Option A and D being pursued as announced in the public meeting last week. Is there a plan to conduct a full and 'proper' traffic study that also includes fire input for both venues?

Thank you. Debbie White,

From: Terri Viehmann

April 28, 2017 9:20:00 AM

To: "Debbie - Mountain Rooms & Chalets" Cc: Cindy Gustafson; Matt Homolka

Subject: RE: Schilling Lodge follow up Hello Debbie, Thank you for your questions and concerns. The next steps in the process will follow the California Environmental Quality Act's (CEQA) mandates. Traffic and public services are analyzed through that process.

We will keep you informed regarding the upcoming meetings and CEQA process.

Terri Viehmann District Clerk Tahoe City Public Utility District

I76-13
cont.

From: Stacy Bordes <stacyalain@earthlink.net>

August 15, 2017 12:38 PM

To: jfriedman@tcpud.org, jpang@tcpud.org, d.wilkins@tcpud.org, scottrzumwalt@gmail.com, r.treabess@tcpud.org, mhomolka@tcpud.org, rcruz@tcpud.org, tviehmman@tcpud.org

Subject: Schilling Lodge-CEQA process

I would like to reiterate my concerns about the inadequacy of the traffic study performed by TXC and my hope that this will be taken very seriously during the CEQA process. Perhaps a longer, more comprehensive study is needed before this larger than expected Schilling project is accepted in a new location.

As I have mentioned several times to TXC and at the PUD meetings, the impact on the safety of 800+ staff and students/athletes attending and working at North Tahoe School and North Tahoe High School plus the families going to and from school and sports activities, as well as adult sports league activities also held at the school, is critical to review during this process.

The intense traffic patterns within the Highlands can change with differing seasons (school year, holiday periods, winter, summer, etc), differing days of the week during these seasons, and differing hours of the day in which heavy traffic already occurs.

I feel strongly that the CEQA process and the PUD board need to take into account the importance of the inadequate traffic study and the impact increased traffic will have on the west side of the Highlands (should the project be relocated) especially since the Schilling project expects to build a complex that will offer significantly more activities beyond skiing and biking (such as a wedding venue, private affair rental, ski academy, etc).

I would appreciate your specific attention to this issue,

Thank you, Stacy Bordes Highlands Resident

From: Roger Huff (huffmtry@aol.com)

August 19, 2017 9:49:12 AM

To: jfriedman@tcpud.org, d.wilkins@tcpud.org, jpang@tcpud.org, r.treabess@tcpud.org, scottrzumwalt@gmail.com, rcruz@tcpud.org, tviehmman@tcpud.org

Subject: For The Record Corrections To 18 AUG Meeting Statements

Dear Board Members.

We were unable to attend yesterday's Special Board Meeting due to schedule conflicts; and while the ability to view the proceedings via streaming video are greatly appreciated, in this case it prevented us from addressing the following inaccuracies during the Public Comment session:

I76-13
cont.

- This meeting was professionally run as usual, but during the opening remarks to the TXC CEQA Work Plan agenda item, the speaker said that, “the District staff hadn’t seen any evidence that the applicant controlled or altered information.” This was surprising, since on March 6, 2017 the TCPUD Board and Management received *twenty-seven (27) specific examples* of such behavior including five (5) that used the applicant’s own words to describe its changes to public questions on the Web Site Questionnaire it controlled. Please review this information.
- The discussion about public outreach got off track because most complaints are not about the TCPUD’s or Highlands HOA’s efforts, but rather about the inadequacy of the TCCSEA’s process. The only communication many Highlands homeowners received from the TCCSEA was a 3 X5 postcard with a photo of the *original* Schilling Lodge on its front and an invitation to poorly-defined Public Workshops on its back. There was no mention whatsoever that TCCSEA was proposing to more than double the facility’s size. This is not acceptable behavior, and another reason some have raised concerns about multiple failures to act in good faith.
- There also appears to be the misconception that most public objections pertain to traffic, which is not the case because they also concern: private property values, noise, possibly allowing alcohol next to schools, putting a privately owned/operated facility on publicly-owned land, etc.
- During closing remarks for this agenda item, one speaker suggested there may be some equivalency about increased traffic at the two candidate sites, but this would be like comparing apples to oranges, because Polaris is by far the busiest street in the neighborhood during winter, school children and gym classes routinely use Polaris, and Polaris is the only emergency evacuation route for multiple schools. None of these were addressed in the TCCSEA’s Traffic Study, leading to legitimate questions about its credibility.

I wholeheartedly agree with (what I think was) Dan Wilkins’ comment that this has to be far more extensive than the usual CEQA review process. Projects based upon one-sided or deficient information are like buildings upon quicksand. Sooner or later, both will develop structural cracks and fall apart, so be careful. Please add the above to your record correspondence file on this project.

Thank you, Roger Huff

In a message dated 8/22/2017 5:14:43 P.M., mhomolka@tcpud.org wrote:

Roger,

Thank you for forwarding this to us. I had reviewed the attached document when you sent it originally and again today. It has not changed our recommendations or conclusions.

It has been added to our public input file. We look forward to working with your community to provide the best project for your neighborhood and all recreation users.

Thank you, Matt Homolka, P.E.

I76-13
cont.

From: HuffMntry@aol.com

August 22, 2017, 8:31:22 PM

To: mhomolka@tcpud.org

Cc: tviehmman@tcpud.org, kboyd@tcpud.org

Sent: 8/22/2017 8:31:22 PM Pacific Standard Time

Subject: Re: FOR THE RECORD CORRECTIONS TO 18 AUG MEETING STATEMENTS

Matt,

Thank you for your response. We agree that this project ought to be best for all users and for our community as a whole, rather than narrowly focusing upon this applicant's desires.

Regards, Roger

From: Huff [mailto:huffmntry@aol.com]

January 11, 2018 12:32 PM

To: Sean Barclay <sbarclay@tcpud.org>; Kim Boyd <kboyd@tcpud.org>; Judy Friedman <jfriedman@tcpud.org>; Dan Wilkins <d.wilkins@tcpud.org>; Ron Treabess <r.treabess@tcpud.org>; John Pang <jpang@tcpud.org>; Scott Zumwalt <scottrzumwalt@gmail.com>

Cc: Terri Viehmann <tviehmman@tcpud.org>

Subject: SERIOUS TXC LODGE EIR WORK STATEMENT PROBLEMS

Good Afternoon,

The attached highlights areas of concern that Highlands Residents asked to be corrected back in October (see below), but still exist in the current CEQA Work Statement that also schedules a "Close of Scoping" date of 19 January, several days before the Highlands Residents' meeting.

TCPUD Response: The CEQA schedule has changed. The scoping phase of the environmental review has not yet begun. We will discuss the timing of the scoping period in detail at Monday's neighborhood meeting.

Please make the following requested changes now.

Thank you,

Roger

1. **Under Project Understanding.** The name of this project has already changed several times, and there are growing public concerns that each has furthered the applicant's claims. The latest project name needs to be changed, because it *improperly and incorrectly* implies that the proposed facility would:

TCPUD Response: It is not uncommon, during the early planning stages, for a project name to change many times. The project name will remain as is and not be changed at this time. The name *properly and correctly* implies the following.

I76-13
cont.

- a. belong to, be operated by, and intended for exclusive use of the TXC, and

TCPUD Response: Any or all of these may be the case or some variant of them.

- b. be a "replacement to and expansion of" the existing Highlands Community Center facility

TCPUD Response: Agreed.

A less controversial and more appropriate name may be the "Enlarged Shilling Lodge" project.

TCPUD Response: We prefer the current project name.

2. **Under Key Issues**, please make the following changes:

- a. In the first sentence, replace "Tahoe Cross Country Lodge" with "Highlands Community Center, which is the correct name for the existing facility, and

TCPUD Response: See first sentence of the Project Understanding. It identifies the Highlands Park Community Center as also being named the "Tahoe Cross Country Lodge" or "Tahoe XC Lodge". These names are interchangeable to us and are simply used to identify a facility and the activities associated with that facility.

- b. Add wildfire safety, possibly allowing alcoholic beverages on the premises, and congestion of the only emergency evacuation route from the schools to the last sentence due to their importance among public safety concerns.

TCPUD Response: TCPUD and Ascent are aware of these concerns. If they are not satisfactorily addressed by the CEQA document, please comment at that time.

4. **Under TASK 2: Environmental Scoping** - The Draft NOP can't "depict the location of the project on a map" if the location hasn't been decided at that point, and the proposed 30-day review period is inadequate to obtain public inputs, especially from part-time or (temporarily) out-of-the-area residents. Please change the latter to 60-days.

TCPUD Response:

1. The NOP will in fact depict the location of the proposed project being evaluated by the CEQA Document.
2. We acknowledge the request to extend the review period. The TCPUD will decide in the future whether the review period should be extended beyond statutory requirements.

5. **Under TASK 3: Administrative Draft EIR Item** - The second paragraph again mentions four alternatives, but does not define what they are. Please do so.

I76-13
cont.

TCPUD Response: The final approved scope of work actually mentions three alternatives in this location. The topic of alternatives being evaluated will be discussed at Monday's neighborhood meeting.

6. **Under TASK 3: Transportation/Traffic Item** - Please make the following changes to this item:

a. Add pedestrian safety and increased congestion of the only emergency evacuation route from the schools to items listed in the first sentence,

TCPUD Response: TCPUD and Ascent are aware of these concerns. If they are not satisfactorily addressed by the CEQA document, please comment at that time.

b. **Do not** rely on LSC's Traffic Analysis of April 2016, because it did not address these important public safety factors and used questionable data sampling;

TCPUD Response: A new traffic analysis is included in this scope of work. However, data collected in support of LSC's April 2016 Report will be used in this new analysis.

c. Address the frequent use of Polaris Road by gym classes and cross-country teams during regular school hours, and

TCPUD Response: Presumably these existing uses will be captured in the existing conditions analysis. If they are not satisfactorily addressed by the CEQA document, please comment at that time.

d. Describe why, after being eliminated by the Applicant, the Cedarwood Drive site is apparently still being considered.

TCPUD Response: The topic of alternatives being evaluated will be discussed at Monday's neighborhood meeting.

TCPUD Response to Items 7 – 15 Below: TCPUD and Ascent are aware of the concerns or desire for additional information contained in these comments and will address them in the CEQA document. If that they are not addressed satisfactorily, please comment at that time.

7. **Under TASK 3: Noise Item** - Please make the following changes to this Item:

a. Define "short-term measurements", and

b. Describe how the "estimated traffic noise levels for existing and future traffic noise levels" would be determined and adjusted for temporal and seasonal variations.

8. **Under TASK 3: Greenhouse Gas Emissions** - Please include the previous mention of how tall trees around Site D limit the practicality of using solar energy systems there.

I76-13
cont.

9. **Under TASK 3: Archaeological, Historical, and Tribal Cultural Item** - Under this item, please:

- a. Identify Susan Lindstrom and her expertise,
- b. Change to note that the proposed massive structural additions to the original Schilling Lodge building would definitely have a major "effect upon that historical resource."

10. **Under TASK 3: Biological Resources Item** - Please include mention that mule deer and black bear are regularly seen crossing Polaris between Heather and the schools.

11. **Under TASK 3: Geology and Soils Item** - Please include that Site D is a watershed drainage area for a seasonal stream that crosses underneath Polaris Road.

12. **Under TASK 3: Aesthetics Sub-Item** - Please re-locate this sub-item out from under the *Less-Than-Significant* Item category, because this large structure and parking area would clearly affect the aesthetics (and property values) of nearby residences.

13. **Under TASK 3: Hazard, Hazardous Materials, and Risk of Upset Sub-Item** - Please move this sub-item out from under the *Less-Than-Significant* Item category, because it must also address routine on-site equipment fueling and maintenance activities.

14. **Under TASK 3: Land Use and Planning Sub-Item** - Please clarify this sub-item which are confusing and appears to be somewhat contradictory.

15. **Under TASK 3: Public Services Sub-Item** - Definite re-locate this sub-item out from under the *Less-Than-Significant* Item category, because congestion of the only evacuation route from schools would clearly affect the response times of emergency vehicles, and is a very high visibility public safety issue.

16. **Under TASK 6: Administrative Final EIR Item** - Do not underestimate the level of controversy about the applicant's: control and alteration of public input, credibility of its Site Scoring, and neglect to consider major public safety concerns.

TCPUD Response: Noted.

In a message dated 1/18/2018 6:09:20 PM, mhomolka@tcpud.org wrote:

Roger,
I wanted to take this opportunity ahead of our upcoming neighborhood meeting to respond more directly to your emailed comments regarding our environmental consultant's (Ascent) contractual scope of work.

I76-13
cont.

We apologize and recognize that at this early planning stage, there is limited official information from the TCPUD to rely on to clearly understand the project. We are developing additional information and will be publishing it soon. We can understand how Ascent's contract and scope of work, being the latest public document produced, can receive this level of scrutiny as there is not a lot of other information out there on which to comment.

The document you reviewed (Ascent's Scope of Work, or "Work Plan" as they called it) is an attachment to their consulting contract with the TCPUD whereby they agree to complete environmental review of the proposed project and alternatives in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The scope of work broadly defines the underlying assumptions and level of effort necessary to complete the scope of work and provides the basis for their estimated compensation.

The scope of work also presents Ascent's general understanding of the project and their assumptions at the time they prepared their proposal. I can assure you that their understanding of the project is much clearer today and will continue to grow as the work proceeds. However, we do not simply modify approved contractual scopes of work to clarify understanding. Changes are only made to clarify changes in level of effort and compensation.

It is important to note what the scope of work is not. It is not the Project Description nor is it the CEQA document (an Environmental Impact Report [EIR] in this case) for the project. This distinction is important because many of your comments below will be addressed in the forthcoming EIR. Your comments have been provided to Ascent so they are aware of the concerns and they can address them in the EIR to the extent they are germane to the environmental review.

The public will have additional opportunity during the CEQA scoping period (initiated by release of a Notice of Preparation [NOP]) to provide input on environmental issues to be addressed and alternatives to be considered in the EIR. The timing of the scoping period, release of the NOP, and future CEQA scoping meetings will be discussed at Monday's neighborhood meeting.

We have evaluated your comments below relative to Ascent's contracted scope of work, and will not be making any of your requested changes to that document at this time. To the degree that they inform the EIR analyses and document preparation, Ascent and the TCPUD will consider them at that time.

In an effort to address your concerns in advance of Monday's meeting, we have spent District staff time preparing this response including the following specific feedback (in the body of your original email). Please consider this our final response on the matter of Ascent's scope of work. We are not attempting to engage in a discussion on this matter. We will be happy to answer further questions at the upcoming neighborhood meeting while keeping in mind the broader purposes of that meeting.

I76-13
cont.

Sincerely,
 Matt Homolka, P.E. District Engineer/Assistant General Manager TCPUD

From: Huff [mailto:huffmtry@aol.com]

January 19, 2018 7:39 AM

To: Matt Homolka <mhomolka@tcpud.org>; Judy Friedman <jfriedman@tcpud.org>; Dan Wilkins <d.wilkins@tcpud.org>; Ron Treabess <r.treabess@tcpud.org>; John Pang <jpang@tcpud.org>; Scott Zumwalt <scottrzumwalt@gmail.com>; Sean Barclay <sbarclay@tcpud.org>; Kim Boyd <kboyd@tcpud.org>

Cc: Terri Viehmann <tviehmann@tcpud.org>

Subject: Re: RE: SERIOUS TXC LODGE EIR WORK STATEMENT PROBLEMS

Good Morning,

We forwarded yesterday's reply to others who contributed to these corrections originally requested back in October, and strongly disagree with staff opinions that continue to heavily reflect the applicant's agenda and preferences. We do realize this is an evolving process, but note that most of these same problems still exist in the *Final Tahoe Cross Country Lodge Replacement and Expansion Project Scope of Work for Environmental Review* document.

After several decades on both sides of Government contracts, I understand the differences between a Work Statement and final Deliverables (e.g., an EIR); but also recognize how the quality of the former affects the quality of the latter. The fact is a Scope of Work that is based upon misleading information or invalid assumptions, proposes to "re-use" clearly biased and deficient documents (i.e., the Site Survey and 2016 Traffic Study), or casually dismisses areas of major concerns to affected residents, will not produce a credible EIR; and decision-making processes like CEQA tend to operate on a garbage in, garbage out, principle.

We have nothing personally against the applicant, but are very concerned with what this project is doing to essential relationships within our community. If the TCPUD wants to truly be the Lead Agency, it would be wise to avoid potential conflicts of interest, increase transparency, and be more responsive to public concerns and requests. Thanks again for your response, and I sincerely hope that next Monday's meeting will put everyone upon a more constructive path.

