

From: [Eric Poulsen](#)
To: [Kim Boyd](#)
Cc: [Rick Ganong](#)
Subject: Schilling Lodge
Date: Sunday, July 19, 2020 9:49:29 AM

**Letter
I42**

Good morning Kim -

We understand that you are working on the CEQA Process for the Schilling Lodge.

This is an important project for the north Lake Tahoe area and the future of the Nordic and biking center.

“ One important CEQA consideration about this project is that it is moving this building from a more sensitive location in the Tahoe basin to a better location with fewer impacts.”

It will enhance and benefit future recreation users for the area.

We are in support and agreement that this important project should move forward.

Thank you for your consideration and help in moving this important project forward.

Eric and Nanette Poulsen

PO Box 2491

Olympic Valley, CA 96146

Sent from my iPhone

I42-1

Letter I42 Eric and Nanette Poulsen

July 19, 2020

Response I42-1

The comment includes background information about the letter’s author, summarizes benefits of the proposed Project, and 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.

From: [Jim Phelan](#)
To: [Kim Boyd](#)
Subject: Schilling Lodge project
Date: Sunday, July 19, 2020 10:58:37 AM

Letter I43

Hi Kim,

After quickly reviewing the Schilling Lodge project, it appears this project has quite a few qualities that determine it to be a well thought out and seems to address and perhaps correct several issues with the current cross country facility. I have only 2 comments at this time, 1) I was curious to understand why a drive through driveway was not considered having one entrance as shown near the school and one off of Cedarwood (as shown as an alternative driveway, perhaps having 2 ways in and out of the facility could help minimize the pressure on Polaris drive during busy school hours. 2) Not understanding the dynamics of making changes to the trail system at the end of any given day if you are stuck at the bottom of the trail system, (location of current lodge), people will need to hike up to get back up to the lodge, is there an alternative to skating or skiing back up the trail to the Lodge?

I think it is wonderful to have an historic building as a ski lodge, it fits Tahoe’s character well. Thank you for the opportunity to comment. Jim Phelan

I43-1

I43-2

I43-3

I43-4

Letter I43 Jim Phelan

July 19, 2020

Response I43-1

The comment expresses support for the proposed Project and the analysis in the EIR. The comment is noted for consideration by the TCPUD Board during the review of the merits of the Project.

Response I43-2

The comment asks why a drive through driveway from Polaris Road to Cedarwood Drive was not considered to relieve pressure on Polaris Road during school hours. Two alternatives were considered for the Project that included access from Cedarwood Drive: (1) Site D – Alternative Driveway, which would have constructed a driveway to Site D from Cedarwood Drive; and (2) Site C – Site at the End of Cedarwood Drive, which would have constructed the lodge at the end of Cedarwood Drive. As discussed on page 4-3 in Chapter 4, "Alternatives," in the Draft EIR for Site D – Alternative Driveway:

With this alternative, the new driveway would cross through the Highlands Subdistrict, which is zoned and designated residential. The driveway for this alternative would be longer than the proposed Project driveway and would require a bridge across a seasonal drainage, which is considered a stream environment zone. Additionally, this alternative would not substantially reduce any environmental impacts as compared to the Project, and did not receive any support from commenters during the public scoping process.

As discussed on page 4-5 of the Draft EIR for Site C – Site at the End of Cedarwood Drive:

This alternative was rejected from further consideration because it would be located within the Highlands Subdistrict, which is zoned and designated residential and the Project would not be consistent with this land use designation. Similar to Site D – Alternative Driveway described above, the location of this alternative would not be supported by the public. Due to the distance from the school, the location of this alternative would be less ideal than the proposed Project for a shared parking agreement with the school for parking during special events.

A pull-through driveway would have similar concerns as the Site D – Alternative Driveway alternative and Site C – Site at the End of Cedarwood Drive alternative and would not substantially reduce any environmental impacts as compared to the Project. This 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 I43-3

The comment asks a question about whether or not there is an alternative to skating or skiing back up the trail to the Schilling Lodge at Site D if a person ends up at the bottom of the hill. The comment does not raise environmental issues or concerns regarding the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the EIR. The comment is noted for consideration by the TCPUD Board during the review of the merits of the Project.

Response I43-4

The comment expresses the opinion that they think it is wonderful to have a historic building as a ski lodge. The comment does not raise environmental issues or concerns regarding the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the EIR. The comment is noted for consideration by the TCPUD Board during the review of the merits of the Project.

750 John McKinney
Truckee, California 96161

Letter
144

July 19, 2020

To Whom It May Concern:

As a full-time of the Tahoe-Truckee community for nearly 20 years, and a passholder of Tahoe XC since moving to the area, I like to keep an eye on developments at Tahoe XC. The project being considered now is the biggest, most exciting effort for the Tahoe XC program in all my years here. This project has an opportunity to improve what Tahoe XC delivers to the community AND concurrently add a historical jewel to Tahoe's north shore by incorporating the historic Shilling Lodge. This would be a wonderful long-term asset to our area, preserving an important part of Lake Tahoe history for future generations.

I was very pleased to see the June 2020 draft Environmental Impact Report for the Tahoe Cross Country lodge replacement/expansion project. I have reviewed the EIR in detail and am impressed by the thoroughness of the document. It's clear that the key issues were identified and diligently analyzed. I was pleasantly surprised by the degree to which environmental concerns were identified, evaluated, and the report offers, practical suggestions for how to offset/mitigate those impacts.

I fully support the goals of and the project, the EIR considers a variety of variations/options for the project. I would like to see the full project proposed for site D move forward. I believe Alternative A (full project, site A) doesn't address key long-term concerns for the viability of Tahoe XC — site D due its elevation and snow melt patterns appears to be far better suited to keeping XC trails open for longer periods for public use, and for keeping Tahoe XC in business.

Another motivation for supporting the full project at site D is that this initiative has the hallmark signs of a big winner — a real "home run" for our community, with identifiable long-term benefits.

I44-1

I've served on boards of directors of both for-profit and nonprofit organizations. I've seen many proposals in which a range of project solutions is put forth; typically "compromise" project variations with reduced scope are outlined with the goal to reduce expenses, minimize disruption, or to quiet loud "squeaky wheels" that seek to derail progress. Unfortunately, when less than ideal projects win out, outcomes are often compromised: benefits are more often than not disproportionately reduced, with lower return on investment; minimum disruption often leads to minimized benefits. Worse still, long-term needs are not met, which translates to yet more project requests sooner (or abandonment of the core business altogether because the hurdles of moving forward are perceived as insurmountable).

The Tahoe XC/Schilling Lodge Project feels like it has the potential to be a huge home run for our community, with lasting payoffs, particularly so at preferred site D. It would be a shame to turn our backs on the opportunity and settle for something less.

I44-1
cont.

Respectfully yours,
John Gerbino

Letter I44 John Gerbino

July 19, 2020

Response I44-1

The comment includes background information about the letter's author, summarizes benefits of the proposed Project, expresses support for the proposed Project, and expresses support for the analysis in the Draft EIR. The comment supports locating the Project at Site D, on the basis of elevation and snow melt patterns allowing for a longer recreation season. Additionally, the comment expresses concern that Alternative A does not fully address key long-term concerns for the viability of the Tahoe Cross-Country Lodge. The comment is noted for consideration by the TCPUD Board during the review of the merits of the Project.

To: Tahoe City Public Utility District
Fr: Tracy Owen Chapman
Date: 7.19.20
Re: DEIR for Schilling Lodge Project

**Letter
I45**

Thank you for including my input regarding the merits of the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the proposed Tahoe Cross Country Lodge Replacement and Expansion Project (Project).

After careful review, I am in full support of the DEIR’s adequacy because it does a thorough job assessing this Project, its potential impacts and mitigation measures. I am confident in the thoroughness of the DEIR’s study and it is evident that any impacts from the Project can be easily mitigated.

I hope the Project will move forward quickly to better serve our community and visitors with quality and responsible outdoor recreation options on a year-round basis.

As a long-time educator and local resident, I am supportive of the new lodge Project to serve as an important resource, in even a greater capacity, at engaging our youth in the great outdoors. The new Lodge will also better accommodate the existing and projected recreation demands of our community and visitors.

Again, the DEIR is a complete and adequate study and it should be approved in order to move this Project forward to fruition.

Working and raising a family in the Lake Tahoe basin, I am keenly aware of good projects vs. those that need more study and this one is ready to go. Let’s work together to deliver this incredible opportunity!

Thank you for your attention.

Tracy Owen Chapman

Tracy Owen Chapman
775-339-1190

I45-1

Letter I45 Tracy Owen Chapman

July 19, 2020

Response I45-1

The comment includes background information about the letter’s author, summarizes benefits of the proposed Project, expresses support for the proposed Project, and expresses support for the analysis and accuracy of the Draft EIR. The comment is noted for consideration by the TCPUD Board during the review of the merits of the Project.

From: [Gerald Rockwell](#)
To: [Kim Boyd](#)
Subject: Tahoe XC Draft EIR
Date: Monday, July 20, 2020 10:26:33 AM

Letter I46

Dear TCPUD Board Members,

I am on the TXC/TCCSEA Board of Directors. I believe this project would easily qualify for negative declaration status. In spite of this, I am very happy we went to the expense of a full EIR. Accent has done a very rigorous and thorough analysis of all potential environmental impacts and provided mitigation measures to negate any potentially significant impacts.

The traffic study is a particular case where the researchers went above and beyond any expected study. The fact that they were conservative (high estimates) in their approach is quite reassuring.

Please accept this EIR so we can move on with repurposing this historic building that will be a wonderful asset to our community.

Sincerely,
Gerald Rockwell

I46-1

Letter I46 Gerald Rockwell
July 20, 2020

Response I46-1

The comment includes background information about the letter’s author, expresses support for the proposed Project, and expresses support for the analysis and accuracy of the Draft EIR. The comment is noted for consideration by the TCPUD Board during the review of the merits of the Project.

From: [Douglas Gourlay](#)
To: [Kim Boyd](#)
Subject: Re: Written Comments on TXC DEIR Project for 17 July TCPUD Board Meeting
Date: Monday, July 20, 2020 3:05:00 PM

**Letter
147**

Excellent - is the same true for the TXC board that is proposing this project? It would be quite horrid optics to find out that any of the TCPUD or TXC board members supporting this project were located near the current site and would be materially benefitting from it being relocated.

I47-1

dg

On Mon, Jul 20, 2020 at 2:41 PM Kim Boyd <kboyd@tcpud.org> wrote:

Mr. Gourlay,

Thank you for your written comments on the Tahoe XC Lodge Replacement and Expansion Project draft EIR. These will be treated as written comments on the draft EIR and will be responded to in writing like all other comments. They will also be provided to the TCPUD Board. As to your broader questions, TCPUD staff offer the following:

- All TCPUD Board members live within the boundaries of the TCPUD and represent all constituents equally.
- If there were any conflicts of interests, they would be announced and disclosed.

Thank you,

Kim Boyd

Senior Management Analyst

Tahoe City Public Utility District

530.580.6286 Direct

530.583.3796 Main Office ext. 386

www.tcpud.org

I47-2



*Building a healthy mountain community through
our passion for public service*

This electronic message contains information from the Tahoe City Public Utility District, which is intended to be sent to the individual or entity named above. If you are not the intended recipient, be aware that any disclosure, copying, distribution, or use of the contents of this information is prohibited. If you receive this electronic transmission in error. Please notify me by email.

From: Douglas Gourlay [mailto:douglas.gourlay@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 9:51 AM
To: Terri Viehmann <tviehmann@tcpud.org>; Dan Wilkins <d.wilkins@tcpud.org>; Judy Friedman <jfriedman@tcpud.org>; John Pang <jpang@tcpud.org>; Scott Zumwalt <scottrzumwalt@gmail.com>; Gail Scoville <gscoville@tcpud.org>; Kim Boyd <kboyd@tcpud.org>; Matt Homolka <mhomolka@tcpud.org>; Sean Barclay <sbarclay@tcpud.org>
Subject: Re: Written Comments on TXC DEIR Project for 17 July TCPUD Board Meeting

I47-2
cont.

Based on the last, rather erudite, question asked I'd like to ask for a statement from all TCPUD board members and TXC Board Members that verifies there are no conflicts of interest. Specifically, each board member should disclose if they:

Live in proximity to the transit corridors for Site A or Site D

Have any commercial interest - salary, investment, contracting, sub-contracting or any financial benefit from them or a household member that would stem from this project

Have any commercial interest in the property development that replaced the Schilling Lodge or in the removal, maintenance, storage, rehabilitation of the Schilling Lodge

A clear statement from each board member from TXC and TCPUD would go a long way in helping the residents of The Highlands know that this decision is safely in the hands of non-conflicted individuals and that there is no violation of the public trust or self-dealing.

On Fri, Jul 17, 2020 at 12:10 AM Douglas Gourlay <douglas.gourlay@gmail.com> wrote:

To: Tahoe City Public Utilities District Board of Directors

bcc: Counsel and other Highlands Homeowners

The attached document contains my comments and analysis of the proposed TXC lodge expansion. Please read this document at the board meeting for the TCPUD board. Alternatively, I am available to present this in person if that option is available.

Douglas Gourlay

I47-2
cont.

Letter I47 Douglas Gourlay

July 20, 2020

Response I47-1

The comment asks if the Tahoe XC Board has any conflicts of interest related to the Project. The comment expresses the opinion that there would be horrid optics if any of the TCPUD or Tahoe XC Board members would materially benefit from relocation of the Lodge. Conflicts of interest are not an issue that requires analysis or consideration in an EIR under the requirements of CEQA and the State CEQA Guidelines. The comment is noted for consideration by the TCPUD Board during the review of the merits of the Project.

Response I47-2

The comment includes correspondence between the letter's author and Kim Boyd of TCPUD. Ms. Boyd indicates that all TCPUD Board members live within the boundaries of the TCPUD service area and any conflicts of interest would be announced and disclosed. The comment also includes a copy of comments that are included in comment letter I36, above. See responses to comments I36-1 and I36-2.

From: [Tom Lane](#)
To: [Kim Boyd](#)
Subject: Fwd: Delivery Status Notification (Delay)
Date: Monday, July 20, 2020 5:56:39 PM
Attachments: [icon.png](#)

**Letter
148**

Please confirm receipt of this email

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Mail Delivery Subsystem <mailer-daemon@googlemail.com>
Date: Mon, Jul 20, 2020 at 8:22 PM
Subject: Delivery Status Notification (Delay)
To: <alpinesports.lane@gmail.com>



Delivery incomplete

There was a temporary problem delivering your message to **kboyd@tcpud.com**. Gmail will retry for 22 more hours. You'll be notified if the delivery fails permanently.

[LEARN MORE](#)

I48-1

The response was:

The recipient server did not accept our requests to connect. Learn more at <https://support.google.com/mail/answer/7720> [tcpud.com 184.168.131.241: timed out]

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Tom Lane <alpinesports.lane@gmail.com>
To: kboyd@tcpud.com
Cc:
Bcc:
Date: Sat, 18 Jul 2020 19:02:28 -0400
Subject: Fwd: New XC Center
 Please confirm receipt of this email.
 thanks Tom

----- Forwarded message -----
 From: **Tom Lane** <alpinestports.lane@gmail.com>
 Date: Fri, Jul 17, 2020 at 1:34 PM
 Subject: New XC Center
 To: <kboyd@tcpud.com>
 Cc: Valli Murnane <dartmurnane@yahoo.com>

Thankyou PUD board for all your time and effort on this community improvement project.

I am in full support of this effort for a number of reasons:

- 1) Current facility is old and the layout is insufficient (too small)We have out grown the current location
- 2) The new proposed facility will not only serve NT residents but greatly enhance it's visitors experience
- 3) The new location will reduce Parking issues and traffic that plague current residents.
- 4) Expanded Public transportation to the new facility would greatly mitigate the Highland neighborhood's concerns (see Park City Utah) or even Squaw/ Alpine "Mountaineer Ride Service"
- 5) Let's focus on the enhanced facility as a benefit to ALL of our community.

Thank you for listening
 Tom and Kristen

Sent from my iPhone

--
 Tom Lane
 Alpine Sports Marketing and Sales
 (530) 412-2648

--
 Tom Lane
 Alpine Sports Marketing and Sales
 (530) 412-2648

I48-1
 cont.

Letter I48 Tom and Kristen Lane

July 20, 2020

Response I48-1

The comment summarizes project benefits and 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.

From: [Huff](#)
To: [Kim Boyd](#)
Cc: [Terri Viehmann](#)
Subject: RESIDENTS QUESTION
Date: Tuesday, July 21, 2020 5:54:14 AM

<p>Letter I49</p>

Good Morning Kim,
 I hope that all is well with you. Yesterday I was asked the following questions that I need you help to answer: (1) How many homes are there in *The Highlands*, and (2) How many of those Highlands home owners were sent the NOA and were invited to comment on the DEIR?

Regards,
 Roger

I49-1

Letter I49 Roger Huff

July 21, 2020

Response I49-1

The comment asks how many homes are in the Highlands neighborhood and how many of the homeowners in the neighborhood were sent the Notice of Availability (NOA) and invited to comment on the Draft EIR. There are 249 residential accounts for TCPUD in the Highlands neighborhood, all of which were mailed a paper copy NOA. The NOA was also emailed to 157 recipients, some of which are Highlands residents.

Public Comment on the Draft Tahoe Cross Country Lodge Replacement and Expansion

Letter
150

Thank you for providing this opportunity for public comment on the Tahoe XC Lodge Expansion Project proposal. This EIR is a vast document. To address all of the points herein would produce a prohibitively long document. In an effort to make this succinct yet comprehensible, I've noted comments on specific points with original document points in **bold**. This by no means implies that additional points do not exist or are not cause for concern for people who spend most of their living hours in this neighborhood.

150-1

As a general comment, of the two possible projects, the location of Alternative A, the current XC center location, makes most sense and preserves the greatest amount of natural resources. I encourage you to go with Alternative A.

A smaller project, limited to the Schilling Lodge structure only, would be superior to serve both the community and the natural environment. Although the exciting dream of a larger facility to produce star athletes, etc. is "sexy," it is impractical and, given the changing climate, not particularly realistic. It would be terrible to, in hindsight, realize that we destroyed something irreplaceable to build something much less valuable. The donor of the Schilling Lodge did not donate out of a desire for a huge xc facility, either: in fact, the XC ski group was not even the first group offered the structure. Therefore, donor intent is irrelevant to this specific project.

150-2

This project might have been an excellent idea were it proposed 50 years ago, when it could have brought many of the plusses noted in this proposal, with fewer of the negatives. But this is not 1970, it is 2020. Today's reality conflicts with the goals of this project. Traffic is just one of the problems with this proposal.

Today, the residential Polaris Rd. area is already stressed by traffic and activity levels. Residents are challenged by traffic traveling at excessive speed and at various hours (including large vehicles which are by their nature quite loud), as well as evening events that are very audible at the houses on the street. Both pets and children have been struck by vehicles traveling at excessive rates of speed by drivers who never intended to hurt anyone but nonetheless hurt or killed a living resident.

150-3

While residents signed on for dealing with the activities and sounds of the nearby school life, adding a sizeable year 'round recreation business, which must attract as many people as possible in order to survive, will dramatically change daily life for the residents.

Please take this perspective more seriously than it has been taken thus far.

The Highlands neighborhood is a well-established residential area. This proposal is for creating a sizeable outdoor recreational commercial enterprise that will need to operate at maximum capacity and hours to make ends meet. According to the Placer County Land use and permit tables, "Outdoor commercial recreation" operations are not

150-4

allowed in residential areas, nor are “commercial event centers,” and for good reasons. It is an unwise and unwelcome combination. How is this project even being considered?

I50-4
cont.

BACKGROUND AND NEED FOR THE PROJECT

“ . . . advance youth and adult recreation opportunities year-round; provide opportunities for additional special events, community events, and private events. . . “

The current roster of events in this residential neighborhood is already quite full. With school 5 days/week for 9 months/year (3 busy periods each day: morning, lunchtime and dismissal), with associated athletic games and activities, weeknight community recreational athletic competitions in the spring and summer, and weekend tournament events in the summer (not counting informal practices), Polaris Road is quite busy without the addition of a business endeavor in the neighborhood. It has been said that starting Fall 2020, there will be 100 additional students attending the high school alone, which will elevate the traffic levels (and concerns) noticeably.