Have a good weekend,
 Roger

In a message dated 1/19/2018 1:30:14 PM, mhomolka@tcpud.org wrote:

Roger, I appreciate your response and we will make sure the Board receives a copy it in their next Board packet. I look forward to seeing you Monday and we share the same hopes for that meeting.

Matt Homolka, P.E. District Engineer/Assistant General Manager. TCPUD

I76-13
 cont.

From: huffmstry@aol.com

January 23, 7:03:11 AM

To: mhomolka@tcpud.org, sbarclay@tcpud.org, kboyd@tcpud.org,
jfriedman@tcpud.org, scottrumwalt@gmail.com

Cc: jpang@tcpud.org, d.wilkins@tcpud.org, r.treabess@tcpud.org, tviehmman@tcpud.org

Subject: SUBSEQUENT FEEDBACK FROM HIGHLANDS RESIDENTS' MEETING

Good Morning,

Yesterday's meeting afforded an opportunity for Highlands Residents to express their sincere and serious concerns about: public safety along Polaris and Old Mill, and proposed massive additions to the original historic structure. It also resulted in the following subsequent feedback that I'm forwarding for TCPUD's consideration:

- Statements made during the meeting confirmed residents' suspicions that: (a) key project documents are "heavily influenced" by the applicant's bias and site preference, and (b) the TCPUD is aware of this. If this is permitted to perpetuate into decision-basing documents (e.g. the EIR), however, it will destroy their credibility.
- The latest name change to the *Tahoe Cross Country Lodge Replacement and Expansion Project* has led several residents to ask, "**What is the Tahoe Cross Country Lodge, and what at this point has been decided would be 'replaced' or 'expanded'?**" They point out the TXC is a tenant activity, that rents space for commercial operations in the TCPUD-owned *Highlands Community Center*, which is also used for other Community functions (e.g., Boy Scouts, HOA meetings). The TXC has erected a sign calling the property the *Tahoe Cross Country Ski & Snowshoe Center* (**not** Tahoe Cross Country Lodge); but putting up a sign doesn't authorize it to re-name, replace, or expand this Community asset. To correct this, please delete the terms "Replacement and Expansion" from this project's name.
- A number of residents were disappointed to hear that the TCPUD had elected to not make any of the requested changes to the CEQA Contractor's Scope of Work to: (a) correct invalid or misleading information, (b) prevent the "re-use" of biased/deficient documents (e.g., Site Scores, the 2016 Traffic Study, and (c) not dismiss items of serious concern to Highlands Residents as having "Less Than Significant Impact."

Please consider this additional feedback. Yesterday's meeting was good, but speaking is only half of communicating effectively.

Thanks again,

Roger

From: huffmstry@aol.com

March 22, 2018, 10:04:57 AM

I76-13
cont.

To: jfriedman@tcpud.org, d.wilkins@tcpud.org, jpang@tcpud.org, r.treabess@tcpud.org, scottrzumwalt@gmail.com, sbarclay@tcpud.org
 Cc: mhomolka@tcpud.org, kboyd@tcpud.org, tviehmenn@tcpud.org
 Subject: SCHOOL TRAFFIC ON POLARIS ROAD

Dear Board Members,

Morning School Vehicle Traffic - On Wednesday March 21st 2018, all vehicles traveling on Polaris Road between Heather and the schools were counted from 6:30am until 8:30 am. It was raining, the berms limited sight distance out of some driveways, peak traffic occurred between 7:00am and 8:30am, and the average speed increased after 8:00am. Following are these actual counts:

Vehicles going toward the Schools:

Private Vehicles:	280
School Buses:	7
Commercial Trucks:	1
Subtotal:	288

Vehicles going away from the Schools:

Private Vehicles:	95
School Buses:	7
Commercial Trucks:	1
Subtotal:	103

Total Morning School Traffic Count: 391

Afternoon School Vehicle Traffic - Because the same basic makeup of faculty, staff, and students have to go back home, it is reasonable to assume that similar numbers of (one-way and two-way) trips would occur during the peak afternoon school traffic period(s).

Daily School Vehicle Traffic Load - School traffic upon this section of Polaris during these two, 2-hour (morning and afternoon) periods alone is approximately 800 vehicles, far more than any other street in the Highlands residential neighborhood.

School Pedestrian Traffic - Some neighborhood students were seen walking to school in the rain that day, but substantially larger numbers are typical in better weather and earlier that same several groups of 10-15 students that looked like gym classes were seen running in the roadway on that section of Polaris Road.

Evacuation Traffic Load – At 10:00am there were 180 vehicles in the schools’ parking lots. Timely egress of this number of vehicles when the only evacuation route is clogged up with emergency response vehicles, concerned parents, etc. is simply unrealistic and would be unacceptably aggravated by any additional traffic on this section of Polaris Road.

I76-13
cont.

Summary – The above numbers of more practical value than: Turn Counts, LOS values, etc. When it comes to safety in the Highlands, the true “experts” are those who face the dangers daily. Please consider this information very seriously.

Thank you, Roger

From: Roger Huff (huffmtry@aol.com)

March 30, 2018 7:19:49 AM

To: jfriedman@tcpud.org, d.wilkins@tcpud.org, jpang@tcpud.org, r.treabess@tcpud.org, scottrzumwalt@gmail.com, sbarclay@tcpud.org Cc: mhomolka@tcpud.org, kboyd@tcpud.org, tviehmman@tcpud.org

Subject: COMMUNICATING AND CREDIBILITY

A major concern continues to be the potentially irreparable damage this controversial project is doing to critical communications and credibility in our community. Here are a couple of simple suggestions to help avoid such catastrophic consequences:

1. Do not allow Board meeting presentations and formal discussions to be dominated by the applicant's perspective, while alternatives and opposing viewpoints are limited to a single slide as an afterthought or brief public comments.
2. Schedule and dedicate formal Board discussion time during Agenda Items to address public concerns, complaints, and requests, so that people don't continue to feel that their inputs are being ignored. Communicating effectively is one of the most important (and most difficult) we have to do even though it only has two basic components; and credibility is much easier to lose than to regain. I hope that the above suggestions help improve both.

Sincerely, Roger

From: Ann Hobbs (Placer County Air Quality Control Board)

April 18, 2018 5:41:51 PM

To: Terri Viehmann Cc: Yu-Shuo Chang

Subject: TXC Lodge Project NOP

Hi there: We recently received a letter to our Board of Directors, from a constituent in the Tahoe City area, that references the TXC Lodge project NOP – Notice of Preparation. As the local air quality agency for Placer County, we wanted to review the document, but have not found a copy available on line, either on your website or on the Tahoe XC website. We did find extensive information from your board's board meeting on it, with a reference in a presentation that mentioned that the NOP was going to be available until early April. Could you please provide the link to the document. Thank you

From: Kim Boyd

April 19, 2018 1:40:24 PM

To: ahobbs@placer.ca.gov Cc: ychang@placer.ca.gov; Sean Barclay; Matt Homolka; Terri Viehmann

Subject: Re: TXC Lodge Project NOP

Ms. Hobbs, Thank you for your inquiry regarding the NOP for our Tahoe XC Lodge project. The NOP has not yet been released. We anticipated an early April release, but we are currently in discussion with the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency about the NOP. We

I76-13
cont.

hope to have it released in the next week or so, and we will certainly ensure distribution to your agency.

Sincerely, Kim Boyd Senior Management Analyst Tahoe City Public Utility District

From: Roger Huff [huffmtry@aol.com]

April 29, 2018 7:37 AM

To: Judy Friedman ; Dan Wilkins ; John Pang ; Ron Treabess ; Scott Zumwalt ; Sean Barclay
Cc: Matt Homolka ; Kim Boyd ; Terri Viehmann

Subject: COMMUNICATING AND CREDIBILITY - FOLLOW UP QUESTION

Good Morning, Hope you all had a nice weekend. Has any action been taken on the two suggestions in my 30 March email?

Thank you, Roger

From: Sean Barclay

May 03, 2018 7:13:17 AM

To: Huff; Judy Friedman; Dan Wilkins; John Pang; Ron Treabess; Scott Zumwalt
Cc: Matt Homolka; Kim Boyd; Terri Viehmann

Subject: RE: COMMUNICATING AND CREDIBILITY - FOLLOW UP QUESTION

Hello Roger, I hope you are well. As you'll recall, this Project was on the agenda at the TCPUD Board meeting in March specifically to provide the public an opportunity to address the Board. You are always welcome and encouraged to attend any meeting of the Board of Directors to share your concerns and suggestions in person during public comment. The next Board meeting is scheduled for Friday, May 18th at 8:30am.

Sincerely, Sean Barclay General Manager Tahoe City Public Utility District

I76-13
cont.

From: Roger Huff [huffmtry@aol.com]

May 03, 2018 7:53:59 AM

To: Sean Barclay; Judy Friedman; Dan Wilkins; John Pang; Ron Treabess; Scott Zumwalt
Cc: Matt Homolka; Kim Boyd; Terri Viehmann

Subject: Re: COMMUNICATING AND CREDIBILITY - FOLLOW UP QUESTION

Good Morning Sean, Thanks for the response, so please let me try to clarify. People have remarked that their specific questions or concerns rarely are afforded agenda items, presentation time, or formal discussion like the TCCSEA/TXC's agenda; but are treated more like afterthoughts and restricted to a few minutes of informal public comments by those who can attend the meetings in person. You may wish to dedicate a specific Agenda Item for the May 18th meeting to formally presenting (and discussing) a roll-up of on-record public concerns and questions. Please consider doing this.

Cheers, Roger

From: Roger Huff [huffmtry@aol.com]

June 22, 2018 12:24 PM

To: Kim Boyd
Cc: Judy Friedman; Dan Wilkins; Ron Treabess; John Pang; Scott Zumwalt; Sean Barclay; Matt Homolka

Subject: Re: Tahoe Cross Country Lodge Replacement and Expansion Project - NOP

Thank you, Kim! Expressed concerns about the proposed EIR Scoping Meetings include:

1. That the public is provided less than thirty (30) days notice,

2. Both of them are scheduled to be held on the same day, and
 3. There isn't any provision for those who can't attend in person. Please review and discuss the above and other public concerns with the Staff and Board members, and consider making changes.
 Have a great weekend, Roger

From: Roger Huff [huffmtry@aol.com]

June 23, 2018 10:54 AM

To: Kim Boyd Cc: Judy Friedman; Dan Wilkins; Ron Treabess; John Pang; Scott Zumwalt; Sean Barclay; Terri Viehmann

Subject: REQUESTED CHANGES

Hi Kim, Unfortunately, the NOP continues to damage credibility by repeating much of the same incorrect or misleading wording that residents asked be corrected in the Draft EIR's Work Statement last October. Let's try again, before they get perpetuated into the EIR. I have highlighted and annotated some of them in the attached version of the NOP that you sent, and very strongly recommend that they be corrected this time around. The failure to do so now will just lead to future controversies.

Regards, Roger

Note - Format conversion issues prevented legible the display of the attachment referenced in the above email

From: Roger Huff [huffmtry@aol.com]

June 27, 2018 11:14 AM

To: Judy Friedman; Dan Wilkins; Ron Treabess; John Pang; Scott Zumwalt Cc: Sean Barclay; Kim Boyd; Terri Viehmann; Matt Homolka

Subject: TXC SKI LODGE PROJECT - REQUESTED EIR SCOPING ACTION ITEMS

Dear TCPUD Board Members, Please: (1) Present and discuss all the following categories and questions (copied from official CEQA Guidance documentation) at this project's Public Scoping Meetings; (2) Insist that all of them are thoroughly and objectively answered in the Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for all candidate Sites and Alternatives; and (3) Ensure this email gets into the District's record correspondence file for this project:

AESTHETICS. Would the project: Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista? Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? OR Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?

AGRICULTURE & FORESTRY RESOURCES. Would the project: Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production? Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use? OR Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result

I76-13
cont.

GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project: Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS. Would the project: Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment? OR Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?

HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project: Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials? Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment? Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school? OR Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?

HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project: Substantially deplete decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin (e.g., the production rate of preexisting nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)? Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would: (i) result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site; (ii) substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite; (iii) create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or (iv) impede or redirect flood flows? OR Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river.

LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project: Physically divide an established community? Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect? OR Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?

NOISE. Would the project result in: Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies? A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity

I76-13
cont.

above levels existing without the project? OR A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

PUBLIC SERVICES. Would the project result in: Need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services: Fire protection? Police protection? Schools? Parks? Other public facilities?

RECREATION. Would the project: Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. Would the project: Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadways, bicycle lanes and pedestrian paths? , taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit? Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways Result in inadequate emergency access? OR Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?

UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project: Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, or wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects? Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? OR Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?

WILDFIRE. If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project: Impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire? Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment? OR Expose people

I76-13
cont.

or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?

MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE. Does the project: Have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory? Have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)? OR Have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?'

I have examined the candidate sites, counted trees and traffic, and taken enough photos to realize that valid answers to these questions will reveal serious and potential "show-stopper" impacts; and I look forward to reviewing the findings of the Draft EIR.
Thank you, Roger Huff

From: Roger Huff [huffmtry@aol.com]

July 04, 2018 7:46 AM

To: Judy Friedman; Dan Wilkins; Ron Treabess; John Pang; Scott Zumwalt; Sean Barclay; Kim Boyd Cc: Matt Homolka ; Terri Viehmann

Subject: TXC LODGE PROJECT NOP COMMENTS & DRAFT EIR INPUTS

Dear Board Members, Credibility and public trust continue to be damaged by incorrect or misleading statements in the NOP that must not be allowed to perpetuate into the EIR or other project documents. These include: The Project Title, Project Location, and Project Description paragraphs imply or state that a structure called the Tahoe Cross-Country Lodge is "located at 925 Country Club Drive" that "also serves as the Highlands Park and Community Center"; and that "the proposed project involves replacing, expanding, and relocating" it. Problems - none of these statements are factually correct. Use of the benign and ambiguous term "adaptively reuse" is misleading and doesn't describe the massive internal changes and additions to the original historic structure; and the Renderings don't properly depict a basement level. Besides correcting the above items, to be more credible please ensure that the Draft EIR also includes a compilation of concerns identified by members of the public.

Thank you, Roger Huff

From: Roger Huff [huffmtry@aol.com]

July 08, 2018 7:47 AM

To: Judy Friedman; Ron Treabess; Dan Wilkins; John Pang; Scott Zumwalt; Sean Barclay; Matt Homolka; Kim Boyd Cc: Terri Viehmann; Jess McMillion

Subject: REQUESTED REALITY CHECKS FOR THE 10 & 17 JULY MEETINGS

Dear Board Members, Please read and discuss the following during both the 10 & 17 July

I76-13
cont.

meetings: When we moved here from the south shore I wanted a lakefront estate, but we were quite happy with our one-bedroom condo. Before we bought our current SUV, I wanted a Porsche; but we have been very satisfied with our Chevrolet. Timely reality checks can avoid making foolish mistakes and getting in over one's head; and the recent funding prioritization by the TOT Grant Advisory Committee should provide this project a critical wake-up call.

One Reality – cumulative costs for: environmental impact analyses, mitigation, design, engineering, construction, public safety issues, and legal fees for the Site D Alternatives (i.e., Full Project, Reduced Project, Alternative Driveway) are extremely high, and quite possibly unrealistic.

Another Reality – continuing to waste precious funding on exploring unrealistic options at this point may limit one to the least desirable alternative (e.g., No Project) downstream. Eliminating the Site D Alternatives and reducing the scope and cost of the EIR would make the project more realistic and affordable, and would currently still offer the Site A – Modified Project and No Project Alternatives; but please re-consider the following (less costly, less controversial, and more realistic) Alternative proposed to the TCPUD in March: REALISTIC PROJECT ALTERNATIVE:

1. Replace the 2,465 sq. ft. Highlands Community Center with the original 4,607 sq. ft., two story, historic Schilling Lodge; as favored by the vast majority of residents in 2014, and as consistent with both the Donor's and the Schilling Family's stated wishes;
 2. Only allow minimal, internal, modifications required not just to meet essential needs of the Applicant; but also for larger Community enjoyment as the Donor and Family intended;
 3. Make the parking area less obtrusive by limiting its additions to those needed to minimize on-street parking on an average winter day, and using the smaller 2,814 sq. ft. surface footprint of the original Schilling Lodge; and
 4. Transfer its final ownership to the TCPUD to avoid problems associated with putting a privately-owned facility on publicly-owned land, and allowing it to be shared by "the larger Tahoe Community" as the Donor has stated.
- Very sincerely, Roger Huff

From: Kim Boyd

July 09, 2018 10:42:12 AM

To: Huff; Judy Friedman; Ron Treabess; Dan Wilkins; John Pang; Scott Zumwalt; Sean Barclay; Matt Homolka Cc: Terri Viehmann; Jess McMillion

Subject: RE: REQUESTED REALITY CHECKS FOR THE 10 & 17 JULY MEETINGS

Hi Roger, Thank you for your comments. Your message has been distributed to Board and staff for their review and will be distributed to the Parks and Recreation Committee on July 10th, and included in the July 20th Board packet.