I50-5

In the past two years, since this proposal has been promoted, the number of people driving to the high school for both XC skiing and mountain biking has increased considerably. Quite a few of these people are in quite a hurry to get there, driving well above the 25 mph speed limit. When asked how they came to enter the trail system from the high school, most have replied that the XC center people suggested it to them.

“Uncertain weather patterns and the poor quality of existing developed facilities stress the financial viability of the TCCSEA operation of the cross-country ski lodge and area.”

Uncertain weather patterns are expected to continue, probably for the lifetime of anyone reading this, and their children and grandchildren. Competently researched data indicates that the overall trend in our area is a warming climate, and not for the first time on our planet. Dr. Charles Goldman is available for consultation on this matter: his 50+ years of research is rather important to this proposal (the TERC staff can help you reach him). One might conclude that a new xc ski facility at our elevation, no matter how attractive an idea it appears, would be a foolish investment, especially when one considers how much forest destruction is required to make it happen.

I50-6

But don’t take my word for it. Consider the conclusions of some of the researchers who have been looking at this for more than 60 years. Just a couple of sources:

The Effects of Climate Change on Lake Tahoe In The 21st Century: Meteorology, Hydrology, Loading And Lake Response

https://tahoe.ucdavis.edu/sites/g/files/dgvnsk4286/files/inline-files/Climate_Change_Report_2010.pdf

Lake Tahoe Climate Change Science Synthesis

https://www.cakex.org/sites/default/files/project/documents/FinalReport_GCC_ScienceSynthesis-1%20Lake%20Tahoe_0_0.pdf

150-6
cont.

PROJECT OBJECTIVES

TCPUD's Project objectives are to:

“Expand recreational opportunities through construction of a new lodge at Highlands to improve resident and visitor experience.”

This expansion—which isn't clearly detailed—will not improve the resident experience; it comes at too high a price. Outdoor commercial recreation is not allowed in Placer County residential areas, an appropriate regulation.

150-7

“Construct a new lodge that minimizes effects on the neighborhood.”

We are eager to see a proposal that would minimize effects on the neighborhood. This proposal will not do that.

Beyond the effects and impact of construction, this lodge project will destroy existing mature forest to plop a very large development and parking area in its place and add significant noise and traffic to a currently residential area.

“Create inviting community areas and public-use spaces.”

What brings most visitors (and residents) to our area? The stunning natural beauty: the forests, the lake. Not the developed areas. What is inviting to people? Not the developed areas. You could leave the xc center as is and the trails would be as inviting as they ever will be. We must not lose sight of this fact.

150-8

An improved lodge is a great idea, but not this specific proposal.

TCCSEA's Project objectives are to:

“Maximize the base elevation of the lodge site.”

The difference in base elevation is not significant enough to warrant such significant alteration of an established residential neighborhood.

150-9

“Improve and maintain educational programs and activities offered to adults and youth and create more userfriendly access to the trail system for beginner, disabled, and senior recreationists.”

The difference in “user friendly access” is not significant enough to warrant such alteration of an established residential neighborhood.

150-10

Also, since the XC center is already advising people to access the trail system through the high school parking lot, that portion of the stated objective is already being met, without the destruction of forest for a large new outdoor recreation commercial complex.

I50-10
cont.

TCPUD and TCCSEA share Project objectives to:

“Remedy inadequate parking and improve access to the lodge and trail system.”

In previous discussions with the late Kevin Murnane, then-Director of the XC ski operation, he asserted that the current XC lodge location had already been given permission to expand the parking in the current location. Therefore, this massive project is not necessary to address this objective.

I50-11

“...facilitate growth and diversity of recreational opportunities by enhancing summer and winter activities.”

This is an attractive sounding sentence with very little clear meaning. Currently, the recreational opportunities take place on an individual basis: people arrive, then go skiing or bicycle riding on the trails. They are here to experience the beautiful forests of the trail system. Nothing people do will enhance this experience, outside of renting skis and bikes.

I50-12

If “growth and diversity of recreational opportunities” means changing the trail system, what are the details?

AREAS OF KNOWN CONTROVERSY AND ISSUES TO BE RESOLVED

“The State CEQA Guidelines require an EIR to include a list of areas of potential controversy and issues to be resolved.

Appendix A includes a complete list of comments received during the scoping period. The following are key issues related to the Project:

Potential traffic impacts in the Highlands neighborhood, effects on emergency access and evacuation routes, and effects on school-related traffic . . .”

Polaris Rd. is a cul de sac: there is only one route in and out. This presents a serious problem in an emergency situation, especially fire, as was amply illustrated in the Oakland Hills fire of 1991 and in Paradise in 2018.

I50-13

Traffic, it has been well established, is already a problem: both people and animals have been struck by vehicles along Polaris Rd., and that is at much lower use rates than a large outdoor recreational center business would create.

In effect, Polaris Rd. would go from an already-stressed residential street into a commercial avenue, against the desires of the established residents who bought homes in a residential zoned area. Therefore, it is only reasonable, if this project were to go through, that the homeowners along Polaris Rd. be offered compensation.

“Public safety related to traffic, pedestrian safety, and serving alcohol at the Schilling Lodge . . .”

There are already issues around the high school (please give residents a chance to describe these to you if there is any doubt). Late night festivities often include hollering and sometimes people driving fast down Polaris Rd. Why isn't the sheriff called more often? Because people don't want to cause a ruckus if it can be avoided, and will wait to see if the people will stop their disturbance and leave. Most often they do, but that is after they have awakened residents.

People who have imbibed alcohol can become not just loudly annoying but belligerent as well. Residents have a very strong preference that this situation not be introduced to our residential neighborhood. Everyone likes to feel safe at home. Please don't take that away from us.

The traffic issue is covered in several places. Please note, wild animals, pets and people have all been hit on Polaris by speeding motorists. The motorists didn't intend to hit the people and animals, but it happened. Current law enforcement doesn't have the bandwidth to enforce the speed limit on this road. Establishing an attraction to bring in more people will worsen this situation.

150-14

“Construction of a new lodge on an undeveloped site . . .”

This phrasing is skewed and an inadequate description. Another way to put this would be, “Destruction of existing forest and habitat to construct new lodge.” Most residents value forest preservation above development of nonessential structures.

150-15

“Noise impacts, including from additional special events and potential disruption to the learning environment of the school . . .”

Currently residents contend with noise and traffic impacts from:

- school 5 days/week for 9 months/year (3 busy periods each day: morning, lunchtime and dismissal)
- associated athletic games and activities (Go Lakers!)
- weeknight recreational athletic events
- weekend events
- informal practices

150-16

For those on the northern side of Polaris (away from the lake), several of these weekend events bring enthusiasts into their backyards. These include xc skiers in winter and mountain bikers in summer. It is tolerable a few times a year because we know it's a one-day event. But it would likely become far more frequent with the addition of a 7-days-a-week outdoor recreational business in our residential neighborhood.

“Parking issues, including on-street parking . . .”

Currently, when there is a school event, you will find cars parked all along Polaris between the schools and the Old Mill intersection, sometimes parking across driveways, in their eagerness to get to their destination. A winter weekend would likely bring all this and more, with icy roads, if there were a large outdoor recreational facility in our residential neighborhood.

I50-17

Section 3.2.1: Aesthetics

Aesthetics are highly subjective, as any public artist can attest. Although this outdoor recreation facility would not affect any “scenic highway” view, it will very much affect the view in the Highlands neighborhood, and forever. The claim that many in the area would have “limited views through the forest of the Schilling Lodge” is plain old silly. The view, especially at night when lights are on, will be more than limited. So is the claim that it would not “degrade the existing visual character or quality of the . . . site or their surroundings.” Simply removing the standing forest will degrade the existing visual character AND quality of the site. Residents, students, staff and visitors will have plenty of view of this lodge, especially in the first five years after its construction, as the land tries to heal from the construction. However, if the Schilling Lodge (and not a huge expanded addition) were placed in Alternative A, the current XC ski lodge location, it would be a re-development project, so the visual change would be greatly lessened. Another benefit would be the preservation of existing mature forest.

I50-18

Section 3.2.7: Public Services

“The impact on fire protection, emergency response, and police protection services would be less than significant for the proposed Project and Alternative A.”

If you’re planning for the hoped-for, everyday-type situation, this is true. But to be accurate, you *must* plan for the emergency situation, and the impact on all three of these agencies would be significant if there were a fire on a school day.

I50-19

Given that Polaris Rd. is a cul-de-sac with two schools at its terminus, adding a large outdoor recreation business alongside it would, most days, further congest Polaris Rd. traffic, certainly at lunchtime and after school, if not also in the morning. Add a fire and suddenly first responders are trying to evacuate a school, a business and residents on a cul-de-sac road. This is unnecessary risk.

Section 3.2.8. Recreation

“The proposed Project and Alternative A would increase the number of events that would use the trails in the surrounding area. Special events that use the trail system would temporarily impact parking and trail use because of an increase in participant users, which could interfere with other recreation users that want to

I50-20

use those trails and potentially reducing the quality of their recreation experience.”

We can safely replace “could” with “will” based on current experience, which includes at times harassment of recreation users by race participants, particularly between bicycle riders and pedestrians. Currently, race participants tend to assume their racecourse is theirs to own and many take exception to coming across walkers/hikers and can be aggressive in their displeasure. Event organizers have room for improvement on this already.

I50-20
cont.

“Neither the proposed Project or Alternative A would affect the fair-share distribution of recreation capacity in the Tahoe Basin because they would continue to provide public access to the cross-country ski area and surrounding trails. Additionally, a larger lodge would be available for public use and for an increase in the types of events yearround. This would be a beneficial impact of the Project.”

I50-21

This is not entirely correct: “continue to provide public access . . .” implies free access but in reality, the XC ski trail system is a pay-per-use operation and all access is by paid admission only. In summer, bicyclists can access the trails for free.

The “beneficial impact” of more events in this residential area is not for the residents, so that is also not entirely correct.

Thank you again for providing the opportunity to give comment on this proposal. And thank you for thinking not just 5 years out, or 10 years out, but 20 years out, with more rain than snow falling at our elevation, and making a decision that will minimize destruction of forest and maximize re-development of already developed areas. That’s good stewardship of our irreplaceable Tahoe basin lands.