Kim Boyd Senior Management Analyst Tahoe City Public Utility District

From: Vivian Euzent [veuzent@comcast.net]

July 08, 2018 2:19 PM

I76-13
cont.

To: Kim Boyd ; Ski@TahoeXC.org

Subject: Tahoe XC Lodge Replacement & Expansion Project

As a part time resident of Truckee, I have been willing to drive to Tahoe Cross Country Ski Area for about 17 years because the staff is so friendly and helpful, other skiers (many of them local residents) are helpful on the trails, and the trail system allows one to get to the more advanced trails without having to spend an hour skiing on the beginning trails in order to get to them. Tahoe XC has successfully created an extremely welcoming and supportive atmosphere. I have enjoyed watching Tahoe XC add programs, a cafe, and, of course, the memorable free hot chocolate or tea on the trail in the warming huts. I strongly support the Site D - Full Porject. This project would make the ski area top rate and increase the likelihood of financial stability.
Sincerely, Vivian Euzent

From: Dianne Miller (lkdda07@gmail.com)

July 15, 2018 21:02

To: d.wilkins@tcpud.org; jfriedman@tcpud.org; jpang@tcpud.org; r.treabess@tcpud.org; scottrzumwalt@gmail.com

Subject: TXC and Schilling Lodge Project Message:

Dear TCPUD Board of Directors, I have been a resident of the North Shore of Lake Tahoe and the Tahoe City area for 45 years. I am a dedicated community member and have supported many projects and improvements over the years. I am an avid cross country skier and spend many hours on the trails of Tahoe Cross Country. They provide a first class nordic center and contribute hugely to our local schools and children. I believe that the Schilling Lodge will be a wonderful addition to Tahoe XC and the local community. Please consider this incredible project and how it will enhance both the local and tourist experience.

From: Monica Grigoleit [shop@cobblestonetahoe.com]

July 17, 2018 11:27:19 AM

To: Kim Boyd

Subject: Tahoe XC

Hi Kim, I was at today's meeting and I do have a lot of additional questions. 1. Cost of each site? 2. How did site D get approved without us knowing? 3. How do we oppose current approved site? Where do I look for these answers?

Thanks, Monica Grigoleit

From: Monica Grigoleit [shop@cobblestonetahoe.com]

July 19, 2018 3:11 PM

To: Kim Boyd

Subject: Tahoe XC

Hi Kim, I have several questions and don't know where to go for the answers. 1) What are the costs associated with each different site? 2) How did TCPUD make it's final decision, was it a public vote or only a decision made by a board specifically for the Tahoe XC proposal?

Thanks, Monica Grigoleit

I76-13
cont.

From: Alex Lesser [alex@pssclabs.com]

July 19, 2018 3:56 PM

To: Kim Boyd; Terri Viehmann; Sean Barclay; jfriedman@tcpud.org;

r.treabess@tcpud.org; jpang@tcpud.org

Subject: YESTERDAY'S MEETINGS

Hello Everyone I wanted to take a moment and just reflect on today's first EIR scoping meeting. First off I am pretty disappointed to see very few TCPUD Board Members in attendance. I want to ask first if TCPUD actually cares what the Highlands residents (or any Tahoe City) residents have to say? We received notification for this meeting almost a full month ago. There really is no reason that the entire TCPUD Board could not be in attendance. From what I understand there is only going to be one opportunity for the Public and TCPUD Board Members to engage in a back and forth. Is this correct? If so will there be any time limits? Will there be a limit to the number of questions? Is there any information TCPUD Board Members can provide now to help the public prepare for what seems to be the only time we can actually engage in a back and forth discussion. Next I would like to reiterate the questions I presented that were not answered. My expectation is that these questions will be answered at some point. Again if the TCPUD Board was in attendance perhaps we could have had a productive conversation rather than community vehemently voicing their objections to many aspects of this project with no one from TCPUD able to respond. If you take the time to review the video, I spend the majority of my time asking questions to the only person representing the TCPUD that appeared to be engaged.

It was stated that the main goals of this project were to do the following three things
 Improve the current layout of the Tahoe Cross Country Ski Lodge to better accommodate things like "storage"
 Provide more parking spaces
 Provide better traffic flow
 These items are directly from the presentation. I'd like to understand how much research has gone into these goals. For instance, how much storage is really needed? If expanded storage is main goal then great let's add some more storage. I highly doubt this means going from a 2400 sq ft structure to a nearly 10,000 sq ft structure. Next, how many days per year is there insufficient parking? Over the past few years the number of weeks that the Cross Country facility is actually open is on average 5 or 6 weeks. That means maybe 10 or 12 weekend days per year that there may be need for additional parking. And in terms of traffic flow, even the presentation noted that the current location of the Cross Country facility can be reconfigured to offer better traffic flow than the proposed location at Site D. I believe if the TCPUD can provide answers to the stated three main objectives, we can all find a solution that would be satisfactory to everyone involved. During my conversations with Highlands residents and neighbors no one has stated that they do not want the Cross Country facility to be improved. But let's make the right improvements for the right reasons.

Now, I'd like to make absolutely certain that in fact the three stated main goals are the only reasons for the proposed site change and lodge expansion. I would like to give TCPUD Board Members the opportunity now to tell the public if there are other reasons that were not stated on the PowerPoint Presentation or stated. I believe this is very important now for TCPUD to address this.

I76-13
cont.

Because I only had 3 minutes to ask questions I didn't have a chance to address my real concern which is public safety. I have stated several times previously that I have very young children. My home sits around a blind turn. There are NO sidewalks on Polaris. There are NO streetlights next to my house. I later found out that one Tahoe City resident has her son hit by a car on Polaris as well as several pets killed by oncoming traffic. Two nights ago, there was an SUV driving 65+ MPH with two teenagers yelling out their car windows. I can only imagine what may happen if this new facility starts serving alcohol. Actually I would like this clarified, will alcohol be served at ANY event at the new Cross Country facility? The Highlands Residents continue to voice their disapproval of moving the location to Site D. The Highlands Residents have voiced support for improvements to the current Cross Country facility at the current site. When, not if, there is a serious accident due to increased traffic on Polaris, we will all be responsible for tragedy.

TCPUD Board Members can step forward now and show the community that their residents' safety comes first by removing Site D completely. I implore the TCPUD Board Members to consider if the situation was reversed and the residents of Tahoe City voted to put the Cross Country center in their backyard. I'm certain every TCPUD Board Member would oppose it as strongly as we are. I invite any TCPUD Board Member to pick up the phone and call me. My number is 562-810-5998. I really don't want until Summer 2019 for a productive discussion. We can have it now.

Alex Lesser

From: Carol Pollock [carolpollock10@gmail.com]

July 19, 2018 4:27 PM

To: Alex Lesser; Kim Boyd; Terri Viehmann; Sean Barclay; Judy Friedman; Ron Treabess; John Pang

Subject: RE: YESTERDAY'S MEETINGS

Dear Alex, Such good points. Because I was not able to attend, I watched the two NOP sessions and did not realize before there was not an occasion for discussion. And with only one Board member there, why bother? Like others I share the concern for safety. Our home is on Old Mill Road. I believe for the last session I provided photos of three accidents that took place on one winter day. It is dangerous in all seasons. I guess I need to resubmit with a summary of concerns: traffic safety, environmental issues and cost benefits of this expansion. I'd love to see the lodge improved by the Schilling lodge in its current location. And, to see parking and traffic flow improved, too. I've gone up to see the summer usage a number of times. Rarely more than 5-10 cars there. I do not understand the budgeted costs for studies, \$200,000 now and \$400,000 next yea, for a project that has no apparent building or operating budget.

Sincerely, Carol Pollock

From: Alex Lesser [alex@pssclabs.com]

July 19, 2018 5:00 PM

To: Carol Pollock Cc: Kim Boyd; Terri Viehmann; Sean Barclay; Judy Friedman; Ron Treabess; John Pang

I76-13
cont.

Subject: Re: YESTERDAY'S MEETINGS Thank you Carol. We are a small community here in Tahoe City. TCPUD Board Members live here. I think we need to work together to address the three identified goals clearly identified at the meeting. In my view these are easily addressed with simple changes. I did not address any financial concerns because there is no amount of financial trickery that can make this lodge financially viable unless the lodge will be used for items beyond the stated goals. It would be great if TCPUD board members can give us a complete picture here.

Alex

From: Debbie White [debbie@mrooms.co.uk]

July 19, 2018 6:50 PM

To: Kim Boyd; Terri Viehmann; Judy Friedman; Matt Homolka; Dan Wilkins; Paul Niwano

Subject: The Schilling Lodge scoping meeting feedback

Kim et al Thank you for the presentation on Tuesday evening. It was good to put some faces to names on emails and to see the progression on this project. A couple of points to pick up on using your presentation points as my headline topics; - The Project will address existing operational deficiencies relative to circulation and parking This was stated in the presentation as part of the purpose of this lodge project.

As I said when I stood up, the rationale for moving to site D from site A has been lack of parking yet the presentation shown on Tuesday showed site D as having 100 parking spaces that is exactly the same as the modified site A option. So site D offers nothing more than the current site in terms of parking spaces (once modified). This further supports the need to stick with site A as the location to place the lodge and improve the current facility. There is also a viable concern that overflow parking at site D will result in cars being parked on Polaris or at the school, which will clog an already heavily trafficked area resulting in blocking traffic flow (as the road is already thin) and creating more safety issues. No outlet, safety when walking on Polaris, blocking fire access etc.. is already a serious concern without hindering it further. - Additional uses, as determined by the TCPUD, may also be proposed. The presentation states enhancing winter Nordic skiing, summer hiking & biking facilities, which we understand but 'additional uses, as determined by the TCPUD may also be proposed'; what does this mean? To include such an open statement is a worry. Can you clarify please? Does this encompass the license to host profit generating events such as weddings? If so, this is another concern given noise pollution, safety and traffic issues. This point must be clarified. - Maximize base elevation of lodge site Logically you would think this would make sense but the meadow at higher elevation is far more exposed to sunshine and snow melt, therefore not relevant.

There was also talk of site D having more snow than site A, but this is simply not true. This is a very weak point to rationalise site D over site A. - Environmental review 2 Land Use & community effects; site A is operational and site D is currently used for biking in the summer and partly for Nordic skiing in the winter. Should site D be chosen, biking through this area will no longer be possible as the area will be covered by a lodge & parking. This is my access to the forest out the back of my house, as it is for many people who use the trails for biking in the summer. Safety to continue to ride from house or car

I76-13
cont.

to trails will be compromised if site D is chosen. Scenic resources; the job of the TRPA and TCPUD is to maintain or enhance views of individual, existing scenic resources that are visible by the public. Site A exists and all boxes have been ticked for this subject. Site D location will result in considerable, catastrophic interference of our current views & landscape. The height of the building is not established (I believe, but could be wrong) so please clarify the height of the building at full or reduced project on site D. I understand max height limits range from 24 feet to 42 feet but additional height up to 56 feet is permitted for certain buildings. Hazards & public safety; Public safety is already a concern on Polaris so site D option will only increase this touchy subject. Nobody wants blood on their hands and this is a melting pot of potential disaster. Access, small street, huge traffic, increased traffic with the XC Lodge at site D, no street lights, no speed bumps, young drivers who think Polaris is a race track (kid you not & mostly those with loud exhausts to really advertise their speed as they fly by your house at 65 mph), a neighbourhood terrified alcohol will be served all contribute to alarming public safety issues at site D. Public services & utilities; site A has all utilities in place. Site D is starting from scratch. Waste of money, damages the environment, huge expense. No need.

Greenhouse gas and emissions & climate change; our planet is changing, we all know that but apparently 11% of all global greenhouse emissions caused by humans can be blamed on DEFORESTATION. Shockingly, this is exactly what site D proposal will do; clearance, or clearing of the forest or stand of trees behind Polaris so the land can be converted to a non-forest use (i.e. this Lodge project). That is not a fact anyone can ignore and the fact this is Lake Tahoe makes it even more shocking that site D is under consideration. Site A, has no impact on this.

The TCPUD need to do the right thing and stop all consideration of site D as the list of cons is just getting longer as time passes. Noise; Site A is far more protected from a noise point of view than site D. Events such as the schools mountain biking championships held early Sept that have a start and finish right about where Site D will be creates a level of noise not acceptable to the neighbourhood. We don't mind it now and then as we are all sports people and we encourage competition but constantly is not an option. One thing not on this list is the effect on flora & fauna; huge, devastation of existing flora and fauna at site D due to tearing up the great outdoors and paving it with a car park and placement of a lodge. Same for animals. Who is going to protect and speak for them? If anyone reading this still thinks site D is a good idea, you should not live in Tahoe. Over and out - I MUST get on my mountain bike!
Debbie White

From: Paul Navabpour [jakeaqu@me.com]

July 19, 2018 6:57 PM

To: Alex Lesser Cc: Kim Boyd; Terri Viehmann; Sean Barclay; Judy Friedman; Ron Treabess; John Pang

Subject: Re: YESTERDAY'S MEETINGS

Alex: Your points are spot-on. I found the meeting rather bizarre to stand at a podium without any of our representatives PRESENT to address our concerns.

I76-13
cont.

Having said that, I will address the TCPUD board with the following points for our family who live here year round and have children attending the school. To the TCPUD BOARD copied above: Environmental impact: CEQA's own slide presented a desire to study the environmental impact on many fronts for moving to the high school. Adding a HUGE driveway from Polaris, or even worse, from Cedarwood does not in any way comply to the objective of being mindful of an environmental impact. Overloading the high school/middle school area with traffic from BOTH Polaris OR Cedarwood is not acceptable. Our kids can't walk on Polaris to school. Our kids AMONG many others travel the trails to the school; add a "driveway" off Cedarwood, and you merely add more traffic to an overburdened corner where the school is and take away the peace of mind for those on bikes and on foot to get to and from school. Unnecessary to break ground, take down trees, affect seasonal creeks with such a HUGE project that will impact neighbors, our backyards, our front yards when the existing location already has the negative impacts absorbed. For the record, I propose a modified expansion and improvement to the TC XC center at it's current location; Far less impact, diverts traffic away from the "school corner" and won't affect us residents that purchased our homes accepting the issues of Polaris KNOWING that we backed up to an "open space" behind our homes free of car or bus traffic.
Regards, Paul Navabpour

From: Debbie White (debbie@mrooms.co.uk]
July 20, 2018 1:45 AM

To: Kim Boyd; Terri Viehmann; Judy Friedman; Matt Homolka; Dan Wilkins
Subject: Schilling Lodge follow up no 2 Kim et al

On my mountain bike ride tonight I went to the Tahoe XC & Snow Shoe Center (site A). I have obviously been there before but without sounding rude, the place is a mess with a total of 8 small outbuildings of all shapes and sizes dotted throughout the property. Stuff everywhere. I understand why those involved got excited at the prospect of a bigger, better, gifted lodge. But it seems feasible that given the opportunity, new life can be injected in to this existing site (A) to maximise the space available, hit project objectives and to clean up what is looking like a once loved Scout Hut from 1975! With careful planning, lower spend, no environmental impact or safety issues, the Schilling Lodge can take pride of place on the existing lot that will also include renovation of the current building plus 100 parking spaces (currently c. 50 that I counted tonight). This option is outlined as 'Proposed Site A - Modified Project' in the TCPUD Scoping document. The table I have done below shows marginal differences in Site D full project & Site A - Modified Project sizes. Small differences with big consequences.

It seems foolish to pursue Site D. Site D Full project size Site A Modified project size
10,154 sq ft reconstructed lodge inc. addition & basement 8, 661 sq ft (6229 sq ft
Schilling Lodge with basement sq ft renovation of existing clubhouse. 59,799 sq ft
parking & driveway coverage 55,803 sq ft parking driveway coverage 100 parking spaces
100 parking spaces Use; as you can see below only 2 of the list of uses for Site D full
project are not possible at Site A- Modified project. No family area or snowmobile car
port. Perhaps the meeting room can be used for a Family Area at Site A when not in use

I76-13
cont.

to overcome this hurdle. Do Snowmobiles have to live on site year round and maybe a temporary structure is possible in the winter. Neither are a disaster or a serious compromise. Site D Full project USE includes: Site A Modified project USE includes: Difference Ticket sales Retail Meeting room Ticket sales Retail Meeting room No family area No snowmobile car port 2 of 13 uses not possible at Site A-Modified Project 2 Café Rental Storage Staff area First aid Lockers Family area Gym/mtg space Snowmobile carport Community/outdoor space Café Rental Storage Staff area First aid Lockers Gym/mtg space Community/outdoor space Elevation; all this discussion, heartache, safety worry & concern to protect our beautiful Tahoe outdoors is for an additional 76' difference in elevation from Site A to Site D.