I50-22

Regards,

Marguerite Sprague
Polaris Rd. resident

Letter I50 Marguerite Sprague

July 21, 2020

Response I50-1

The comment provides an introduction to the letter. No further response is necessary.

Response I50-2

The comment expresses support for Alternative A. The comment also notes a preference for retaining the size of the original Schilling residence building. The comment expresses the belief that the Schilling Lodge donor did not donate the facility out of a desire for a huge cross-country facility and the Tahoe XC group was not the first group offered the structure. See comment letter I75, which is authored by a member of the Schilling family and 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 I50-3

The comment expresses an opinion that traffic is one of the problems with this proposal and that Polaris Road is already stressed by existing traffic and activity levels, traffic traveling at excessive speed, as well as evening events that are very audible at the houses on the street. The comment goes on to state that both pets and children have been struck by vehicles traveling at excessive rates of speed. Additionally, the comment notes that the proposed Project will dramatically change daily life for the residents.

Please see Master Response 1: Transportation Safety. The comment addresses enforcement and social issues rather than specific physical environmental issues and does not address the adequacy of the Draft EIR analysis. 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 I50-4

The comment asserts that according to the Placer County land use and permit tables "outdoor commercial recreation" and "commercial event centers" are not allowed in residential areas. Given this, the comment asks how the Project could even be considered.

The comment is referring to Section 17.06.050 of the Placer County Code of Ordinances.

As stated in Section 1.03(E) of the Area Plan Implementing Regulations (Placer County and TRPA 2017), "The Placer County Code applies to the area within a conforming Area Plan to the extent that a provision is not in conflict with the TRPA Code of Ordinances or this document." Thus, because the Implementing Regulations apply zoning designations to all areas of Placer County within the jurisdiction of TRPA, including the proposed Project site and Alternative A site, the provisions of the Implementing Regulations supersede the zoning ordinance in the County Code. See Section 2.07(F) of the Area Plan Implementing Regulations, which identify the permissible uses in the North Tahoe High School Subdistrict, which contains the proposed Project site and Alternative A site. Section 21.3.1.E of the TRPA Code describes permissible accessory uses in areas with the recreation designation, which include "related commercial sales and services such as ski shops, pro shops... parking lots, maintenance facilities... employee facilities other than housing... outdoor recreation concessions, bars and restaurants..." Additionally, as further discussed in response to comment I35-6, the proposed Project site and Alternative A site are both zoned for "recreation" use and not "residential." See response to comment I35-6, which addresses the land use and zoning designation on the proposed Project site and Alternative A site.

Response I50-5

The comment refers to a statement related to advancing year-round recreation activities and providing opportunities for additional special events in the "Background and Need for the Project" section in the "Executive Summary" chapter of the Draft EIR. The comment summarizes activities at the school and traffic on Polaris Road. 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 I50-6

The comment refers to a statement related to uncertain weather patterns, the poor quality of existing developed facilities, and the financial viability of the TCCSEA operation in the “Background and Need for the Project” section in the “Executive Summary” chapter of the Draft EIR. The comment provides a general statement related to climate change and that a new cross-country ski facility at the elevation in the Highlands neighborhood would not be a good idea. The comment provides two additional sources related to the potential effects of anthropogenic climate change within the Tahoe region. Each report uses data published within the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change’s (IPCC’s) Fourth Climate Change Assessment (IPCC 2007), and downscales data to project future climatic conditions within the Tahoe region assuming various emissions scenarios. These reports were submitted as evidence to substantiate the commenter’s assertion that the Project would not be suitable for use in future years. These reports, among others which are included under in Section 3.7.1, “Regulatory Setting,” in Section 3.7, “Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change,” indicate that due to rising global temperatures, the Tahoe region will experience less snowfall as compared to historical averages, making cross-country skiing a less available recreational activity. While this assertion may be true, the Project would provide additional community benefits that are not limited to snow-related recreational activities. For instance, during the summer months, the Existing Lodge provides (and the proposed Schilling Lodge would continue to provide) educational programs and access to hiking and mountain biking opportunities to visitors. The submission of these reports does not conflict with the evidence cited in Section 3.7, “Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change,” which details the projected climatic change to California and the Tahoe region in Section 3.7.2, “Environmental Setting.” Thus, these reports are not considered new material that would alter the findings or conclusions of the Draft EIR.

Furthermore, consistent with direction provided by the California Supreme Court in *California Building Industry Association v. Bay Area Air Quality Management District* (2015) 62 Cal.4th 369 (CBIA v. BAAQMD) “agencies subject to CEQA generally are not required to analyze the impact of existing environmental conditions on a project’s future users or residents. But when a proposed project risks exacerbating those environmental hazards or conditions that already exist, an agency must analyze the potential impact of such hazards on future residents or users.” Given this direction from the Court, CEQA does not require that a lead agency evaluate the impact of the environment on the project, rather the project’s impact on its environment, except in cases where the project may exacerbate an existing adverse environmental condition. As discussed in Section 3.7, “Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change,” the Project would generate unmitigated emissions of GHGs above a net zero threshold; however, implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.7-1 would be sufficient to minimize amortized construction and operational emissions to a net zero level. Thus, the Project would not contribute GHG emissions that could exacerbate the adverse effects of human-caused climate change.

Response I50-7

The comment expresses an opinion that the expanded Lodge would not improve the residents’ experience and notes that outdoor commercial recreation is not allowed in Placer County residential areas. Regarding the comment’s assertion related to allowable uses in residential areas, see response to comment I50-4. Comments received from residents related to their opposition to the Project are acknowledged and included in this Final EIR. In spite of some of the expressed disadvantages of the Project from the residents’ point of view (e.g., traffic), nothing precludes the residents from visiting and using the proposed Schilling Lodge for access to cross-country skiing trails, mountain biking or hiking on the nearby trails, or reserving the facility for meetings or events. The Existing Lodge (i.e., the Highlands Community Center building) would be replaced with a historic building that would be larger, providing more space for these different uses. Arguably, the exterior and interior of the Schilling Lodge would provide an aesthetic improvement over that of the Existing Lodge. Additionally, the Project provides an opportunity to add a historic structure to the Highlands neighborhood. As noted on page 2-7 of the Draft EIR, regarding the Schilling residence, which would become the Schilling Lodge:

It exemplifies the architecture and lifestyle of early Tahoe development in the modern era. The Schilling residence was constructed using local and natural materials as a 4,465-sq. ft., two-story, wood-framed structure... Construction of the proposed Schilling Lodge would retain the character defining features that contribute to its historic character as identified in the Schilling Residence Targeted Historic Structure Report

(Wiss, Janney, Elstner Associates 2015) and in compliance with the standards for the rehabilitation of historic structures included in The Secretary of Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring, and Reconstructing Historic Buildings (National Park Service 2017), which include standards for additions to historic buildings.

The comment is noted for consideration by the TCPUD Board during the review of the merits of the Project.

Response I50-8

The comment refers to the Project objective, "Create inviting community areas and public-use spaces," and expresses an opinion regarding what brings most visitors to the Tahoe area, stating that developed areas are not what bring visitors and residents. The comment also states that if the Existing Lodge remained as is, the trails would remain inviting to visitors. The Project does not propose to change the trails associated with Tahoe XC. See response to comment I50-7, that highlights some of the benefits of the Project in the Highlands neighborhood, which would also extend to visitors. Also see response to comment I10-4, which explains the types of community use of the Schilling Lodge that could occur with implementation of the Project. The Project does not detract from the natural beauty of the forests and the lake that draw many visitors to the Tahoe region. The comment is noted for consideration by the TCPUD Board during the review of the merits of the Project.

Response I50-9

The comment asserts that the difference in the base elevation at the Lodge site is not significant enough to support the need for the Project. See response to comment I35-5 that addresses criticisms of the proposed Project at the proposed location related to the increase in elevation compared to the site of the Existing Lodge. The comment is noted for consideration by the TCPUD Board during the review of the merits of the Project.

Response I50-10

The comment refers to the Project objective, "Improve and maintain educational programs and activities offered to adults and youth and create more user-friendly access to the trail system for beginner, disabled, and senior recreationists," and asserts that the difference in user-friendly access is not significant enough to support the need for the Project. See response to comment I35-5, which addresses the benefits associated with proximity to user-friendly terrain at the proposed Project site. The comment's opinion does not raise environmental issues or concerns regarding 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 I50-11

The comment asserts that a previous director of Tahoe XC had already been given permission to expand the parking in the current location. The comment expresses the opinion that because of this, the Project is not needed to address the Project objective related to parking. While it is true that the applicant could seek approval for and implement parking improvements alone, the applicant is seeking to achieve many objectives that would be met by the proposed Project or Alternative A as described in Chapter 2, "Description of the Proposed Project and Alternative Evaluated in Detail," in the Draft EIR. The comment is noted for consideration by the TCPUD Board during the review of the merits of the Project.

Response I50-12

The comment refers to the Project objective, "Provide high quality and professionally maintained recreational amenities and facilitate growth and diversity of recreational opportunities by enhancing summer and winter activities," and asks for clarification about what this statement means. This Project objective is an applicant-provided objective. See response to comment I10-4, which describes the opportunities for community use of the Schilling Lodge, including running, skiing, and biking day camps and a small increase in the number of large special events (such as races) that could occur with the proposed Project or Alternative A. 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 I50-13

The comment states that the State CEQA Guidelines require an EIR to include a list of areas of potential controversy and issues to be resolved. The comment also expresses concerns related to traffic and public safety.

A list of potential areas of controversy or issues to be resolved are listed on page ES-4 under the "Areas of Known Controversy and Issues to be Resolved" section in the "Executive Summary" chapter of the Draft EIR.

Please see Master Response 1: Transportation Safety. Additionally, as detailed on page 3.5-1 of Section 3.5, "Transportation," of the Draft EIR the potential for the Project to interfere with implementation of an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan is discussed in Section 3.2.3, "Hazards and Hazardous Materials."