This is pitiful and a disgraceful waste of everyone's time, public money and effort. Site A planned use if not the TXC center. This has been raised throughout this process; what use is planned for Site A should Site D be the chosen? This question has not been answered, which is frankly astonishing. Having no plan for the space is a blatant waste of public money and has so many consequences. I realise all options must be considered but having a plan for Site A if Site D is chosen should be very much part of your internal discussion and planning process as surely that involves a level of spend and management too? You can't simply forget it in this equation. Once again, thank you for your time.
Debbie White

From: Janet Huff [huffmnty@aol.com]

July 20, 2018 9:02 AM

To: Judy Friedman; Ron Treabess; Dan Wilkins; John Pang; Scott Zumwalt; Sean Barclay; Matt Homolka; Kim Boyd; Terri Viehmann

Subject: REQUESTED EIR SCOPING ITEMS Dear

TCPUD Board & Staff Members, To reduce future challenges, please make sure the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) objectively and thoroughly answers all of the following questions in each of these analysis areas identified at the Public Scoping meetings:

Re Hydrology/water quality - Would the Proposed Project (i.e., Site D – Full Project) or any of the Alternatives: change the drainage pattern of the site, or alter the course of a natural stream?

Re Geology and soils, land capability, and coverage - Would the Proposed Project (i.e., Site D – Full Project) or any of the Alternatives: result in soil erosion or loss of topsoil, conflict with zoning of forest land or open space, convert forest land to non-forest use, or conflict with any land use, habitat conservation, or natural community conservation plan?

Re Scenic resources - Would the Proposed Project (i.e., Site D – Full Project) or any of the Alternatives: adversely effect a scenic vista, degrade public views of the site or surroundings (i.e., create an eyesore), or produce a light source that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?

I76-13
cont.

Re Biological resources - Would the Proposed Project (i.e., Site D – Full Project) or any of the Alternatives: adversely affect sensitive or special status species, protected wetlands, interfere with resident wildlife movements, or conflict with policies protecting biological resources, including tree preservation?

Re Cultural resources - Would the Proposed Project (i.e., Site D – Full Project) or any of the Alternatives: adversely and excessively modify a structure that is significant to Lake Tahoe’s cultural history?

Re Hazards and public safety - Would the Proposed Project (i.e., Site D – Full Project) or any of the Alternatives: create public and environmental hazards through the routine transport, storage, and handling of flammable fuels and other hazardous materials that present a reasonable possibility of accidents within one quarter mile of schools, expose people and structures to increased wildfire dangers, or increase congestion of the only emergency evacuation route from two schools?

Re Public services and utilities - Would the Proposed Project (i.e., Site D – Full Project) or any of the Alternatives: create a need for new/expanded facilities to maintain acceptable service levels, emergency response times (e.g., fire protection, law enforcement), and provide both the project and Highlands neighborhood with sufficient water supplies in normal and dry years?

Re Traffic and parking - Would the Proposed Project (i.e., Site D – Full Project) or any of the Alternatives: increase the vehicle traffic upon the busiest street(s) in the Highlands during the winter months, endanger pedestrians (e.g., neighborhood children, gym classes) that routine use Polaris, Cedarwood, Old Mill, and Heather, increase the “rolling-stop” violations through the stop signs at Old Mill and Polaris, endanger drivers and residents on the slippery winter conditions on both Old Mill and Polaris, or dangerously increase congestion on the only emergency evacuation route from two schools?

Re Air quality - Would the Proposed Project (i.e., Site D – Full Project) or any of the Alternatives: contribute to a decrease in air quality in a residential and school neighborhood?

Re Greenhouse gas emissions - Would the Proposed Project (i.e., Site D – Full Project) or any of the Alternatives: increase greenhouse gas emissions by adding up to one hundred more cars and several buses to the daily traffic in a residential and school neighborhood?

Re Noise - Would the Proposed Project (i.e., Site D – Full Project) or any of the Alternatives: generate a temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the area beyond those existing without the project?

Thorough analyses of the above are expected to reveal significant impacts, some of which may be unfeasible to mitigate, but people are willing to give the formal process a chance to work. Please let me know if you have any questions about the above requested action. Sincerely yours, Janet Huff

I76-13
cont.

From: Roger Huff [huffmtry@aol.com]

July 21, 2018 7:43 AM

To: Kim Boyd; Judy Friedman; Ron Treabess; Dan Wilkins; John Pang; Scott Zumwalt; Sean Barclay; Matt Homolka; Terri Viehmann

Subject: SPECIFIC EIR SCOPING REQUESTS - PLEASE CONFIRM RECEIPT

Dear TCPUD Board & Staff Members, The following are provided in response to your Public Scoping invitation to offer early input, comment on the scope of environmental issues and potential effects and alternatives to be considered in the EIR. The requested specific actions are intended strengthen the EIR and make the project more feasible, less divisive, and much more beneficial for a much larger segment of our community.

1. Please make the following corrections to the invalid and/or misleading statements in the Notice Of Preparation (NOP) and identified previously:

a. There currently are no such facilities as the Tahoe Cross-Country Lodge or Highlands Park and Community Center. Both these names are incorrect. b. The Proposed Project (i.e., Site D – Full Project) does not include any replacement or expansion of the above facilities. This is misleading. c. Use of the terms “public use” and “community use” are also misleading, because the proposed facility is designed specifically for TCCSEA/TXC membership/commercial operations use, not for the larger community.

2. Please also insist that the EIR provide thorough and objective answers to the following questions (taken from CEQA guidance documentation) regarding whether the Proposed Project (i.e., Site D – Full Project) or any of the Alternatives would: have adverse effect on a scenic vista, degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings, or create a source of light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area; generate a temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity or a temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity above levels existing without the project; result in soil erosion or the loss of topsoil; conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land, result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use, or cause an environmental impact due to a conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation violate any air quality standard or contribute to a net increase in an existing or projected air quality violation, generate greenhouse gas emissions, or conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing emissions of greenhouse gases; create a hazard to the public or the environment through routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials, create a hazard to the public or environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment, emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school, or expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to risk of loss, injury or death involving wild land fires including where wild lands are adjacent to urbanized areas or residences are intermixed with wild lands; have an adverse effect, directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a sensitive or special status species, interfere with movement of any native resident or

I76-13
cont.

migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance, or conflict with the provisions of a Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan or conflict with any habitat conservation or natural community conservation plan; cause an adverse change in the significance of a historical resource; alter the existing drainage pattern of the site, including through alteration of the course of a stream through addition of impervious surfaces, or alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including the alteration of the course of a stream; result in a need for new/altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause environmental impacts, to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or performance objectives for: fire protection, law enforcement, schools, or other public facilities; conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of circulation system effectiveness, conflict with any congestion management program, including level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards or conflict with policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease performance or safety of such facilities; or result in inadequate emergency access; require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, or wastewater⁰ treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, or the expansion of existing facilities, in order to have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years; impair an adopted emergency response or emergency evacuation plan, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or uncontrolled spread of a wildfire; or expose people or structures to risks, including down slope or downstream flooding, landslides, from of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes.

I76-13
cont.

3. And since Public Scoping solicits “Alternatives,” please replace the high-risk Site D – Alternate Driveway option with the following more realistic, less controversial, and more affordable Site A – Low Impact option that does not create the serious environmental impacts of the Proposed Project at Site D or currently proposed Alternatives: Change the title to the “Highlands Community Center Project,” and replace the existing Highlands Community Center with the original (4,607 sq. ft.) historic Schilling structure in the current Country Club Drive location; Only permit minimal internal and external changes required not just to meet basic needs of the TCCSEA/TXC, but also for other Community functions;

4. Reduce the parking lot size: by limiting its additions to those required to minimize on-street parking on an average winter day, and by using the smaller (2,814 sq. ft.) surface footprint of the Schilling structure; and

5. Transfer final ownership of the facility to the TCPUD for use as a true community resource, like the current Highlands Community Center. As always, if you have questions about any of the above, please contact me.

Very sincerely, Roger Huff

From: Carol Pollock [carolpollock10@gmail.com]

July 23, 2018 12:35 PM

To: Judy Friedman; Ron Treabess; Dan Wilkins; John Pang; Scott Zumwalt; Sean Barclay; Matt Homolka; Kim Boyd; Terri Viehmann

Subject: XC Lodge in the Highlands

My husband and I have a home on Old Mill Road, which we have owned for over twenty years. I would like to reinforce the need for traffic studies related to increased traffic on our street. I believe at the first comment meeting I provided photos of three accidents that took place directly below our home on one not terribly snowy day this winter. Exiting our driveway is risky in all seasons with the current traffic. Walking on Old Mill is equally dangerous and difficult. The school traffic is predictable and what existed when we purchased our home. The traffic increases and impacts just from the softball games on Thursday evenings is unbelievable. Not what we bargained for. In addition to traffic safety I am very concerned about environmental damage that will result in covering 50,000 square feet of open space with parking lots and 10,000 sq. foot new lodge. Not to mention the problems that will be encountered by neighbors in the proposed Site D. I am entirely in favor of improvements to the XC lodge in its current location, utilizing a smaller Schilling lodge, improving the parking and traffic flow for an average winter day.

One of our neighbors has suggested the following alternative:

- Replace the high-risk Site D - Alternate Driveway option with the following more realistic, less controversial, and more affordable Site A - Low Impact option that does not cause the environmental impacts of the Proposed Project at Site D or its currently proposed Alternatives;
- Change the title to the "Highlands Community Center Project," and replace the existing Highlands Community Center with the original (4,607 sq. ft.) historic Schilling structure in the current Country Club Dr. location;
- Only permit minimal internal and external changes to the original structure required not just to meet basic needs of the TCCSEA/TXC, but also for other Community functions;
- Reduce the parking lot size (and traffic load): by limiting its additions to those required to minimize on-street parking on an average winter day, and by using the smaller (2,814 sq. ft.) surface footprint of the Schilling structure; and
- Transfer the final ownership of the facility to the TCPUD for use as a community resource, like the current Highlands Community Center.

My neighbors also have pointed out areas of the study that need further clarification and identification. Those seem to be very appropriate to request. I have included them below:

To reduce future challenges, please make sure the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) objectively and thoroughly answers all the following questions in each of these analysis areas identified at the Public Scoping meetings July 17th:

- Re Hydrology/water quality: Would the Proposed Project (i.e., Site D – Full Project) or any of the Alternatives: change the drainage pattern of the site, or alter the course

I76-13
cont.

of a natural stream? Re Geology and soils, land capability, and coverage: Would the Proposed Project (i.e., Site D – Full Project) or any of the Alternatives: result in soil erosion or loss of topsoil, conflict with zoning of forest land or open space, convert forest land to non-forest use, or conflict with any land use, habitat conservation, or natural community conservation plan?

- Re Scenic resources: Would the Proposed Project (i.e., Site D – Full Project) or any of the Alternatives: adversely effect a scenic vista, degrade public views of the site or surroundings (i.e., create an eyesore), or produce a light source that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?
- Re Biological resources: Would the Proposed Project (i.e., Site D – Full Project) or any of the Alternatives: adversely affect sensitive or special status species, protected wetlands, interfere with resident wildlife movements, or conflict with policies protecting biological resources, including tree preservation?
- Re Cultural resources: Would the Proposed Project (i.e., Site D – Full Project) or any of the Alternatives: adversely and excessively modify a structure that is significant to Lake Tahoe’s cultural history?
- Re Hazards and Public Safety: Would the Proposed Project (i.e., Site D – Full Project) or any of the Alternatives: create public and environmental hazards through the routine transport, storage, and handling of flammable fuels and other hazardous materials that present a reasonable possibility of accidents within one quarter mile of schools, expose people and structures to increased wildfire dangers, or increase congestion of the only emergency evacuation route from two schools?
- Re Public services and utilities: Would the Proposed Project (i.e., Site D – Full Project) or any of the Alternatives: create a need for new/expanded facilities to maintain acceptable service levels, emergency response times (e.g., fire protection, law enforcement), and provide both the project and Highlands neighborhood with sufficient water supplies in normal and dry years?
- Re Traffic and Parking: Would the Proposed Project (i.e., Site D – Full Project) or any of the Alternatives: increase the vehicle traffic upon the busiest street(s) in the Highlands during the winter months, endanger pedestrians (e.g., neighborhood children, gym classes) that routine use Polaris, Cedarwood, Old Mill, and Heather, increase the “rolling-stop” violations through the stop signs at Old Mill and Polaris, endanger drivers and residents on the slippery winter conditions on both Old Mill and Polaris, or dangerously increase congestion on the only emergency evacuation route from two schools?
- Re Air quality: Would the Proposed Project (i.e., Site D – Full Project) or any of the Alternatives: contribute to a decrease in air quality in a residential and school neighborhood? Re Greenhouse gas emissions: Would the Proposed Project (i.e., Site D – Full Project) or any of the Alternatives: increase greenhouse gas emissions by

I76-13
cont.

adding up to one hundred more cars and several buses to the daily traffic in a residential and school neighborhood? Re Noise: Would the Proposed Project (i.e., Site D – Full Project) or any of the Alternatives: generate a temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the area beyond those existing without the project?

Finally, as a Tahoe taxpayer I am astonished that this project can proceed to this point without a building budget and operating budget. How can that be? And, how can so much money be spent for studies on a significant project that has no funding requirements that have been identified.

Very sincerely, Carol Pollock

From: Huff [mailto:huffmstry@aol.com]

July 23, 2018 2:29 PM

To: Kim Boyd <kboyd@tcpud.org>; Judy Friedman <jfriedman@tcpud.org>; Ron Treabess <r.treabess@tcpud.org>; Dan Wilkins <d.wilkins@tcpud.org>; John Pang <jpang@tcpud.org>; Scott Zumwalt <scottrzumwalt@gmail.com>; Sean Barclay <sbarclay@tcpud.org>; Matt Homolka <mhomolka@tcpud.org>; Terri Viehmann <tviehmann@tcpud.org>

Subject: Re: SPECIFIC EIR SCOPING REQUESTS - PLEASE CONFIRM RECEIPT

Hi Kim,

A number of people would like to see their inputs also discussed during the upcoming Board meeting, and feel strongly about it. What would it take to make it an official agenda item?

Roger

In a message dated 7/23/2018 2:02:24 PM, kboyd@tcpud.org wrote:

Thank you Roger.

These comments will also be considered in preparing the Draft EIR analysis and have been shared with Board and staff. They will be included in the August 17th, 2018 Board packet.

Kim Boyd Senior Management Analyst, Tahoe City Public Utility District

From: Don Heapes [donheapes@tahoexc.org]

July 24, 2018 12:33 PM

To: Kim Boyd Subject: TCCSEA Lodge Replacement Scoping Comments
Kim... I am hoping the criteria for determining significant impacts in CEQA scoping are stated up front in the process and not at the back end after data has been collected.
Thanks...Don Heapes

From: Ted Gomoll [tedgomoll@gmail.com]

July 24, 2018 2:43 PM

To: Kim Boyd

Subject: Tahoe Cross - Country Lodge

I76-13
cont.

Hi Kim, I am following up on the meeting held 7/17/18. I have been a Highlands property owner since the early 1990's. I strongly believe that the new lodge should not be located in our residential area whether the high/middle school location or current location. The construction traffic will be dangerous and very disruptive. When the new high school was built, construction trucks were travelling our streets all hours of the day and night seven days a week. The noise was unbearable in a residential area. Therefore the best location would be the north side of State Hwy. 28 next to the new bike trail and the TART stop across from the entrance to Dollar Point. This would be far less disruptive to our residential community and very accessible year around for all types of users. Virtually no road construction would be necessary and a large parking lot could be constructed with minimal negative environmental impact. It would be easy to construct a trail from the Hwy 28 location to the current trail network. The existing lodge could remain as gathering area, warming area with restrooms and the parking lot would not need to be enlarged. Most Highlands property owners support my recommendation and would be willing to sign a petition to the TCPUD board supporting the Hwy 28 location. Possibly a few Highlands property owners should meet with the TCPUD board to discuss the Hwy 28 location alternative.