Regarding the concerns noted in the comment related to excessive traffic associated with implementation of the proposed Project, Impacts 3.5-1 and 3.5-2 in Section 3.5, "Transportation," of the Draft EIR analyze the potential effects of Project-generated traffic within the study area. Finally, the request that homeowners along Polaris Road be compensated for the additional traffic that the proposed Project would generate does not raise any CEQA issues or address the adequacy of the Draft EIR analysis. 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 I50-14

The comment states that late night festivities around the high school often include hollering and sometimes people driving fast down Polaris Road. The comment expresses the opinion that people who have imbibed alcohol can become a nuisance and residents have a very strong preference that this situation is not introduced to the residential neighborhood. The comment goes on to note that wild animals, pets, and people have all been hit on Polaris Road by speeding motorists and that law enforcement does not have the bandwidth to enforce the speed limit on this road and the proposed Project would bring in more people and worsen this situation.

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. See response to comment I10-19, which addresses concerns related to the presence of alcohol at the Schilling Lodge. Please see Master Response 1: Transportation Safety for a response related to speeding. 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 I50-15

The comment disagrees with the wording of the statement, "construction of a new lodge on an undeveloped site" in the "Executive Summary" chapter under the "Areas of Known Controversy and Issues to be Resolved" section on page ES-4 of the Draft EIR. The comment asserts that another way to phrase this statement would be "destruction of existing forest and habitat to construct new lodge." 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 I50-16

The comment summarizes the types and extent of noise and traffic currently experienced in the neighborhood. The comment asserts that instances of recreation users in the backyards in the neighborhood would occur more frequently than under existing conditions. 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 I50-17

The comment states that when there is a school event, you will find cars parked all along Polaris between the schools and the Old Mill Road intersection, sometimes parking across driveways. A winter weekend would likely bring all this and more, with icy roads, if there were a large outdoor recreational facility in our residential neighborhood. See Impact 3.5-4, which addresses the potential for the Project to result in inadequate parking conditions beginning on page 3.5-24 in Section 3.5, "Transportation," in the Draft EIR. This analysis takes into account provisions to minimize the use of residential parking, such as carpooling, that would be incorporated into event planning and implemented

to address parking demand and pursuit of a shared-parking agreement with the Tahoe Truckee Unified School district to allow Tahoe XC and North Tahoe High School to share their respective parking areas during high-use events. The impact analysis concludes implementation of the Project would result in an improvement to existing conditions in the neighborhood as a whole for these reasons and because of the increased size of the parking lot. Parking illegally is prohibited by law, and it is presumed that drivers must obey existing parking regulations and laws or be ticketed. Enforcement of parking regulations and the risk of violating laws is not a topic subject to CEQA review. 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 I50-18

The comment asserts that aesthetics are highly subjective. The comment agrees that the Project would not affect any "scenic highway," but asserts that it would affect the view in the Highlands neighborhood. The comment disagrees with statements in Section 3.2.1, "Aesthetics," in the Draft EIR that there would be limited views of the Schilling Lodge through the forest and that it would not degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site or the surroundings. The comment specifically notes concerns related to nighttime views and those related to tree removal. The comment notes that aesthetic impacts at the Alternative A site would be less of a visual change because the Project would consist of redevelopment.

The potential impacts from the proposed Project and Alternative A related to light and glare are assessed on page 3-9 of the Draft EIR. The light and glare impacts would be less than significant because the proposed Project and Alternative A would include lighting that would be downward facing and the minimal necessary for safety purposes, neither would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area. Additionally, the exterior building materials used for the Schilling Lodge would consist of wood siding and a product that best matches the historic character of the original wood shake roof but meets local fire code requirements, consistent with the materials used in the historic Schilling residence. These materials would not create new sources of glare.

To clarify the analysis of impacts on the visual character or quality of the site as it relates to tree removal for the proposed Project and Alternative A, Section 3.2.1, "Aesthetics," is revised in this Final EIR. This change is presented below and in Chapter 2, "Revisions to the Draft EIR." This clarification does not alter the conclusions with respect to the significance of any environmental impact.

A new paragraph is added after the third paragraph on page 3-7 as follows:

The nearest residence to the proposed Project site is located 370 feet south of the Schilling Lodge and parking lot. The proposed Project would only remove trees within the footprint of the Schilling Lodge, driveway and parking lot, and trees in the surrounding forest (including within the viewing distance between nearby residences and the parking lot) that would provide screening would be retained. The number of trees that could be removed by either the proposed Project or Alternative A are identified in Table 2-2 on page 2-12 in Chapter 2, "Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives Evaluated in Detail," in the Draft EIR. Figure 2-5 on page 2-17 in Chapter 2 of the Draft EIR shows an aerial photo of the existing forest, adjacent school, and nearby residences along with an overlay of the Schilling Lodge, parking lot, and driveway. As seen in the aerial photo, many trees are located between those facilities included in the proposed Project and the nearest residences. The presence of these trees between the Schilling Lodge facilities and nearby residences would limit and screen views of those facilities. Impacts related specifically to tree removal are detailed under Impact 3.3-2 beginning on page 3.3-17 in Section 3.3, "Biological Resources," of the Draft EIR. Although trees would be removed to construct the proposed Project, nearby residents would continue to have views of the forest that would limit their view of the Schilling Lodge and would retain the visual character of the forested area.

Response I50-19

The comment references the less-than-significant impact conclusion related to fire protection, emergency response, and police protection services under Section 3.2.7, "Public Services," in the Draft EIR and asserts that you must plan for emergency situations and that the impact on these agencies would be significant. The comment notes that conditions along Polaris Road, a cul-de-sac with the schools at the end, residences, and a business would experience unnecessary risk associated with the Project.

As discussed on page 3-13 of the Draft EIR, the location of the Schilling Lodge next to the schools compared to existing conditions with the Existing Lodge located 0.8-mile down the road would essentially result in no change in emergency response times compared to existing conditions. This impact analysis is focused on the impacts related to fire, police, and emergency response services.

The potential for risks related to wildfire and emergency evacuation are addressed on page 3-12 under Section 3.2.3, "Hazards and Hazardous Materials," and on pages 3-15 and 3-16 under Section 3.2.9, "Wildfire." See response to comment I10-7, which addresses concerns related to emergency response and evacuation. See response to comment I10-8, which addresses concerns related to wildfire from the Project.

Response I50-20

The comment refers to a statement in Section 3.2.8, "Recreation," in the Draft EIR related to potential impacts on the quality of recreation experience during special events that use nearby trails. The comment notes that there are times when special event participants do harass recreation users and suggests that event organizers could improve management of the events. As noted on page 3-14 under Section 3.2.8, "Recreation," in the Draft EIR:

Currently, six large special and premier events are held at Tahoe XC each year. The Project proposes a total of nine large special events, an increase of three large special events compared to existing conditions. Although implementation of the proposed Project or Alternative A would result in an increase in the number of trail users participating in the additional special events, this increase would be short-term and temporary, as the Project applicant would limit the number of additional races and the trail races last for only a few hours on a single day. Because the increase in use of trails and the temporary congestion of some trails during special events would be limited and not substantially different than under existing conditions, the proposed Project and Alternative A would not result in a substantial adverse effect on the quality of recreation users in these areas and would not accelerate the physical deterioration of these trails.

As discussed on page 2-13 in Chapter 2 of the Draft EIR, a Management Plan for operating the Schilling Lodge has been drafted by TCCSEA (see Appendix B of the Draft EIR), which includes policies to guide TCCSEA management decisions and operational details for the Schilling Lodge and associated recreation activities. At the time of writing of this Final EIR, the Management Plan has not been finalized. The Management Plan's policies would be included in a future land lease or agreement with TCPUD following construction of the proposed Project. It is possible that additional policies, such as those related to the operation of special events as raised in this comment, could be included in the Management Plan. The comment is noted for consideration by the TCPUD Board during the review of the merits of the Project.

Response I50-21

The comment disagrees with the statement in the recreation analysis in the Draft EIR that the Project would continue to provide public access to recreation resources. The comment incorrectly assumes that public access implies free access. Use of the Tahoe XC cross-country ski trails is not free, but is available to any member of the public, because the fees are used to maintain the winter trail system and operation of Tahoe XC. The comment also asserts that the beneficial impact of more events in the Highlands neighborhood is not for the residents. Although comments have been received by residents expressing their disapproval of events at the Schilling Lodge, the assertion that residents would not benefit is not entirely true because there is nothing that would preclude residents from participating in any of the special events hosted at the Schilling Lodge and they would be in close proximity to the events allowing them to have easy access if they participated. This comment does not provide any specific evidence that 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 I50-22

The comment expresses appreciation for the opportunity to provide comments on the proposed Project. The comment is noted for consideration by the TCPUD Board during the review of the merits of the Project.

From: [Donald Fyfe](#)
To: [Kim Boyd](#)
Subject: Tahoe XC Draft EIR
Date: Tuesday, July 21, 2020 4:40:25 PM

Letter I51

Hello Kim,

After spending some time reviewing the Draft EIR for the Tahoe Cross Country Lodge Replacement and Expansion project I would like to express my observations.

I was impressed with how thorough the report was, it is quite an impressive document. Also of note, on the rare occasion where the project created an impact that was noted as significant, the mitigation strategies seemed to address the issue, minimizing the impacts.

It appears to me the Full Project proposed is clearly the best way to address all the inadequacies of the current lodge facility outlined in the report.

Thank you for the opportunity to express my thoughts.

Sincerely, Donald Fyfe

I51-1

Letter I51 Donald Fyfe
 July 21, 2020

Response I51-1

The comment expresses support for the proposed Project and expresses support for the analysis and mitigation measures presented in the Draft EIR. The comment is noted for consideration by the TCPUD Board during the review of the merits of the Project.

July 21, 2020

Tahoe City Public Utility District
Kim Boyd, Senior Management Analyst
PO Box 5249, Tahoe City, CA 96145
Email: kboyd@tcpud.org

Letter
152

Subject: Tahoe XC Draft EIR

Dear Ms. Boyd:

I am writing this letter in support of the preferred option (Site D) for the *Tahoe Cross Country Lodge Replacement and Expansion Project*. The Environmental Impact Review (EIR) fully addresses and mitigates any impacts of this new location and the replacement and expansion project at Site D provides many significant benefits for the community.

This project location would provide more suitable space to serve the community and allow for easier beginner access. Additionally, the proposed location would provide additional days to weeks of winter access for the community as air temperatures rise and snowpack decreases due to climate change*.

The long-term viability of this recreation resource requires better access to trails for winter use. This location is located at a higher elevation (approximately 100 vertical feet higher elevation) and is also closer to high elevation trails. These slightly higher elevation trails sustain snow longer and this location also avoids three of the four pitches that can close the area in low snow years. As avid Nordic skiers, this amenity is very important to us personally, but also for our community and the economic viability of Tahoe XC.

Traffic impacts related to the lodge are small in comparison to the effects of the high school. The people along Polaris and Old Mill purchased their property knowing they were on the access route to the school. I do not think that Tahoe XC will add measurably to the volume of traffic experienced other than it will expand it from 5 days per week to include weekends.

I hope to see this project move forward and look forward to a new, higher elevation base.

Thank you for your consideration,



Heather and John Segale (Residents of Tahoma since 1996)

152-1
152-2

*See the UC Davis *State of the Lake* chapter on meteorology available at <https://tahoe.ucdavis.edu/stateofthelake>. Over the last 107 years, daily air temperatures measured at Tahoe City have increased. The long-term trend in average daily minimum temperature has increased by 4.43 °F (2.46 °C). The trend line for the minimum air temperature now exceeds the freezing temperature of water, which is leading to more rain and less snow as well as earlier snowmelt at Lake Tahoe.

Letter I52 Heather and John Segale

July 21, 2020

Response I52-1

The comment includes background information about the letter's author, summarizes benefits of the proposed Project, expresses support for Site D of the proposed Project, and expresses support for the analysis in the Draft EIR. The comment is noted for consideration by the TCPUD Board during the review of the merits of the Project.

Response I52-2

The comment asserts that traffic impacts related to the Schilling Lodge are small in comparison to the effects of the high school and expresses the opinion that the traffic associated with the proposed Project would not measurably add to the volume of traffic experienced under existing conditions. The comment is noted for consideration by the TCPUD Board during the review of the merits of the Project.

From: [Robert Duffield](#)
To: [Kim Boyd](#); [Robert Duffield](#)
Subject: Tahoe Cross-Country Lodge Replacement and Expansion Project EIR Comments
Date: Tuesday, July 21, 2020 9:31:12 PM

Letter I53

Hello Kim Boyd,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Tahoe Cross-Country Lodge Replacement and Expansion Project EIR. The following email is to be considered official comment to the public review of the Tahoe Cross-Country Lodge Replacement and Expansion Project EIR.

My name is Robert Duffield. I am very familiar with the current operators of the Tahoe Cross Country Ski Area, the TCCSEA, and the current base lodge facility and trail system. The reason I am so familiar is two fold. In addition to being a year round user of the facility, I was an employee of the TCPUD Department of Parks and Recreation for 20 years and more specifically, the Director of the Parks and Recreation Department during the time period the TCCSEA came into being and began their partnership with the TCPUD to operate the ski area. I directed the consultant recruitment and hiring to perform the Lakeview Cross Country Ski Area Assessment Report in 1999. This report has been used by the TCPUD and TCCSEA as a master planning guide for the operation and expansion of the facility.

I53-1

As an additional background, I am familiar with the Schilling estate having had the opportunity to visit the estate numerous times while it was in the Schilling family ownership. It truly exemplifies the "Old Tahoe" design and construction attributes that are forever "Classic". The availability to convert this residence into a community facility is a great and unique opportunity to keep the historic heritage alive and to meld it with improvements that would provide a wonderful home for year round recreational opportunities in the North Tahoe Region.

The following are my comments on the project EIR. I have attempted to keep them brief and to the point. Should additional comment or clarification be needed I would be happy to provide that in a separate document.

I53-2

1. The Proposed Project and Alternative A look to address the short term and long term operational needs of the facility. The facility area assessment report conducted by Nordic Group International in 1999, identified many shortcomings of the current lodge configuration, location, and day to day operations. Recommendations were made to address these. Many of these recommendations are incorporated in the Proposed Project by the TCCSEA.
2. The Project EIR in my opinion is thorough and complete. Within the document the specific areas of environmental impacts have been identified and where impacts found, appropriate mitigation actions recommended. The conclusion seems apparent that either option, the Proposed Project or Alternative A could be built and any issues mitigated to satisfy the environmental issues and the neighborhood concerns. With that being said, in my opinion the Proposed Project is the preferable alternative for several reasons. These reasons are supported in the EIR. Some of these reasons are:
 - o The stated issue of the logistics of having a steep grade change at the current location that every skier/biker needs to climb to get to more favorable terrain for all ability levels is an issue. The Proposed Project alleviates this issue by having users start on the upper level.

I53-3

- The current location has a lower elevation and more sun exposure. This is a challenge to keep the snow in the winter and with everyone starting out there, this is an issue. The extended winter season or low snow season operation that would be realized at the Proposed Project site will enhance the experience of users as well as increase the number of users over the course of the season thus making the operation much more viable.
- The water supply to be provided by the TCPUD is more viable at the Proposed Project location. As stated in the EIR, there could be issues providing mandated water flow at the Alternative A site.
- The proximity to the HighSchool of the Proposed Project is a major consideration. This is at the end of the street and on busy weekends the shared parking would be a great amenity. Also, the High School is currently used for other Recreation activities such as adult sports leagues and special events, it would be natural to include the Schilling Lodge there. Certainly the high school ski teams would have better access to the ski trails and the use of the ski waxing and training facilities at the lodge would be a great benefit.
- After review of the EIR, it appears to me that the Proposed Project would have a more distant affect on the surrounding residents. Alternative A would have the lodge and parking much closer to existing resident housing.
- Selection of the Proposed Project site allows for the current Highlands Community Center to remain a public asset to the community. With the growth of full time residents being noted over the last while, the need for community facilities will grow and this asset can be used in addition to the Schilling lodge to provide opportunities for the community.

I53-3
cont.

In summary, I am in support of the Proposed Project site of the Tahoe Cross Country Lodge replacement and Expansion Project. The EIR identifies the potential environmental issues and recommendations are provided on how to mitigate them. It is important these issues be addressed. The TCCSEA has proven over the last 20 plus years that they are a community driven organization that is here to stay. They have provided enduring, responsible operation of the Tahoe Cross Country Ski area and have expanded operations to include viable shoulder season and summer activities to the community. There is no doubt the community supports the TCCSEA and the recreation opportunities they have brought forward. It is time to take the next step and make their operation truly world class with the implementation of the Lodge Replacement and Expansion project. The Schilling Lodge will provide the space and atmosphere needed to be a real jewel. The Schilling Lodge will bring historical preservation to the forefront of North Tahoe where it is desperately needed. I look forward to the TCPUD Board voting to allow the TCCSEA to move forward with this project on the Proposed Project site .

As stated I am happy to respond to any questions. My contact information is: Phone: (530) 400-3676; Email: reduffield51@gmail.com.

Kind Regards;
Robert (Bob) Duffield

Letter I53 Robert (Bob) Duffield

July 21, 2020

Response I53-1

The comment provide an introduction to the letter and background about the letter author's experience as a former employee and director of TCPUD Department of Parks and Recreation, involvement in preparation of the Lakeview Cross-Country Ski Area Assessment Report used by TCPUD and TCCSEA in planning for operation and expansion of the Tahoe XC facility, and experiences he had visiting the Schilling residence at its original location. The comment is noted for consideration by the TCPUD Board during the review of the merits of the Project.

Response I53-2

The comment notes that the proposed Project and Alternative look to address short-term and long-term operational needs of the facility and many of the recommendations provided by Nordic Group International in 1999 were incorporated into the proposed Project. The comment is noted for consideration by the TCPUD Board during the review of the merits of the Project.

Response I53-3

The comment expresses the opinion that the Draft EIR is thorough and complete. The comment notes that appropriate mitigation is recommended where impacts were found. The comment also notes that either the proposed Project or Alternative A could be built but the comment expresses support for the proposed Project for a number of reasons, such as accessibility to more user-friendly terrain, less sun exposure, better water supply, potential for shared parking at the high school, and need for community facilities among other reasons. The comment is noted for consideration by the TCPUD Board during the review of the merits of the Project.

From: [kevin.allbi.beer](#)
To: [Kim Boyd](#)
Subject: Tahoe XC Draft EIR
Date: Tuesday, July 21, 2020 11:54:56 PM

**Letter
I54**

Hello Kim and other TCPUD staff. I am writing to voice my strong support for the Tahoe Cross-Country Lodge Replacement and Expansion Project Draft EIR. I find that the overall DEIR is adequate under CEQA and that the relatively minor impacts of new construction can be fully mitigated. Additionally, the new lodge will offer very high value to the community, and especially youth, given its proximity to the high school and middle school. For these reasons and many others, I urge you to vote to approve the DEIR.

I54-1

Thank you,
 Kevin Drake

Placer County Lay Representative
 TRPA Advisory Planning Commission

and

Local business owner

Letter I54 Kevin Drake
 July 21, 2020

Response I54-1

The comment expresses support for the proposed Project and the analysis and accuracy of the Draft EIR. The comment is noted for consideration by the TCPUD Board during the review of the merits of the Project.

Dan Haas

PO Box 1433 Tahoe City, Ca 96145

Letter
155

July 18, 2020

Kim Boyd
Tahoe City Pubic Utility District
PO Box 5249
Tahoe City, Ca 96145
kboyd@tcpud.org

Dear Kim,

As a resident of Tahoe City and a frequent user of the Tahoe Cross -Country Ski Area both for skate skiing and for mountain biking I fully support the relocation of the main lodge and the repurposing of the historic Schilling Lodge as a base of operations (Site D- Full Project).

I
155-1
I

The ski area is a community benefit but community benefits should not come at the cost of the environment or have substantial impacts on the surrounding community. I do not see any significant and unavoidable impacts related to this project. Even better, any potentially significant impact can be mitigated to a less than significant level.

I
155-2
I

I understand that there are concerns from the community, especially from residents of the Highlands neighborhood, surrounding this project. The biggest concerns I have heard have to do with the potential traffic impacts in the surrounding neighborhood, specifically impacts to school traffic and emergency/evacuation routes. I believe the dEIR thoroughly studied these concerns and found the potential impact to be less than significant.