Best regards, Ted Gomoll

From: John Sutter [John@johnsutterrealestate.com]

July 24, 2018 6:38 PM

To: Kim Boyd

Subject: Comments

Hi Kim, We are the owners of 3075 Highlands Court and would like to add comments to the environmental topics. We believe the High School location would be the best location and have the lowest negative effect on the quality of life for Highlands' property owners. As far as the "increased traffic" on Polaris, wasn't it busier 10-15 years ago when the schools were full and we had more full time residents? I have been a real estate agent here for 28 years. Whenever I showed homes on Polaris I would disclose "you will have more traffic than other streets... but the best snow removal!" This fact is well known for all locals and for parcel owners to complain after the fact is disingenuous. The high school location would not put the facility right in the face of the adjoining neighbors, (including my parcel), as the plan to place/expand the current location would. I believe the value of our parcels would be diminished as, instead of looking at the fairway, we would be looking at a huge complex. The new location at the high school would be farther away from existing homeowners parcels besides the bonus of a higher elevation for snow operations. As a contractor, I recall that coverage could be swapped. Would it not be advantageous to use the existing coverage the Country Club parcel has, to transfer to the new high school location? Another factor which should be addressed is the noise and time of any operation. We live in a "residential" area. We should not be inundated by noise or lights before 7:00 am. (preferably 8...)

Thank you for your efforts! John and Linda Sutter 1

From: Ray Garland [raygarland2@gmail.com]

July 25, 2018 12:53 PM

To: Kim Boyd

I76-13
cont.

Subject: ISSUES SURROUNDING SITE "A" - TXC Lodge Expansion

Hi Kim, Before the deadline later today, I wanted to point out some issues regarding alternative site "A". At the public scoping meeting, I was asked by one of the TXC Board members why they had not heard from neighbors surrounding the current facility. The main reason is that so much publicity and emphasis has put on the preference for site "D" near NTHS that they don't think they are in any danger of site "A" ending up as the site selected for the expansion. However, should site "A" be selected, I think I can assure you that there would be a large outcry and opposition from neighbors on Country Club, Highlands Dr., Village and Cedarwood. The expansion, even at the reduced size, plus expanding the parking lot to 100 spaces would move the lodge up the hill directly behind houses on Village and Cedarwood. TXC initial research indicated it would have a negative sightline impact on more houses near site "A" than site "D". So you could certainly expect to hear from residents so affected. In addition, the large number of trees that would have to be removed would be objected to by residents on the aforementioned streets.

Sincerely, Ray Garland 3165 Cedarwood Drive

From: Stephanie Schwartz [stephandmike@hotmail.com]

July 25, 2018 4:33 PM

To: Kim Boyd

Subject: Comments about the proposed TCXC lodge replacement

Kim, After attending many meetings over the years (beginning with the first meeting in the yurt 4 years ago) I think the 2 main reasons that the TCCSEA wants the lodge to be relocated to Site D are: 1. The potential for more snow 2. Easier access for beginner and disabled skiers Neither of these issues can justify the environmental impact that will ensue if the lodge is moved from its original site (Site A) to the proposed site (Site D).

1. The elevation gain at Site D is 76 feet. Site A sits at 6560' and Site D sits at 6636'. The amount of snowfall is equal. I ski on those trails daily and I can tell you with absolute certainty that when the snow is melting at the existing site it is also melting at the proposed site. When dirt is showing, it is showing in both places. Equally. The only way to ensure more snowfall would be to move the TCXC center above 8000'. This insignificant elevation gain does not justify paving a driveway, paving 100 parking spaces or building a 10,000 square foot building on existing meadows and forest.

2. I understand the hill makes it challenging for beginner skiers and handicapped skiers, however, please note that beginner skiers and handicapped skiers ski at the downhill ski resorts daily. I think reworking that slope above the existing site (Site A) will make far less environmental impact than what is proposed for Site D. I think the best way to solve the environmental impact problem is to keep the lodge where it is, Site A. Create a beautiful, accessible lodge for all skiers. The title of your web page says it perfectly - Tahoe Cross Country Lodge Replacement, replacement NOT relocation.

Thank you, Stephanie Schwartz Highlands Homeowner

From Julie Basile

July 25, 2018

I76-13
cont.

To: Kim Boyd

Subject: Tahoe Cross-Country Lodge Replacement and Expansion Project - EIR

Dear Ms. Boyd: Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on the Notice of Preparation for the Tahoe Cross-Country Lodge Replacement and Expansion Project . I appreciate that the Tahoe City Public Utility District has shown such a great capacity for listening to the community. I have written previous comment letters regarding this project, but it is my understanding that these comments should be provided during the environmental review process. Please accept my apology for any repetition. I have a few thoughts regarding the project objectives and many concerns about the potential impacts associated with Site D - alternative driveway.

A. Project Objectives 1. Does the Tahoe City Cross Country Center need an expanded facility? I have been a pass holder at the cross country center for many years and I try to utilize the trails several times a week. In the last few years, unfortunately the weather has not cooperated and the cross country ski season has been fairly minimal (except for last year). The center is not always able to open over the Christmas holiday when many visitors come to the area. Many of the traditional races such as the Great Ski Race continue to be cancelled. Although snowmaking would make skiing possible, the large amount of area to cover verses the price of a trail pass do not seem to support snowmaking like the downhill ski resorts. If the new facility costs the Cross Country center more to operate, will it still be sustainable? If year after year, people don't use their passes more than a few times, will they continue to buy them? I am sure there are some yearly costs that must be paid such as insurance, equipment, staff etc that must be paid regardless of whether the facility opens or not. An expanded facility would require a higher operating cost and if Mother Nature doesn't cooperate, that could be more of a burden than a benefit. I would hate to see the Cross Country center become economically unviable. There are many locals that use this area to exercise every single day. This is not my area of expertise and really none of my business, but an important question to be asked. 2 Who is this expansion intended to serve? Are we trying to draw a huge number of visitors to this area? Does this change the experience that we currently enjoy and is that worth the financial benefit? Is the project proposed this way because the lodge was gifted and happens to be larger or does the facility need to be this size? I only bring this up because Squaw Valley added a fancy Village with lots of great places to eat, shops and places to stay and now it is very difficult to enjoy a day on the mountain on the weekend or a holiday when the kids don't have school. This area is a perfect example of a traffic issue. It is not only the residents that complain, I hear second home owners and visitors expressing their disappointment with their experience.

My understanding was that this upgrade was intended to support the education component. If this is the case, shouldn't it be a part of the high school? Shouldn't it be accessed in the same way as the school? If this is the case the alternate driveway through Cedarwood Drive does not appear beneficial. 2. Is this the highest and best use of the Schilling lodge gift? Is it possible or beneficial to upgrade the existing lodge and use the Schilling lodge in a different place? If the Schilling lodge is not the best fit for Tahoe City Cross Country because of its increased size, is it possible to use the Schilling lodge for another community project and perhaps give some of the money that would have been

I76-13
cont.

spent for a new facility back to the Cross Country Center to update their existing facility? Could it be used for the Fire Station site in town if there is an art center or conference center there? What about at the golf course for the new ice rink? Could it be incorporated into a new recreation center? Is it possible that it could be a ski destination out in the woods that could add an additional amenity to the Cross Country Center? Could it be a part of a system of lodges that people hike to and could provide an additional recreation opportunity in the basin? They have this system in New Zealand and it is pretty incredible. People in our community really want recreation experiences that are not already provided in our town. Many families commute to Truckee and Reno to provide recreational opportunities for their children several to five times a week. Pool Facilities, gymnastics gyms and covered/ indoor field space would be a huge benefit to our community.

B. Site D - alternative driveway The alternative evaluating a proposed “driveway” from the end of Cedarwood Drive to the project site creates at least 7 environmental impacts to avoid the traffic impact to a portion of Polaris Road. I have listed a minimum of the categories below and some of the sections that are applicable. Please note that this is in no way a complete list but a starting point. The proposed alternative driveway appears environmentally offensive, not cost effective and downright dangerous to residents of Cedarwood Drive and all of the Highlands residents that utilize that street for exercise.

1. Aesthetics
 - a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?
 - b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?
 - c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?
 - d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?
2. Agriculture and Forestry Resources
 - d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?
3. Biological
 - b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?
 - e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?
4. Hydrology / Water Quality
5. Land Use / Planning
 - b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect? Association of Environmental Professionals 2017 CEQA Guidelines Appendices 291 Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated Less Than Significant Impact No Impact
 - c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan? XI. MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the
6. Noise
 - c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?
 - d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?
7. Recreation
 - b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction

I76-13
cont.

or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

8. Transportation/Traffic c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?

Discussion At this time, Cedarwood is a very quiet street, one in which I know almost every car and the only time it is really ever busy is when there is a band meeting at Mr. Norby's house. It is a street that many of the Highlands residents use to walk their dogs during the winter months and the children play and ride their bikes without fear that they will be hit by a car. The back yard is a different story. It is full of skiers cruising by enjoying themselves. Will their outdoor experience be any different if they are listening to the sound of buses going by instead of the quiet of the forest?

What about the residents on Polaris that have traffic in front of their house but they back to Conservancy lands? Is this an appropriate alternative to take that away and put traffic in the back of their house too? That section of trail is highly used recreationally. Is a new road appropriate in this area that has a creek? As a resident of the Tahoe Basin, and a TCPUD customer I hope that the final approved project respects our environment as well as our community. Thank you for this opportunity to comment.

Sincerely: Julie Basile

From: huffmtry@aol.com

July 26, 2018 3:06:53 PM

To: mhomolka@tcpud.org

Cc: kboyd@tcpud.org, jfriedman@tcpud.org, r.treabess@tcpud.org, d.wilkins@tcpud.org, jpang@tcpud.org, scottrzumwalt@gmail.com, sbarclay@tcpud.org, tviehmann@tcpud.org

Subject: Re: SPECIFIC EIR SCOPING REQUESTS - PLEASE CONFIRM RECEIPT

Hi Matt,

We discussed value of the public hearing their inputs and questions formally discussed by Board Members, and the proposed Alternative would eliminate many of the major concerns expressed by residents on July 17th. Some questions they asked do not fit neatly into an EIR, but are nevertheless still important to the feasibility (and credibility) of this project.

Cheers, Roger

In a message dated 7/26/2018 1:21:02 PM, mhomolka@tcpud.org wrote:

Roger,

We have received a lot of input during the NOP public scoping period, which as you know closed yesterday. In the next few weeks our team will be reviewing and considering the comments and input we have received. If we conclude that the list of alternatives should be revised, we will bring that to the Board for discussion and their approval. Otherwise, we have no need for Board action until later in the EIR process. Without staff doing so, the only other way to get a specific item added to the agenda is for a Board member to request it. I can appreciate and completely understand your and others strong desire for answers and continued discussions; they will come. I would just

I76-13
cont.

ask that you give us the time to provide you with well informed and detailed answers and information in the Draft EIR.

Thanks,

Matt Homolka, P.E. District Engineer/Assistant General Manager TCPUD

From: Roger Huff [huffmtry@aol.com]

August 14, 2018 7:26 AM

To: Judy Friedman; Dan Wilkins; Ron Treabess; John Pang; Scott Zumwalt; Sean Barclay; Matt Homolka; Kim Boyd; Terri Viehmann

Subject: TRAFFIC STUDY CONCERNS

Good Morning, A number of Highlands residents reported seeing "Traffic Study" vehicles last Friday (August 10th) afternoon, when there was no school, staff, faculty, or parent traffic; and most residents were eating supper. What specifically are these data snapshots supposed to represent?

Regards, Roger

From: Debbie White [debbie@mrooms.co.uk]

August 15, 2018 10:42 AM

To: Kim Boyd; Terri Viehmann; Matt Homolka; Judy Friedman; Bob Bolton; Dan Wilkins

Subject: Traffic study, Friday 10th August 2018 on Old Mill, Tahoe City

Kim Hi. I'm sure all of you have seen this picture by now but can you tell me what this study was for or part of? I think the worry from our neighbourhood is that it will be used to justify the Schilling Lodge Site D option using traffic study figures that don't truly represent traffic flow when school is in use. Can someone explain this process?

Thank you. Debbie White

NOTE - Due to format conversion issues the picture mentioned in the above email could not be legibly displayed

On 08/16/2018 12:01, **Kim Boyd wrote:** Good afternoon Debbie, The traffic analysis will be detailed in the Traffic Study, which will be included in the Draft EIR when published. These details will include all dates, purposes, and results of traffic analyses done throughout the year. Kim Boyd Senior Management Analyst Tahoe City Public Utility District

From: Debbie White [debbie@mrooms.co.uk]

August 16, 2018 12:37 PM

To: Kim Boyd; Terri Viehmann; Matt Homolka; Judy Friedman; Dan Wilkins; Sean Barclay

Subject: Re: Traffic study, Friday 10th August 2018 on Old Mill, Tahoe City

Kim Thank you. So can you tell me how many dates are planned?

Kind regards, Debbie

From: Roger Huff (huffmtry@aol.com)

I76-13
cont.

August 16, 2018 12:13:32 PM

To: Kim Boyd; Judy Friedman; Dan Wilkins; Ron Treabess; John Pang; Scott Zumwalt; Sean Barclay; Matt Homolka; Terri Viehmann

Subject: Re: TRAFFIC STUDY CONCERNS

Thanks, Kim I know there were a number of concerns about the data sampling in the 2016 Traffic Study, and residents want to guard against cherry-picking non-representative measurements that once again don't include both vehicle and pedestrian counts on Polaris Road between the schools and Heather Lane on regular school days, weekends, and special events. This is extremely important to the validity and credibility of the EIR.

Cheers, Roger

From: Kim Boyd

August 16, 2018 12:03:50 PM

To: Huff; Judy Friedman; Dan Wilkins; Ron Treabess; John Pang; Scott Zumwalt; Sean Barclay; Matt Homolka; Terri Viehmann

Subject: RE: TRAFFIC STUDY CONCERNS

Good afternoon Roger, The traffic analysis will be detailed in the Traffic Study, which will be included in the Draft EIR when published. These details will include all dates, purposes, and results of traffic analyses done throughout the year.

Kim Boyd Senior Management Analyst Tahoe City Public Utility District

From: Alex Lesser [alex@pssclabs.com]

September 30, 2018 7:51 PM

To: Judy Friedman; Dan Wilkins; Ron Treabess; John Pang; Scott Zumwalt; Sean Barclay; Matt Homolka; Kim Boyd; Terri Viehmann

Subject: Some Economic Questions

Hello I'd like to ask the following questions below. Please respond that the questions have been received and will be responded to in a timely manner.

1. Is it true the Donor (Mr. Mozart) paid for deconstruction, is paying for its storage, and offered to pay \$1 Million for re-construction of the former Schilling residence?
2. What is the total, maximum amount of public (e.g., taxpayer) funding estimated to be required, budgeted, and allocated to support the project review and approval process?
3. If the proposed facility would continue to be owned and used primarily for the benefit of the Applicant, how much would the Applicant contribute to the property tax base?
4. Has there been any objective, independent, analysis that indicates if or how operation and maintenance of the proposed facility is economically feasible?
5. If ownership of the proposed facility would be turned over to the TCPUD, how would its estimated operating and maintenance costs affect taxes and fees in the community?

From: Kim Boyd

October 02, 2018 1:51 PM

To: Alex Lesser Cc: Sean Barclay; Matt Homolka; Terri Viehmann

Subject: RE: Some Economic Questions

I76-13
cont.

Alex, Thank you for your email, it has been received and will become part of the Project record. Additionally, it has been shared with the TCPUD Board and Project team, and will be included as correspondence in our Oct 19th Board packet. You raise good questions, most of which will be addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) (anticipated to be released in Feb/March 2019) or during the EIR approval process. Thank you, Kim Boyd Senior Management Analyst Tahoe City Public Utility District

From: Roger Huff [huffmtry@aol.com]

October 09, 2018 8:05 AM

To: Dan Wilkins; John Pang; Judy Friedman; Ron Treabess; Scott Zumwalt Cc: Sean Barclay; Matt Homolka; Kim Boyd; Terri 2 Viehmann

Subject: TCCSEA/TXC LODGE PROJECT ECONOMIC QUESTIONS

Dear Board Members, Meeting and correspondence records show that a number of members of our community have raised serious concerns about the economic aspects of the subject project, and key questions appear to remain unanswered. To remedy this, please answer the following:

1. What would happen to this project if the current funding for the storage and the reconstruction of the original historic structure goes away?
2. How much are the permits, fees, site preparation, modifications and additions, and construction of the proposed project currently estimated to cost, and how does the Applicant plan to pay for this?
3. Since virtually all the proposed additions and modifications are designed mainly for the use of TCCSEA members or TXC commercial activities, how would the Applicant pay for the proper maintenance and operation of the proposed facility when environmental conditions (e.g., lack of snow) prevent the latter?
4. Will community members who don't belong to the TCCSEA or use the TXC services be asked in any way to pay for the maintenance, operation, or protection of the proposed facility?
5. Wouldn't a far less ambitious and more modest facility be less controversial and more economically feasible than any of the currently proposed alternatives? A number of people are very interested in Board members' answers to the above, so I very strongly encourage you to reply within the next week or so. As always, I'm glad to help you disseminate that information if you wish.

Regards, Roger

In a message dated 10/9/2018 10:15:33 AM, **kboyd@tcpud.org writes:** Roger, Thank you for your email, it has been received and will become part of the Project record. Additionally, it has been shared with the TCPUD Board and Project team, and will be included as correspondence in our Oct 19th Board packet. You raise good questions, most of which will be addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) (anticipated to be released in Feb/March 2019) or during the EIR approval process. Thank you, Kim Boyd Senior Management Analyst Tahoe City Public Utility District

From: Roger Huff [huffmtry@aol.com]

October 09, 2018 1:28 PM

I76-13
cont.

To: Kim Boyd Cc: Sean Barclay; Matt Homolka; Terri Viehmann; Dan Wilkins; Judy Friedman; John Pang; Ron Treabess; Scott Zumwalt
 Subject: Re: TCCSEA/TXC LODGE PROJECT ECONOMIC QUESTIONS
 Kim, Thank you. Board members may want to give answering these questions priority, because several residents have already questioned why public funds are being spent for staffing a CEQA process before such basic economic issues have been thoroughly addressed. I've reviewed the EIR guidance, and don't recall it covering these economic areas. Cheers, Roger

Note - In addition to the preceding correspondence, the TCPUD has verbally been asked questions about the project's funding plan and economic feasibility by Msrs. Swift and Navabpour and during Board meetings.

From: Alex Lesser [alex@pssclabs.com]

October 22, 2018 12:54 PM

To: Kim Boyd Cc: Sean Barclay; Matt Homolka; Terri Viehmann

Subject: Re: Some Economic Questions

Board Members, Your reading file for last week's meeting included correspondence from several residents including myself asking you to answer specific questions regarding the economic feasibility of the TXC Lodge Project. The staff reply implied that these issues would be addressed during the draft EIR review, but these economic issues are not part of the "environmental" review process. Are you going to answer these questions or not?

Regards, Alex Lesser

On Oct 22, 2018, at 1 :50 PM, **Kim Boyd wrote:** Alex, Thank you for your email, it has been received and will become part of the Project record. Additionally, it has been shared with the TCPUD Board and Project team, and will be included as correspondence in our Oct 19th Board packet. You raise good questions, most of which will be addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) (anticipated to be released in Feb/March 2019) or during the EIR approval process.

Thank you, Kim Boyd Senior Management Analyst Tahoe City Public Utility District

From: Roger Huff (huffmnrty@aol.com)

October 24, 2018 2:17 PM

To: judy@tahoepapertrail.com; Dan Wilkins; John Pang; Ron Treabess; Scott Zumwalt

Cc: Terri Viehmann

Subject: CREDIBILITY

Dear Board Members, At least four different individuals have asked very serious questions about economic issues pertaining to the TXC Project at TCPUD meetings and in written correspondence; and several emails on the subject in the Reading File weren't discussed during last week's Board meeting. People were told that their economic concerns would be addressed as part of the environmental review process, but this is not likely. I strongly encourage you to answer all their economic questions now, because one consequence of not doing that will be irreparable damage to District and Board credibility. Please do not let this happen.

Thank you, Roger

I76-13
cont.

From: Roger Huff [huffintry@aol.com]

October 31, 2018 7:52 AM

To: Dan Wilkins; Judy Friedman; John Pang; Ron Treabess; judy@tahoepapertrail.com; Scott Zumwalt Cc: Sean Barclay; Matt Homolka; Kim Boyd; Terri Viehmann

Subject: PLEASE ANSWER THESE ECONOMIC QUESTIONS

Dear Board Members, Please don't put off answering the economic questions about the TXC Lodge Project asked by Ms. Pollock, Mssrs. Lesser, Navabpour, Swift, and others any longer. The NOP states that the TCPUD's objectives include to: "preserve financial accountability and transparency of TCPUD property tax funds," and also clarifies that the EIR won't address these economic issues. Please answer these economic questions now. Thank you, Roger

In a message dated 10/31/2018 9:09:12 AM **sbarclay@tcpud.org wrote:** Dear Roger, Thank you for your email. Staff continues to work towards gathering information both for the preparation of the environmental review, as well as to identify economic impacts and evaluate potential options for business arrangements between TCPUD and Tahoe XC/TCCSEA. Items currently under evaluation for that second topic include building ownership scenarios, maintenance and operations scenarios, and other operational and administrative items related to the project. Staff is working towards presenting these scenarios as an agenda item at the March 2019 TCPUD Board meeting for public input and discussion by the board. This discussion will help clarify and establish expectations well in advance of any board action related to the environmental review or approval of the project, which is currently scheduled for the fall of 2019. We will do our normal extensive outreach to the neighborhood prior to the meeting, when it is confirmed. Sincerely, Sean Barclay General Manager Tahoe City Public Utility District

I76-13
cont.

From: Roger Huff [huffintry@aol.com]

November 05, 2018 6:59 AM

To: Sean Barclay

Subject: FOLLOW UP QUESTIONS

Good Morning Sean, I shared your response with folks posing these economic questions, and over the weekend was asked: (a) if the Board members have actually seen them yet, and (b) if you intend to include an agenda item for the Board to discuss their concerns during the next meeting? Please let me know, Roger

From: Sean Barclay

November 08, 2018 4:35 PM

To: 'Huff'

Subject: RE: FOLLOW UP QUESTIONS

Hello Roger, a) Yes, the board members have seen and read all of the correspondence regarding the economic questions. b) There will be no specific item on the agenda for the November Board meeting for the Board to discuss these concerns. However, all of the correspondence we have received will be included in the Board packet and can be discussed by the Board under the Correspondence portion of the agenda. As always, you or any other member of the public is welcome to attend the Board meeting and speak to

the Board under the Public Comment section. Sincerely, Sean Barclay General Manager
Tahoe City Public Utility District

From: Paul Navabpour [jakeaqua@me.com]

November 09, 2018 8:53 AM

To: Sean Barclay Cc: Kim Boyd

Subject: XC Center-CONCERNS not being addressed

Hi Sean, Hope you are well For the record, we live on Polaris. We have kids attending NT Middle School. And are HUGELY opposed to the move to the location adjacent to the high school. Help me understand your approach and direction! -Paul

To reiterate from earlier communications: Environmental impact: CEQA's own slide presented a desire to study the environmental impact on many fronts for moving to the high school. Adding a HUGE driveway from Polaris, or even worse, from Cedarwood does not in any way comply to the objective of being mindful of an environmental impact. Overloading the high school/middle school area with traffic from BOTH Polaris OR Cedarwood is not acceptable. Our kids can't walk on Polaris to school. Our kids AMONG many others travel the trails to the school; add a "driveway" off Cedarwood, and you merely add more traffic to an overburdened corner where the school is and take away the peace of mind for those on bikes and on foot to get to and from school. Unnecessary to break ground, take down trees, affect seasonal creeks with such a HUGE project that will impact neighbors, our backyards, our front yards when the existing location already has the negative impacts absorbed. For the record, I propose a modified expansion and improvement to the TC XC center at it's current location; Far less impact, diverts traffic away from the "school corner" and won't affect us residents that purchased our homes accepting the issues of Polaris KNOWING that we backed up to an "open space" behind our homes free of car or bus traffic.

Paul Navabpour

From: Roger Huff (huffmtry@aol.com)

November 09, 2018 12:17 PM

To: Judy Friedman; Dan Wilkins; Ron Treabess; Sean Barclay; Kim Boyd; Matt Homolka; Scott Zumwalt Terri Viehmann

Subject: TCPUD Parks & Recreation Meeting - 11/13/18 -AGENDA ITEM

Requirements creep should raise a red flag, and funding yet another Traffic Study that also overlooks major areas of concern like pedestrians, gym classes, and emergency evacuation route congestion on the portion of Polaris between the schools and Heather make no sense. Please discuss these during next Tuesday's meeting.

Thank you, Roger

From: Roger Huff (huffmtry@aol.com)

November 11, 2018 2:23 PM To;

Judy Friedman; Dan Wilkins; Ron Treabess; Scott Zumwalt; John Pang Sean Barclay; Matt Homolka; Kim Boyd; Terri Viehmann As a former program manager and government contractor, I very strongly advise against approving the proposed Amendment No. 1 to the Ascent contract because: (1) impacts of access to the schools

I76-13
cont.

and Highlands Community Center are not beyond scope of the initial Work Statement, (2) funding a Traffic Study that doesn't include actual vehicle counts, speed measurements, pedestrians, and gym class usage, and school emergency evacuation route congestion upon the segment of Polaris between the schools and Heather will be a waste of money and invalid, and (3) "requirements creep" like this destroys projects. Do not do this. Regards, Roger This amendment request includes additional work required for alternatives evaluation, the traffic analysis, including evaluation of retaining Highlands Community Center for alternatives at Site D, and impacts on access to the school.
Cheers, Roger

From Carol Pollock [carolpollock10@gmail.com]

November 12, 2018 8:41 AM

To: Dan Wilkins; John Pang; Judy Friedman; Ron Treabess; Scott Zumwalt; Sean Barclay; Matt Homolka; Kim Boyd; Terri Viehmann

Subject: Traffic study for XC lodge on Board agenda this Friday

Please do not approve the proposed Amendment that funds another inadequate traffic study for the XC Lodge. We need a real study that takes into consideration the actual conditions that exist in the Highlands, particularly on Old Mill and Polaris. My house is on Old Mill and each year we watch accidents up and down Old Mill, generally in winter, but other times of year. It's dangerous at all times, worse for pedestrians, like kids trying to walk to school. Many of the kids take a shortcut through our property and others when there's no snow. We're okay with this. Yes, it's shorter, but it's also far safer.

Unfortunately I cannot attend the meeting to object to this study in person. I hope you'll do the right thing. If any of you have kids that go to the High School and Middle School you must know how dangerous traffic already is on these streets. Please authorize funds for a study that documents reality at the time of year-in the winter with snow and ice. Thanks for your consideration. Sincerely, Carol Pollock

From: Roger Huff [huffmtry@aol.com]

November 13, 2018 8:37 AM

To: Judy Friedman; Dan Wilkins; Ron Treabess; John Pang; Scott Zumwalt Cc: Sean Barclay ; Matt Homolka ; Kim Boyd ; Terri Viehmann

Subject: OBJECTIONS TO THE PROPOSED TXC CONTRACT AMENDMENT
TCPUD Board Members: As evidenced by the following quotes from the existing EIR Scope of Work, the proposed contract Amendment is unneeded and unwise because: (1) Alternatives at Sites A and D and the Highlands Community Center are already addressed, and (2) the current contract agreement requires a more thorough Traffic Analysis than stipulated in the Amendment.

“Project Understanding

The proposed Tahoe Cross Country Lodge Replacement and Expansion Project would reconstruct the Highlands Park and Community Center (Tahoe Cross Country Lodge, Tahoe XC Lodge) owned by the Tahoe City Public Utility District (TCPUD). The increase in square footage of the recreation building is sufficient to require TRPA Governing Board approval of the project. The reconstructed lodge would be

I76-13
cont.

approximately 10,150 square feet, substantially larger than the existing 2,273-square foot lodge. The District and TCCSEA have initially evaluated the feasibility and desirability of five reconstruction sites (Sites A through E), including the location of the existing lodge. From that analysis emerged the selection of three project alternatives, Site A, Site D, and a no Project alternative. The Work Plan considers analysis of up to two sites, including the existing site (Site A) and the proposed site (Site D), and a modified alternative such as an optional access route.”

Key Issues The Highlands community is a residential area, consisting of permanent and part-time residents, and also contains North Tahoe High School, North Tahoe School, and the Tahoe Cross Country Lodge. This community has expressed concerns about existing levels of traffic and other activity associated with the Tahoe Cross Country Lodge and nearby schools, and the proposed project serves to heighten those concerns, particularly as it relates to traffic on Polaris Road and other local roads, parking supply, traffic noise, lodge and event noise, and increased visitation. Transportation/Traffic Existing traffic, primarily associated with the North Tahoe High School and North Tahoe School, and parking issues in the Highlands community are a concern for local residents.

This scope includes evaluation of Sites A and D, for both winter and summer conditions. If changes to the project or other requirements other than those described below indicate the need to revise this analysis, the additional work would be outside of the scope described herein. This analysis considers evaluation of Sites A and D. As the previous analysis did not include summer conditions, LSC will conduct summer traffic counts similar to the winter traffic counts, as follows:

- PM peak-hour intersection turning-movement counts at 4 study intersections
- 24-hour roadway traffic counts at 3 locations Note that the winter analysis included both holiday and weekday conditions, whereas the summer analysis includes only one busy summer day.
- Summer Traffic Volume Impacts. The trip generation, distribution, and traffic assignment of the proposed project will be estimated based upon the existing traffic counts as well as input from the client regarding existing and proposed summer activities. G Level of Service Analysis Update: Since completion of the original study, the standard methodology for Level of Service (LOS) analysis has been updated. While this is not expected to change the results significantly, the analysis should be updated to avoid critique. In addition, a summer PM peak hour LOS analysis will be provided.

A memorandum will be prepared presenting the traffic analysis and results, with accompanying tables and graphics. Vehicle-Miles of Travel Analysis:

The transportation study scope did not include an analysis of Vehicle-Miles of Travel (VMT). As this will be necessary for the CEQA document, LSC will conduct a spreadsheet-based analysis of VMT, based on the trip generation presented in the transportation study and the distribution of external trips. A memorandum will be

I76-13
cont.

prepared presenting the analysis, results, and potential mitigation measures, as necessary. Summer Parking Analysis.

- Hourly parking counts will be conducted at the existing parking lot on 2 busy days for an 8-hour period each day. The parking demand of the proposed project will be estimated based on the parking count results and any anticipated change in summer activities. A memorandum will be prepared presenting the analysis and results.

- Traffic Safety Analysis: The original transportation study scope also did not include a review of traffic safety impacts. LSC will prepare this analysis, consisting of the following steps: - Review of available crash data for the residential streets impacted by Tahoe XC traffic volumes for the most recent available 10-year period. In addition to reviewing the Statewide Integrated Traffic Records System (SWITRS), we will contact the local CHP and Sheriff's offices as well as the School District to identify if there are any records of crashes not included in the SWITRS database.

- Bicycle and pedestrian counts for a two-hour AM and two-hour PM period of busiest school traffic for the following locations: - Polaris Road just east of the school campus - Polaris Road just west of and east of Old Mill Road - Old Mill Road just south of Polaris Road - Polaris Road just west of Fabian Way - Fabian Way just south of Polaris Road - Fabian Way just north of Polaris Road - An assessment of driver sight conditions along roadways affected by the Tahoe XC traffic volumes. Note that as sight distance restrictions resulting from snow vary widely depending on snowfall and snow removal practices, it is not possible to specifically quantify driver sight distance in peak snow conditions.

- A review of proposed driveway location and spacing. - An evaluation of the overall impact of the proposed project and project alternatives on traffic, bicycle, and pedestrian safety. As necessary, potential mitigation measures will be identified and discussed." Regards, Roger

From: Terri Viehmann

November 14, 2018 7:49 AM

To: 'Huff'; Judy Friedman; Dan Wilkins; Ron Treabess; John Pang; Scott Zumwalt Cc: Sean Barclay; Matt Homolka; Kim Boyd

Subject: RE: OBJECTIONS TO THE PROPOSED TXC CONTRACT AMENDMENT

Hello Roger, Thank you for your comments. Your message will be distributed at this Friday's board meeting, added to the project file, and reviewed by staff and Board. Kind Regards, Terri Viehmann District Clerk Tahoe City Public Utility District

From: Roger Huff (huffmtry@aol.com)

Sent: 11/19/2018 7:28:23 AM Pacific Standard Time

To: jfriedman@tcpud.org, d.wilkins@tcpud.org, r.treabess@tcpud.org, jpang@tcpud.org, scottrzumwalt@gmail.com Cc: sbarclay@tcpud.org, mhomolka@tcpud.org, kboyd@tcpud.org, tviehmann@tcpud.org

Subject: TXC PROJECT CONTRACT QUESTIONS

I76-13
cont.