I
155-3
I

The new location offers better access to beginner terrain, a higher elevation for a longer season, and better access for student athletes. The Schilling Lodge will present an improved experience for staff and customers and provide an additional meeting space for the community.

I
155-4
I

Best regards,



Dan Haas

Letter I55 Dan Haas

July 22, 2020

Response I55-1

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 I55-2

The comment notes that they did not see any significant and unavoidable impacts from the Project and any potentially significant impact can be mitigated to a less-than-significant level. The comment is noted for consideration by the TCPUD Board during the review of the merits of the Project.

Response I55-3

The comment acknowledges concerns expressed by the community related to potential traffic impacts in the neighborhood, specifically related to school traffic and emergency access and evacuation routes. The comment expresses the belief that the Draft EIR thoroughly analyzed these concerns and concluded potential impacts would be less than significant. The comment is noted for consideration by the TCPUD Board during the review of the merits of the Project.

Response I55-4

The comment states the new location offers better access to beginner terrain, a higher elevation for a longer season, better access for student athletes, an improved experience for staff and customers, and additional meeting space for the community. The comment is noted for consideration by the TCPUD Board during the review of the merits of the Project.

Tahoe City Public Utility District
 Kim Boyd, Senior Management Analyst

Letter
 I56

A wonderful and very worthwhile endeavor is taking place in our community. The Tahoe Cross Country Ski Area and its amazing group of volunteers, have been working very diligently to bring a fabulous new base facility with the iconic Schilling Lodge to this local/community ski area. This is an incredible improvement for the Tahoe Cross Country Ski Area.

This new base facility and Schilling Lodge will improve TCCSA beyond any scale or metric imaginable.

- More than double the parking with 100 proposed parking spaces, compared to 46 at the current site. No more street parking on weekends or weekdays.
- Overflow parking for special events like The Great Ski Race and more. There is adjacent overflow parking at North Tahoe High School.
- The Schilling lodge allows for larger retail, ski rental and ski maintenance areas.
- Increased food service and lounge areas for guests.
- The lodge has space for a real team room for our frequent state champions, The North Tahoe High School Nordic Ski Team. Currently they have a team room, not much bigger than a closet.
- The new base facility's location is best suited for the TCCSA. The lodge is immediately adjacent to the beginner terrain. How many first time and beginner skiers have never come back to this ski area because of the unfriendly, steep, and often icy hill that accesses the beginner terrain? Beginners will be greeted with the area's large, flat and easiest terrain right out the door. The chances of having a fun and enjoyable learning experience, for these skiers, couldn't be better.
- The Schilling Lodge that will be reconstructed on the new site, was originally built in 1936. There is plenty of history and Old Tahoe magnificence that comes with this house being converted to the Ski Lodge. What a great use and donation to the Tahoe Cross Country Ski Area and our community. We and our visitors will now see, breathe and feel the history that the Schilling Lodge provides.

I56-1

Thank you to all the Tahoe Cross Country Ski Area volunteers. Your tireless work is appreciated and a gift to all of us.

John and Leslie Hyché

Letter I56 John and Leslie Hyché
 July 22, 2020

Response I56-1

The comment expresses support for the proposed Project and lists components of the proposed Project and the associated benefits. The comment is noted for consideration by the TCPUD Board during the review of the merits of the Project.

From: [Genevieve Evans](#)
To: [Kim Boyd](#)
Subject: Tahoe XC DEIR
Date: Wednesday, July 22, 2020 6:50:47 PM

**Letter
I57**

Ms. Boyd-

I would like to express my support for the Schilling Lodge Tahoe XC project at the preferred site near the high school. I am a relatively new Tahoe XC Board member, although I have been skiing at Tahoe XC since 2004. I have read the DEIR and feel that it has more than adequately addressed all issues.

The following are what I see as the greatest benefits of the project to the community:

- The primary reason Tahoe XC is more appealing to many than Tahoe Donner XC (I believe) is that we have a close community feel. What a better way to improve upon that sense but repurpose an old Tahoe home as a gathering place for XC skiers!

- Locating the lodge near the high school will alleviate parking shortages on weekends and for special events, provide better access to beginner terrain and perhaps even give us a few more ski days a year.

I understand that residents living on Polaris will see an increase in traffic on weekends. However, this seems like a relatively small increase. Additionally, much of the traffic increase could be due to the fact that the word is out: Tahoe is the place to be!

}

I57-1

}

I57-2

Thank you,

Genevieve Evans

Letter I57 Genevieve Evans

July 22, 2020

Response I57-1

The comment expresses support for the proposed Project, provides background about the letter’s author as a new member of the Tahoe XC Board, and believes the Draft EIR adequately addresses all issues. The comment also identifies benefits of the Project that include the close community feel and potential for shared parking with the high school. The comment is noted for consideration by the TCPUD Board during the review of the merits of the Project.

Response I57-2

The comment expresses understanding that residents living on Polaris Road would see an increase in traffic on weekends but believes this seems like a relatively small increase and asserts that much of the traffic increases could be due to Tahoe’s popularity as a travel destination. The comment is noted for consideration by the TCPUD Board during the review of the merits of the Project.

From: [Mike Schwartz](#)
To: [Kim Boyd](#); [Huff](#); [Terri Viehmann](#)
Subject: Quit trying to force Nordic Center move
Date: Wednesday, July 22, 2020 11:32:26 PM

Letter I58

I don't get why you guys are forcing a future of hard feelings and increased hassle and danger on Polaris Rd. I've complained before but here is my last plea for TCPUD to just cut ties with this stupid project. Spend your money on something else. How about making the access road you should have at the beginning, that links the current nordic center building with hwy 28 near the bike path. It works, go look already!!!! Put the silly old schilling lodge on the hill in the current parking lot if for some reason you MUST use it. Make some stairs to climb the 200 vertical feet to the meadow. That's it. Separate these two daily crowds of people between the school and skiing.

Constructing this building at the highschool benefits about 20 fancy pants nordic skiers who of course would like a new building and parking lot. Which you can give them at the existing site. You know all the problems a move to Polaris will create, we keep telling you. It's almost like none of you live here. I hear the TC nordic board doesn't live here. They are the most selfish people forcing this to happen. You don't need to make more money in a residential neighborhood. Skiing is an outside thing. Just modernize what you have and look into a real hwy 28 access road. Sending a ton more people down to the highschool in addition to the speeding kids and sports teams every day is insane. For what? The kids don't need it, the skiers don't need it, and the people who want to go inside to enjoy a coffee can do so in the revised current building. You don't build huge projects in residential neighborhoods to begin with. Especially on a crowded dead end narrow road. What is wrong with you guys? I live on Polaris and wouldn't dream of driving up or down Old Mill with any snow. Now you are going to ADD 100 people per day in a hurry to ski when there is new snow. The kids drive so damn fast every day going to school and sports. It's a constant rush hour twice a day, 7 days a week.

I for one will have no respect for the nordic center management or TCPUD if they force this project. Every negative aspect that has been voiced in the impact reports and community comments seems to just go in one of your ears and out the other. What is up with that? Are you just discounting the locals' knowledge of this bad situation because you are used to ignoring the NIMBA aspect of every project? This is not an issue like that. We all use the nordic trails. We know what we need and don't need. Snow isn't deeper at the highschool. Ask any local xc skier on Polaris. We don't need to provide some high end building to nurture bay area ski team kids. And we sure as hell don't need a property that needs to be rented out for parties to pay the property expenses.

Mike Schwartz
The Backcountry
mike@thebackcountry.net
shipping - 11400 Donner Pass Rd. Truckee CA 96161
bill to - PO Box 6706 Tahoe City CA 96145
 cell 530-362-0020
Truckee Store: (530) 582-0909
Squaw Store: (530) 581-4707

I58-1

I58-2

I58-3

I58-4

Letter I58 Mike Schwartz

July 22, 2020

Response I58-1

The comment expresses opposition to the proposed Project. The comment suggests spending the money for the Project on other things, suggests making an access road that links the Existing Lodge with SR 28, expresses the belief that the proposed Project would create problems, and suggests modernizing what already exists. The comment does not raise environmental issues or concerns regarding 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 I58-2

The comment expresses opposition to building the proposed Project in a residential neighborhood. See response to comment I35-6, which addresses the land use and zoning designation on the proposed Project site and Alternative A site. The comment does not raise environmental issues or concerns regarding 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 I58-3

The comment states that huge projects should not be built in residential neighborhoods, especially on a crowded dead-end narrow road. The commenter states that they live on Polaris Road and would not dream of driving up or down Old Mill Road with any snow and that the Project would add 100 people per day in a hurry to ski when there is new snow. The commenter concludes by stating that the kids drive very fast every day going to school and sports 7 days a week.

See Master Response 1: Transportation Safety for discussion of transportation safety-related concerns related to winter conditions along Old Mill Road. The comment does not raise any CEQA issues or address the adequacy of the Draft EIR analysis. 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 I58-4

The comment expresses the opinion that the Project is not needed. The comment does not raise environmental issues or concerns regarding 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.

From: [Huff](#)
To: [Kim Boyd](#); [Dan Wilkins](#); [John Pang](#); [Scott Zumwalt](#); [Gail Scoville](#); [Terri Viehmann](#)
Cc: [Sean Barclay](#)
Subject: TAHOE XC DRAFT EIR
Date: Thursday, July 23, 2020 6:16:09 AM

Letter I59

Dear Board Members,

Correspondence shows at least three different members of the community were told answers to their questions on various subjects (e.g., funding plans, economic feasibility study) would be in the DEIR; but this did not happen. Please provide answers to these important questions now.

Thank you,
Roger

I59-1

Letter I59 Roger Huff

July 23, 2020

Response I59-1

The comment states that correspondence indicates that answers to questions related to a funding plan and economic feasibility study posed by members of the community would be in the Draft EIR. The financial aspect of the Project is not a topic that requires analysis in the EIR under CEQA. This comment does not raise environmental issues or concerns regarding 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.

From: [Joy M. Doyle](#)
To: [Kim Boyd](#)
Cc: [Debbie Kelly-Hogan](#)
Subject: Tahoe XC Draft EIR
Date: Thursday, July 23, 2020 3:00:14 PM

**Letter
I60**

Kim,

I am writing to offer my support of the Tahoe Cross County Center Lodge Replacement and Expansion Project.