Dear Board Members, Please answer the following questions regarding the amended professional services agreement (Agreement) for the TXC Ski Lodge Replacement and Expansion Project:

QUESTION #1 – Will there be a TCPUD-owned facility in The Highlands that is routinely available for other community functions like the Highlands Community Center now is, or will it be replaced by one that is designed specifically for TCCSEA members' use and TXC's commercial operations?

QUESTION #2 – Will the Traffic Analysis in the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) include all of the tasks as described in both the basic Agreement's SOW and recent Amendment, or in any way be limited to those in the Amendment? Please do not defer answering the above questions until the Draft EIR review cycle. Your responses will be shared with other concerned members of our community. Thank you, Roger

In a message dated 11/29/2018 11:52:54 AM **tviehmann@tcpud.org** wrote: Hello Roger, Your correspondence has been received by Board and staff. It will be included with the December board packet correspondence and added to the project file. Kind regards, Terri Viehmann District Clerk Tahoe City Public Utility District

From: Roger Huff (huffmtry@aol.com)

November 30, 2018 7:27 AM

To: Terri Viehmann Cc: Judy Friedman; Dan Wilkins; Ron Treabess; John Pang; Scott Zumwalt; Sean Barclay; Matt Homolka; Kim Boyd

Subject: Re: TXC PROJECT CONTRACT QUESTIONS

Thank you Terri. Welcome back. I hope that the Board answers these two contract questions very soon, and will be happy to share their answers with others.

Cheers, Roger

From: Debbie White [debbie@mrooms.co.uk]

December 07, 2018 2:58 PM

To: Kim Boyd; Terri Viehmann; Matt Homolka; Judy Friedman; Dan Wilkins; Sean Barclay

Subject: Fwd: Re: Traffic study, Friday 10th August 2018 on Old Mill, Tahoe City

Kim I never heard back from you on this

Thanks Debbie

From: Kim Boyd

December 07, 2018 4:11:47 PM

To: Debbie - Mountain Rooms & Chalets; Terri Viehmann; Matt Homolka; Judy Friedman; Dan Wilkins; Sean Barclay S

Subject: RE: Re: Traffic study, Friday 10th August 2018 on Old Mill, Tahoe City

Hi Debbie, I apologize for not responding and if my email was not clear. Those types of details, including dates and methodology, will be included in Traffic Study, which will be included in the Draft EIR when published. That is tentatively scheduled for March 2019.

Kim Boyd Senior Management Analyst Tahoe City Public Utility District

I76-13
cont.

From: Roger Huff [huffmtry@aol.com]

December 16, 2018 10:47 AM

To: Judy Friedman; Dan Wilkins; Ron Treabess; John Pang; Scott Zumwalt; Sean Barclay
Cc: Matt Homolka; Kim Boyd; Terri Viehmann

Subject: BOARD MEETING AGENDA ITEM

Good Morning, Will the Board please discuss and answer these two contract questions during Friday's meeting, so that those who are unable to attend it in person are aware of the District's position on them? Thank you, Roger

TXC PROJECT CONTRACT QUESTIONS Dear Board Members, Please answer the following questions regarding the amended professional services agreement (Agreement) for the TXC Ski Lodge Replacement and Expansion Project:

ISSUE #1- The project's latest Title indicates that the facility currently used by the TXC will be "replaced," and the basic Agreement's Scope Of Work (SOW) says the project would "reconstruct" the Highlands Community Center"; but the recent Amendment includes an evaluation for "retaining" and "operation" of the Highlands Community Center." These differences send concerned members of our community confusing, mixed messages. **QUESTION #1** – Will there be a TCPUD-owned facility in The Highlands that is routinely available for other community functions like the Highlands Community Center now is, or will it be replaced by one that is designed specifically for TCCSEA members' use and TXC's commercial operations?

ISSUE #2 - The basic Agreement's SOW calls for a more detailed Traffic Analysis which includes: "Existing traffic, primarily associated with the North Tahoe High School and North Tahoe School, and parking issues in the Highlands community," "Evaluation of Sites A and D, for both winter and summer conditions," "PM peak-hour intersection turning movement counts at 4 study intersections" "24-hour roadway traffic counts at 3 locations," A Level Of Service (LOS) Update, A Vehicle Miles of Travel (VMT) Analysis, A Summer Parking Analysis, and A Traffic Safety Impact Analysis that consists of: "A review of 10-year crash data for all impacted residential streets," "Bicycle and pedestrian counts for busiest AM and PM school traffic periods in the following locations: 1. Polaris Road just east of the school campus 2. Polaris Road just west and east of Old Mill Road 3. Old Mill Road just south of Polaris Road 4. Polaris Road just west of Fabian Way 5. Fabian Way just south of Polaris Road, and 6. Fabian Way just north of Polaris Road," An assessment of driver sight conditions on affected roadways, A review of proposed driveway location and spacing, and "An evaluation of the overall impact on traffic, bicycle, and pedestrian safety." But the recent Amendment only mentions a traffic/parking study that consists of: Confirming the validity of previous winter (intersection turn) counts, Evaluating a potential community center at the existing TXC site, Evaluating impact on circulation and vehicular delays at school access points, Data collection for the potential Cedarwood Access Alternative 5, and "Optional" speed surveys. **QUESTION #2** –Will the Traffic Analysis in the Environmental Impact Report

I76-13
cont.

(EIR) include all of the tasks as described in both the basic Agreement's SOW and recent Amendment, or in any way be limited to those in the Amendment?

Please do not defer answering the above questions until the Draft EIR review cycle. Your responses will be shared with other concerned members of our community. Thank you,

In a message dated 12/17/2018 7:44:02 AM **tviehmann@tcpud.org** wrote: Hello Roger, Thank you for your message. Your previous email is included with the December 21, 2018 board packet. The current message will be distributed to staff, the full board, printed for the public and posted to our website before this Friday's board meeting. Kind regards, Terri Viehmann District Clerk Tahoe City Public Utility

From: Roger Huff [huffmtry@aol.com]

December 17, 2018 7:51 AM

To: Terri Viehmann

Subject: Re: BOARD MEETING AGENDA ITEM

Thank you, Terri. Good job as usual, and hope it gets discussed and answered during the meeting as requested.

Merry Christmas, Roger

From: Alex Lesser

January 14, 2019 10:45:56 AM

To: gscoville@tcpd.org; Kim Boyd; Terri Viehmann; Judy Friedman; John Pang; Scott Zumwalt Cc: Sean Barclay; Matt Homolka; Ramona Cruz

Subject: Follow up

TCPUD Board Members, Your reading file for this Friday's Board meeting shows that community members have sent the TCPUD over seventy emails and letters about the TCCSEA/TXC Ski Lodge project, and those that strongly object to locating the facility next to North Tahoe's schools outnumber those that prefer it by a ratio of ten to one. More than twenty residents have expressed serious concerns about: the ineffectiveness of public outreach processes, lack of credibility and thoroughness in site scoring and traffic studies, and the enormous adverse effects the proposed facility would have upon public safety and environment. When is the TCPUD Board going to start listening?

Very sincerely, Alex

From: Carol Pollock

January 15, 2019 4:45:20 PM

To: Judy Friedman; John Pang; szumwalt@tcpud.org; Gail Scoville; Sean Barclay; Matt Homolka; Ramona Cruz; Kim Boyd; Terri Viehmann; jmcmillon@tcpud.org; dwilkins@tcpud.org

Subject: Agenda Item for Friday's Board meeting

TCPUD Board and Staff, I hope that you will include an Agenda Item for the Board to formally discuss the correspondence between the public and the TCPUD included in the reading file for this week's meeting. It contains a list of letters and emails from members of our community regarding the TXC project that reveals a number of serious concerns about public safety, environmental impacts, economic feasibility, potential conflicts of

I76-13
cont.

interest, and issues with key project documents. If these concerns aren't properly addressed now, they will likely become much more serious problems in the future. I have letters in the file—while I had been very supportive of an improved XC Center--in its current size and location I am not. I am concerned about many issues---principally ones of public safety—traffic, school ingress and particularly egress—and the very real dangers of Old Mill Road. (Which is the route that all GPS systems use to the proposed location) The accidents on Old Mill are generally one car accidents and I doubt if many are reported to the Sheriff or Highway Patrol! I have also asked questions about the budget to build and operate the XC Center. I hope these will be addressed in some detail. I will not be able to attend the meeting but will participate remotely. Thank you for your attention to my request.

Sincerely, Carol Pollock Highlands Homeowner

I76-13
cont.

Letter I76 Carol Pollock

July 24, 2020

Response I76-1

The comment includes background about the letter author and contributions TCPUD has made to the community. The commenter asserts that the proposed Project presents a significant risk to public safety. The comment expresses support for reasonable modifications for the Project at Site A to reduce or eliminate impacts on public safety. The comment is noted for consideration by the TCPUD Board during the review of the merits of the Project.

Response I76-2

The comment asserts that residents and other users on Polaris Road and Old Mill Road would be affected by increased traffic from the proposed Project. The comment also asserts that pedestrians and bicyclists are already at risk from the existing level of traffic on those streets. The comment expresses the opinion that the current transportation analysis, upon which a variety of conclusions are based, is inaccurate and requests an accurate traffic count of existing traffic on Old Mill Road and Polaris Road. The comment summarizes concerns related to speeding on Polaris Road and icy conditions on Old Mill Road. The comment asserts that the transportation analysis identify realistic ways to minimize traffic safety concerns.

Please see Master Response 1: Transportation Safety. No further response is necessary. The comment is noted for consideration by the TCPUD Board during the review of the merits of the Project.

Response I76-3

The comment expresses concern related to alcohol consumption at the proposed Project site. The comment requests analysis of the consequences of alcohol consumption at both the proposed Project site and Alternative A site. The comment asserts the only mitigation would be no alcohol consumption allowed at either site. The comment asks if consumption of alcohol next to a school is legal. See response to comment I10-19, which explains that alcohol would not be sold at the Schilling Lodge. All operations at the Schilling Lodge, including during all events, must obey all laws related to the provision of alcohol. As detailed in response to comment I50-14 above, the portion of the comment related to alcohol consumption addresses social issues rather than specific physical environmental issues and does not address the adequacy of the Draft EIR analysis. Enforcement of laws related to the sale or provision of alcohol is not a topic subject to CEQA review. The comment is noted for consideration by the TCPUD Board during the review of the merits of the Project.

Response I76-4

The comment requests that the EIR analyze how the additional traffic at Site D would impact safe evacuation or emergency response by fire or law enforcement and how those impacts would be mitigated. The potential for risks related to emergency evacuation are addressed on page 3-12 under Section 3.2.3, "Hazards and Hazardous Materials." See response to comment I10-7, which addresses concerns related to emergency response and evacuation. The comment is noted for consideration by the TCPUD Board during the review of the merits of the Project.

Response I76-5

The comment requests that proof be provided for the conclusions of the traffic noise consequences for Site D that no mitigation is required. As described on page of 3.8-19 in Section 3.8, "Noise," of the Draft EIR a 10 percent increase in traffic was used to estimate traffic noise increases. This assumption is further explained on page 3.5-13 in Section 3.5, "Transportation," and was used to provide a conservative worst-case scenario. It is unlikely that the proposed Project would result in this level of traffic and associated noise increase; thus, using this conservative assumption to evaluate noise impacts, which were found to not exceed any noise standards, ensures that Project-generated traffic noise increases would be even less than what was reported in the Draft EIR, and therefore, would also not result in a substantial increase in traffic noise that would exceed any applicable standard. Table 3.8-11 on page 3.8-20 in the Draft EIR includes the results of the traffic noise modeling for the proposed Project and Appendix F of the Draft EIR includes all modeling inputs and outputs. The results of the modeling in conjunction with the traffic data supported

by the traffic analysis constitute proof or substantial evidence that support the conclusions. No additional information is needed to supplement the analysis.

Response I76-6

The comment provides suggestions for offsetting the higher elevation advantage of the proposed Project site, such as a shuttle bus from Site A that could provide safe transportation back and forth between the beginner terrain near Site D and the Lodge at Site A. The comment requests evidence that an expanded Lodge at Site D or Site A would offset the impacts of low snow and warmer weather. See response to comment I35-5, which addresses the benefit associated with proximity to user-friendly terrain at the proposed Project site. See response to comment I50-6, which addresses concerns related to the impacts of climate change on the proposed Project. The comment is noted for consideration by the TCPUD Board during the review of the merits of the Project.

Response I76-7

The comment asserts that the Project represents a massive increase in the size and coverage of the Existing Lodge, which could have significant aesthetic degradation and increased traffic consequences. The comment expresses the belief that the increase in size would not provide a community benefit and requests an explanation of how the Project would not adversely affect aesthetics. See response to comment I10-5, which addresses the comment's concern related to aesthetic impacts. Also see response to comment I10-4, which discusses community uses provided by the Project. The comment is noted for consideration by the TCPUD Board during the review of the merits of the Project.

Response I76-8

The comment requests an explanation of how the Project would preserve the financial responsibility and transparency of TCPUD's property tax funds and how a facility designed around the applicant's own membership/commercial functions qualifies as being for "community use." The comment asks how will use decisions be made that do not adversely affect public safety of the community. See response to comment I41-8, which addresses concerns related to financial aspects of the Project. See response to comment I10-4, which discusses community uses provided by the Project. A Draft Management Plan prepared by TCCSEA for the Schilling Lodge was included as Appendix B in the Draft EIR. At the time of writing of this Final EIR, the Management Plan has not been finalized and the Management Plan's policies would be included in a future land lease or agreement with TCPUD following construction of the Project. It is possible that additional policies could be included in the Management Plan related to the operation of special events. The comment expressed is not a topic that requires analysis in the EIR under CEQA. The comment is noted for consideration by the TCPUD Board during the review of the merits of the Project.

Response I76-9

The comment expresses support for a modified Site A alternative that would retain the size of the Schilling residence building, expand the parking lot by 10 spaces, use a shuttle that connects to nearby parking, and provide for paid parking at the Lodge to encourage use of public transit and carpools. The comment requests evaluation of this alternative in the Draft EIR and asserts that the evaluation of the Site A – Modified Project alternative that was rejected in the Draft EIR for the reasons stated are inaccurate. See response to comment A3-6, which addresses requirements for the Project to develop a TDM, which may include measures that encourage use of shuttle buses. Additionally, as detailed in response to comment A2-6, the specific measures and associated details of a TDM plan, such as inclusion of a shuttle bus program, would be analyzed for feasibility and developed by the applicant as part of the development review process; and thus, are not included in the Draft EIR. However, as detailed in response to comment A2-6, in order to provide a more refined and comprehensive set of potentially feasible measures that could be incorporated into the Project TDM plan, a planning level assessment of potentially feasible TDM measures was completed. The TDM measure assessment provides general descriptions of the individual TDM measures, addresses feasibility and applicability of these measures to Project, and provides general ranges of VMT reductions associated with the measures. This assessment is included as Appendix A to this Final EIR.

See response to comment I10-18, which explains the analysis of the various alternatives, including the Site A – Modified Project alternative, that was included in the Draft EIR. The comment does not provide any specific evidence related to the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. The comment is noted for consideration by the TCPUD Board during the review of the merits of the Project.

Response I76-10

The comment includes an excerpt from Section 4.1.2, “Environmental Impacts of the Tahoe Cross-Country Lodge Replacement and Expansion Project,” and Section 4.2, “ Alternatives Considered and Not Evaluated Further,” from Chapter 4, “Alternatives,” in the Draft EIR. The comment states this is excerpted to include only the two sites currently under consideration with an emphasis on Site A – Reduced Project alternative. This comment does not raise environmental issues or concerns regarding the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR.

Response I76-11

The comment excerpted the description of Site A – Reduced Project alternative from the Draft EIR. The comment requests data regarding providing utilities since this would not be necessary on an already developed site. On page 4-3 of the Draft EIR, the description of utilities for Site A – Reduced Project alternative states, “The cost and effort to provide utilities (e.g., power, gas, water, fire line, sewer, telephone, and data) would be similar to Alternative A, which would be greater than at the proposed Project site.” See response to comment I10-18, which explains why additional alternatives were not analyzed in detail. The State CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(d) states, “The EIR shall include sufficient information about each alternative to allow meaningful evaluation, analysis, and comparison with the proposed project.” The comment is noted for consideration by the TCPUD Board during the review of the merits of the Project.

Response I76-12

The comment includes an excerpt of Section 4.3, “Alternatives Selected for Further Evaluation,” including a portion of Table 4-1, “Site Development Features of Each of the Alternatives.” Related to the footnotes in the table, the comment asks why the sizes of the Schilling Lodge and the Existing Lodge are combined. Section 4.5, “Site A – Modified Project,” includes a description of the components of this alternative, which would construct the Schilling Lodge while also continuing to use the Existing Lodge; thus, the square footage of both of those buildings is combined in Table 4-1 (see page 4-10 of the Draft EIR):

The Site A – Modified Project alternative would be in the same location as Alternative A but would include a different site configuration with two buildings—the Schilling residence with a basement addition (totaling 6,229 sq. ft.) and renovation of the Existing Lodge building (2,432 sq. ft.; see Table 4-1 and Figure 4-3).

The comment refers to the estimate of trees that would be removed for the Site A – Modified Project alternative and Site D – Reduced Project alternative and asks that the number of trees estimated for removal be provided by an objective source.

As explained under Impact 3.3-2, “Tree Removal,” in Section 3.3, “Biological Resources,” in the Draft EIR (see page 3.3-18):

Removal of trees greater than 14 inches dbh requires review and approval by TRPA. Specifically, applicants must obtain a tree removal permit from TRPA prior to removing trees greater than 14 inches dbh, except for certain cases exempt by the TRPA Code (for example, trees of any size marked as a fire hazard by a fire protection district or fire department that operates under a memorandum of understanding with TRPA can be removed without a separate tree permit). A harvest or tree removal plan is required by TRPA where implementation of a project would cause substantial tree removal. Substantial tree removal is defined in Chapter 61 of the TRPA Code as activities on project areas of 3 acres or more and proposing: (1) removal of more than 100 live trees 14 inches dbh or larger, or (2) tree removal that, as determined by TRPA after a joint inspection with appropriate state or federal forestry staff, does not meet the minimum acceptable stocking standards set forth in Chapter 61.

Because of the number of trees that would be estimated for removal for the Site A – Modified Project alternative and Site D – Reduced Project alternative (see Table 4-1), either of these alternatives would also be required to implement Mitigation Measure 3.3-2: Minimize Tree Removal, Develop and Implement a Tree Removal and Management Plan. The amount of tree removal required for these alternatives would require issuance of a tree review permit by TRPA and, thus, review and approval of any tree survey submitted by the applicant. As stated on page 3.3-10 under Section 3.3.2, “Environmental Setting,” in Section 3.3, “Biological Resources,” of the Draft EIR, “Registered professional foresters have conducted multiple reconnaissance-level tree surveys of the proposed Project and Alternative A sites, which inform the biological effects analysis related to tree removal.” The comment does not provide any specific evidence that the tree survey data provided for the Draft EIR is inaccurate. The comment is noted for consideration by the TCPUD Board during the review of the merits of the Project.

Response I76-13

The comment is an attachment to letter I76 and includes excerpts of correspondence between members of the public, TCPUD staff, and members of the applicant team regarding the Project. The correspondence includes responses to questions raised by members of the public; all of the correspondence occurred prior to release of the Draft EIR; thus, the correspondence does not pertain specifically to the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR. Some of the correspondence includes copies of comment letters that were submitted on the Notice of Preparation released for the Project. The topics included in the letter are raised in other comment letters received on the Draft EIR. The categories of topics include:

- ▶ Comparison of fees for use of the Community Center by Tahoe XC compared to other users
- ▶ Tax requirements
- ▶ Presence of a commercial activity at a site not zoned for commercial activity
- ▶ Opposition to the Project
- ▶ Zoning requirements
- ▶ Support for a Site A alternative
- ▶ Traffic safety
- ▶ Discontent with TCCSEA
- ▶ Selection of alternatives
- ▶ Effects of climate change on snow
- ▶ Alcohol concerns
- ▶ Traffic study inadequate
- ▶ Increased traffic and traffic safety
- ▶ Concern about increased size of Lodge
- ▶ Name of the Project
- ▶ Wildfire safety
- ▶ Ascent and LSC scope of work
- ▶ Concerns related to the presentation of the Project at TCPUD Board meetings
- ▶ List of questions from the State CEQA Guidelines Appendix G, “Environmental Checklist Form”
- ▶ Disagreement with terms or statements related to the Project title, Project location, Project description, adaptive reuse
- ▶ Suggestions for alternatives
- ▶ Support for Site D

- ▶ Finances for TCCSEA and the Project
- ▶ Need for the Project
- ▶ Parking
- ▶ Opposition to Site D and Site A
- ▶ Need for a new facility
- ▶ Funding
- ▶ Community use of the Schilling Lodge
- ▶ Opposition to contract amendment for Ascent and LSC

Copies of the comment letters submitted on the NOP were included in Appendix A of the Draft EIR.

See responses to comments I26-1, I32-3, and I41-8. The financial aspect of the Project is not a topic that requires analysis in the EIR under CEQA.

See response to comment I35-6, which addresses concerns related to zoning and allowable uses at either the proposed Project site or Alternative A site. Commercial use at the Existing Lodge or Schilling Lodge is an accessory uses to the primary use on the site.

See response to comment I10-18, which explains the analysis of alternatives included in the Draft EIR and why the inclusion of those alternatives are sufficient to meet the requirements of CEQA to provide a comparative analysis of a reasonable range of alternatives to the proposed Project in the Draft EIR.

See Master Response 1: Transportation Safety, which addresses concerns related to traffic from the Project. See Response I10-15 for a discussion of the traffic study and TPCUD's discretionary role as lead agency for the Project.

See response to comment I50-6, which addresses concerns related to the effects of climate change on the Project.

See responses to comments I10-19 and I64-15, which address concerns related to the presence of alcohol at the Schilling Lodge.

See response to comment I10-8, which addresses concern related to the wildfire analysis in the Draft EIR.

See response to comment I71-5, which addresses the parking analysis in the Draft EIR and the need for the parking lot proposed as part of the Project.

The need for the Project is provided in the "Background and Need" section on pages ES-1 and ES-2 in the "Executive Summary" chapter with Project objectives identified in Section 2.4, "Project Objectives," on pages 2-6 and 2-7 in Chapter 2, "Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives Analyzed in Detail."

The correspondence includes many opinions related to the Project, including opposition to the proposed Project, opposition to Alternative A, support for the Site D location, and discontent with TCCSEA. The comment is noted for consideration by the TCPUD Board during the review of the merits of the Project.

3.3.3 Public Meeting

**Tahoe Cross Country Lodge Replacement and Expansion Project
Draft Environmental Impact Report
Public Meeting
TCPUD Board of Directors
July 17, 2020, Online Live Stream, Tahoe City, CA**

Letter PM

#	Commenter	Summary of Comments	
		Matt Homolka read aloud two comment letters provided by Roger and Janet Huff and Carol Pollock. To avoid redundancy, these comment letters will be included verbatim with the rest of the comment letters and are not reproduced here.	PM-1
1	Jim Robbins	<p>The commenter states he is a Tahoe XC Board Member.</p> <p>Jim expressed thanks to Sean Barkley, Matt Homolka, and Kim Boyd and the TCPUD staff for their hard work on the project.</p> <p>They are proud of the 20-year partnership and concession agreement with TCPUD.</p> <p>He believes they have established themselves as a vibrant part of the community and thinks Tahoe XC is an important fabric of the outdoor community and believes a new lodge would be beneficial in the long term for everyone.</p> <p>Thanks consultant for preparation of the EIR, which he believes is thorough and accurate.</p> <p>He encourages the Board to approve the project.</p> <p>He understands the mitigating factors could be dealt with.</p> <p>He states the project will help Tahoe XC overcome seasonal difficulties and provide a year-round activity center for the North Tahoe community.</p> <p>He also states the project will allow them to continue to provide good programs and provide access to the backcountry in the neighborhood for youth and adults.</p>	PM-2
2	Don Heapes	<p>Thanks TCPUD staff and Ascent for their high-quality work.</p> <p>He believes this is a rigorous document that helps inform the applicant of the impacts of their project.</p> <p>Asks people who have issues with the document to make an effort to review and understand the document. Facts are the basis for community discussion.</p> <p>Believes the document is comprehensive in scope, rigorous in its process, and correct in its conclusions and the mitigations are appropriate to reducing impacts to less-than-significant levels.</p> <p>One issue that has been brought up is the size of the building. The design of the project has gone through a rigorous process with the design team to design an appropriate sized lodge for their needs. To the existing structure, the project would add 3,000 square feet of basement space to allow for equipment storage and reduce the need for outdoor storage.</p>	PM-3

#	Commenter	Summary of Comments	
		<p>The second level provides space for staff facility and it is within the existing roofline.</p> <p>The small addition to the building is needed to meet the needs for program requirements.</p> <p>When Tahoe XC was presented with the opportunity to save a historic structure they felt compelled to take that opportunity. This is a legacy opportunity for their community and a measure of how we've spent our time here.</p> <p>It is important that this project succeed.</p>	<p>PM-3 cont.</p>
3	Douglas Gorlay	<p>The commenter lives on Polaris Road.</p> <p>He would like to highlight a couple of items in the EIR. Cites the Department of Interior standards for restoration and reconstructing historic buildings, which are included in the EIR. He highlights standards related to relocating or expansion of a historic structure. The commenter states the DOI standards are being violated with this project.</p> <p>His preference is no project.</p> <p>He quotes Section 4.8, which states that the No Project alternative would be the environmentally superior alternative.</p> <p>He states the analysis favors maintaining the Site A alternative over Site D.</p> <p>He states it is hard to imagine that a 76-foot increase in elevation and a slightly flatter starting area is worth increased traffic. He points to differences in the amount of traffic on Polaris versus the traffic at the existing site.</p> <p>He notes there would be an increased danger to students and pedestrians where speeds were recorded at 42 mph and in excess of 50 mph by police reports.</p> <p>He also notes concerns regarding increased ground cover in a pristine meadow and wooded area, increased tree removal on Polaris site, clear violation of zoning and land use covenants on Polaris Road, and sight distance issues per Department of Transportation guidelines that he states will endanger lives of students and pedestrians.</p> <p>He states that a vote for this project is a vote against safety for children, who do not have sidewalks or speed control measures.</p>	<p>PM-4</p> <p>PM-5</p> <p>PM-6</p> <p>PM-7</p> <p>PM-8</p> <p>PM-9</p>
4	William Stelter	<p>Thanks TCPUD for providing the opportunity to comment.</p> <p>He is a TCPUD customer and long-time Tahoe XC passholder. He is also a local civil engineer involved in planning, design, and permitting for nearly 20 years.</p> <p>He describes his experience in reviewing environmental documents (Initial Study/Mitigation Negative Declarations, EIRs, etc.).</p> <p>He stated he has followed this process since the lodge was initially donated by the Schilling family and provided responses to the public questionnaire issued by Tahoe XC 3 years ago.</p> <p>Thanks TCPUD and Tahoe XC for preparing a thorough document that goes above and beyond requirements for analyzing impacts from the project.</p>	<p>PM-10</p>

#	Commenter	Summary of Comments	
		<p>He states his belief that it will be a valuable resource and reference document moving forward.</p> <p>Thank you for being attentive to the detail.</p>	PM-10 cont.
5	Sue Rae Irelan	<p>Introduces herself as a board member of Tahoe XC. The TCCCSEA has partnered with the TCPUD to provide winter and summer recreation at Highlands Park for many years.</p> <p>States one of the things we are seeing in this COVID year is how important it is for our public health to provide public open space and recreation spaces. The use up there, at all of the access points and including the community center, has been increasing over the last few years and that happens whether or not there is a new lodge at whatever size.</p> <p>The use of the trails brings some nuisance factors (traffic, noise, activity, parking).</p> <p>The project as designed and intended to offset a few of the nuisance factors and moving the location at the high school moves nuisance away from more residents.</p> <p>The traffic pattern in the neighborhood will change. The traffic associated with the new lodge is a pretty small amount compared to the amount of traffic that will grow anyway.</p> <p>Part of what we see and part of the reason this entity formed was to provide public recreation and expected to provide this in partnership with the PUD.</p>	PM-11
6	Carol Pollock	<p>We have been part-time residents for 30-40 percent of the year for over 20 years on Old Mill.</p> <p>Asks if any members of the Board live in the Highlands.</p> <p>Also asks if any members of the Tahoe XC board live in the Highlands.</p> <p>See benefits to increasing and improving what exists but also enormous disadvantages of placing the lodge in the neighborhood. A huge disadvantage to anyone who lives in the Highlands.</p> <p>Appreciates all of the work on this project.</p>	PM-12

Letter PM1 TCPUD Board of Directors Meeting

July 17, 2020

Response PM1-1

The comment states that TCPUD staff read aloud comment letters provided by Roger and Janet Huff and Carol Pollock. See comment letter I25, which was submitted by Roger and Janet Huff, and associated responses to the comments. Roger and Janet Huff also submitted comment letter I41. Roger Huff also submitted comment letters I1, I5, I6, I7, I9, I21, I49, and I59. See comment letter I32, which was submitted by Carol Pollock, and associated responses to comments. Carol Pollock also submitted letters I38 and I76. See responses to the comments included in these letters above.

Response PM1-2

The comment provides background about themselves as a Tahoe XC Board member. The comment summarizes the role Tahoe XC has played in the community and asserts his belief that the Project would help Tahoe XC overcome seasonal difficulties and other benefits of the Project. The comment expresses support for the proposed Project. The comment is noted for consideration by the TCPUD Board during the review of the merits of the Project.

Response PM1-3

The comment provides background about themselves as a Tahoe XC Board member. The comment acknowledges criticisms raised against the Project but hopes that people make an effort to review the document. The comment provides background related to the proposed size of the proposed Lodge. The comment expresses support for the Project. The comment is noted for consideration by the TCPUD Board during the review of the merits of the Project.

Response PM1-4

The comment states that moving the Schilling residence from its original lakefront location is a violation of the Department of the Interior's Standards. Please see response to comment I35-4.

Response PM1-5

The comment refers to Section 4.8, "Environmentally Superior Alternative," on pages 4-20 through 4-22 of the Draft EIR and states that the No Project alternative is the environmentally superior alternative. See response to comment I35-24, which addresses identification of the environmentally superior alternative in the Draft EIR. The comment is noted for consideration by the TCPUD Board during the review of the merits of the Project.

Response PM1-6

The comment states the analysis favors maintaining the Site A alternative over the Site D alternative. The comment also questions if the traffic associated with the Project is worth a 76-foot increase in elevation and closer proximity to flatter terrain. See response to comment I10-18, which explains the analysis of alternatives included in the Draft EIR. See response to comment I35-5, which addresses concerns related to the need for a higher elevation and closer proximity to flatter terrain. The comment is noted for consideration by the TCPUD Board during the review of the merits of the Project.

Response PM1-7

The comment notes there would be an increased danger to students and pedestrians where speeds were recorded at 42 mph and in excess of 50 mph by police reports. Please see Master Response 1: Transportation Safety. The comment is noted for consideration by the TCPUD Board during the review of the merits of the Project.

Response PM1-8

The comment lists concerns related to increased coverage in a meadow and wooded area, tree removal, inconsistencies with zoning and land use, sight distance issues, and traffic safety. See response to comment I35-16, which addresses impacts related to increased coverage. See responses to comments I32-4, I35-10, and I41-20, which address concerns related to tree removal. See response to comment I35-6, which addresses the land use and zoning designation on the proposed Project site and Alternative A site. See response to comment A2-5, which addresses requirements for sight distance. See Master Response 1: Transportation Safety, which addresses concern related to

traffic safety, including related to sight distance. The comment is noted for consideration by the TCPUD Board during the review of the merits of the Project.

Response PM1-9

The comment states that a vote for the Project is a vote against safety for children because sidewalks and speed control measures are not present. See Master Response 1: Transportation Safety. The comment is noted for consideration by the TCPUD Board during the review of the merits of the Project.

Response PM1-10

The comment provides background about the speaker as a TCPUD customer, Tahoe XC passholder, local civil engineer, and reviewer of environmental documents. The comment expresses the belief that the document was thorough in analyzing impacts from the Project. The comment is noted for consideration by the TCPUD Board during the review of the merits of the Project.

Response PM1-11

The comment provides background about herself as a Tahoe XC board member. The comment states that accessibility to public open space and recreation spaces is important for public health. The comment acknowledges some nuisance factors associated with use of the trails (e.g., traffic, noise, activity, parking) and notes the Project is designed to offset some of the nuisance factors by moving the location of the Lodge closer to the high school. The comment also notes the traffic pattern in the neighborhood would change with the Project, but it would be relatively small. The comment is noted for consideration by the TCPUD Board during the review of the merits of the Project.

Response PM1-12

The comment provides background as a part-time resident in the Highlands neighborhood. The comment asks if any of the TPCUD Board members or Tahoe XC Board members live in the Highlands neighborhood. The comment generally states they acknowledge the benefits of the Project but also the disadvantages of the proposed Lodge to the neighborhood. The comment is noted for consideration by the TCPUD Board during the review of the merits of the Project.

This page intentionally left blank.