I am a 30-year Carnelian Bay resident. Sadly, because I worked full-time and raised two children here, I had limited time to spend at Tahoe Cross County. Last year, however, because I started working part time from home and my kids are off on their own, I purchased a Tahoe Cross Country pass. I visited the center ~15 times and enjoyed it immensely. Not only was the facility properly maintained and operated, I was amazed how much it was used and enjoyed by residents and visitors alike. I vowed to own and use a Tahoe Cross Country pass forever into the future, as long as my health, fitness level and finances allow as I want to support this vital amenity of our community.

I have concluded that Tahoe XC is the heart and soul of the North Lake Tahoe community. It is a social hub and physical outlet unlike any other and provides an unparalleled experience and opportunity that is accessible and enjoyed by all ages and abilities, who visit and participate in cross country skiing and snowshoeing.

No other venue can match Tahoe Cross Country Center - it is vital to our community. We need to invest in the lodge so generation after generation can use and enjoy the facility.

I fully support and encourage Tahoe City PUD to make improvements and upgrades to the lodge because it is a precious community asset. I believe the scope of the draft EIR is complete and adequate for the project and serves the public's interest well. Conclusions in the draft EIR are well founded and any potentially significant impacts are addressed and mitigated in the report.

In closing, please accept my support.

Respectfully,

Joy M. Doyle
 530-386-3657 (mobile)
 530-581-1245 (office | home)
tahoejoy660@gmail.com

I60-1

Letter I60 Joy M. Doyle
 July 23, 2020

Response I60-1

The comment includes background information about the letter’s author, expresses support for the proposed Project, and expresses support for the analysis and accuracy of the Draft EIR. The comment is noted for consideration by the TCPUD Board during the review of the merits of the Project.

From: [Lin Winetrub](#)
To: [Kim Boyd](#)
Subject: TXC draft EIR
Date: Thursday, July 23, 2020 3:59:41 PM

**Letter
I61**

We are in support of TXC being moved to site D.

As nordic skiers since the 70's when Skip ran the area, and then as employees when Kevin and Valli were the managers, we believe in the value of a community gathering spot offering year round recreational services. As its already been stated, TXC needs more parking, improved layout for better flow, much more efficient storage, staff rooms, enhanced community spaces, and better starting place with more snow.

- 1) There is not sufficient parking for employees and visitors during high season ski days, holidays, and weekends, mostly during the months of February & January..
- 2) Supplies are spread out all over the place, with sleds taking up cafe space, Ski equipment in the rental shop and the storage shed, and an outdoor closet, plus more office supplies, cafe supplies, retail supplies in the attic. Very, Very Very inefficient.
- 3) On busy days, we are exploding at the seams, in all departments, Front Desk check in, retail, rental shop and cafe. It would be so amazing to offer guests a more inviting cafe and comfortable indoor public lounge, a more efficient rental experience, plus an employee lounge for breaks. When it is busy we are climbing over benches and bumping into each other just to service customers.
- 4) TXC works because we have a great set of employees & volunteers. Yet often it is a huge challenge to provide the service we desire with the space we currently have. Our popularity means we are working in an organized chaotic fashion
- 5) Providing recreation in winter for families, individuals, seniors, dog owners disabled skiers, is truly a tremendous undertaking for such a small area. Keeping all these folks happy and being able to fulfill their expectations for a great outdoor exercise experience is no small feat. We could provide so much more with more parking and a larger building.
- 6) Now here's the biggie. We need a flatter, larger, easier beginner area! Lessons for beginners are encouraged and highly recommended for safety and knowledge and new skills.
- 7) It is true that a number of residents do not ski at TXC. It is also true that a number of residents ski or snowshoe our groomed trails w/o paying for a trail pass. Who is benefiting by using our trails and who is being taken for granted?
- 8) We wish to see the recreation experience improve for all: Residents, employees, volunteers, and skiers. Seems like we could work together to achieve this. We all live here to enjoy the seasons and mother nature.

We hope that with the positive results from the EIR and that most residents support the new site that it will be approved. Many years of happy skiing for all.

Rick Wertheim and Lin Winetrub

I61-1

Letter I61 Rick Wertheim and Lin Winetrub

July 23, 2020

Response I61-1

The comment includes background information about the letter's author, summarizes benefits of the proposed Project, expresses support for Site D for the proposed Project, and expresses support for the analysis and accuracy of the EIR. The comment is noted for consideration by the TCPUD Board during the review of the merits of the Project.

From: [Renee Kojane](#)
To: [Kim Boyd](#)
Subject: Tahoe XC Draft EIR
Date: Thursday, July 23, 2020 5:39:24 PM

Letter I62

Hi there Kim,
 It's Renee Kojane contacting you regarding my support of the Schilling Lodge Project. I am the newest board member of Tahoe XC and agreed to join because it has been one of the healthiest, happiest places in Tahoe for our family. And it's become even more so during this pandemic. I joined the board about a year ago hoping I can help return some of the goodwill this place has offered us. I have all along felt that the Schilling project will serve as a much needed community space where people can gather, relax and connect. We are in need of that more than ever. Tahoe XC is a special spot and warrants a proper lodge that will give a sense of place and will assuredly enhance one of the most loved locations on the North Shore of Lake Tahoe.

I62-1

Thank you for everything.

~Renee Kojane
www.reneekojaneart.com

Letter I62 Renee Kojane
 July 23, 2020

Response I62-1

The comment includes background information about the letter's author and 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.

From: [Schroepfer Scott](#)
To: [Kim Boyd](#)
Subject: Tahoe XC Draft EIR
Date: Thursday, July 23, 2020 10:17:45 PM

Letter
I63

It looked to me to be a thorough assessment of the consequences of moving TXC up the road.
Let this process continue.

I 163-1

Scott Schroepfer
schroepfer.tahoe@gmail.com

Letter I63 Scott Schroepfer

July 23, 2020

Response I63-1

The comment expresses support for the proposed Project and the analysis of the Draft EIR. The comment is noted for consideration by the TCPUD Board during the review of the merits of the Project.

To: TCPUD Board of Directors
 TXC Schilling Lodge Project response to DEIR report
 23rd July 2020
 Written by Debbie White

Letter
I64

 We are 6 years on from the start of this process and it is pitiful that the donation of this lodge is all about a donor whose sole purpose was to get a tax write off and build the new lakefront more appropriate to this day and age. The upshot is a dilemma of what to do with it.

We are not in favour of the relocation of this Lodge to Site D (Polaris) as proposed. We have supported all along a modified site A (current location) version that includes the Schilling Lodge.

The DEIR doesn't appear to include the Alternative Site A option to replace the Highlands Community Center with the original, historic Schilling Lodge with minimal modifications required to improve the existing site. This is the sensible option that should have been investigated as extensively as Project Site D. Why hasn't it been?

Key issues related to the project:

Environmental impact

The removal of trees in order to facilitate the Schilling Lodge impacts both sites. 183 trees at Site D versus 79 at Site A. Both have environmental impact yet under the Mitigation Measure 3.3-2: Minimize Tree Removal, Develop and Implement a Tree Removal and Management Plan, the mitigation level for Site D could typically include realignment and re-configuration of parking and a reduction in parking requirements, which if implemented, totally negates one of the main criteria for a new site. It is not worth the cost to desecrate the forest and create disruption to flora and fauna that will never recover. We understand change and development, progress and evolution but the thought of long-established plant and animal species being ripped up and torn apart is unthinkable and wrong. For example, Owls might not be seen but they are heard in the neighbourhood and without the trees, they have no habitat.

Potential traffic impacts

Impact 3.5-2: Cause Traffic Volumes on a Residential Roadway; how can you say that the proposed Project (Site D) would not alter travel patterns or increase traffic volumes to the extent proposed Project and Alternative A would not alter travel patterns or increase traffic volumes to the extent that the capacity of a residential roadway would be exceeded? Of course they would be exceeded given the very nature of the location of Site D and the intention of the facility; to create business and therefore traffic to and from the location. Placer County may have a 2,500 vehicles per day standard for residential roadways, but Polaris is not a standard road. It is a dead end, no through road so the capacity of Polaris is not adequate to meet 'standard' norms. The concept of capacity in this scenario is very important and the

I64-1

I64-2

I64-3

road in question (Polaris) should be adequate to serve the needs of the projected traffic. As we have the presence of a school at one end of Polaris, it is well documented that volume of traffic is already at capacity during peak times therefore the addition of another commercial facility at the same end of the street will only increase traffic flow and usage of said street. With no sidewalks that help maintain traffic flow, the flow and therefore volume of traffic are even more compromised.

I64-3
cont.

Parking issues

Impact 3.5-4: Potential to Result in Inadequate Parking Conditions.

Parking has always been an argument to move the existing TXC Site A to Project Site D yet when I asked TXC in a presentation back in 2018 how many parking spaces they had at existing Site A, they couldn't tell me. An embarrassing and foolish error at best when being used as a tool for a case. However, I had counted them the day before and astonishingly, site D offers very few additional spaces to existing Site A. This is not a robust reason to change sites.

I64-4

Events such as weddings will no doubt exceed the 100 spaces planned for Project Site D and therefore further impact the neighbourhood as a whole so you are wrong thinking this alternative would work. It won't work without significant impact to residents.

If 10 of the 100 spaces at Project Site D have to be allocated to Level 2 electric vehicle charging stations (as it states a minimum of 10% of the parking spaces for the project), this reduces regular parking to 90 spaces, further reducing available parking that is no improvement on existing site A's parking. It is senseless to consider Project Site D when there is very little gain.

Impact 3.5-5: Construction-Related Impacts on Traffic; construction on Project Site D will require restriction of use of Polaris that you state could result in detours and lane closures. There is no possibility of detours on Polairs. Lane closures will have a momentous impact on the already hindered narrow street and traffic flow on Polaris.

I64-5

You also mention a mitigation measure that includes a shuttle bus program but where are the cars going to park for a shuttle bus to pick up and drop off? I don't understand how this is a feasible solution.

I64-6

There are clear safety risks with increased traffic at Site D that need to be addressed. Polaris road has no sidewalks and is not lit, so an uptick in traffic volumes will clearly compromise pedestrian, resident, and neighbourhood safety. This has not been specifically addressed in the DEIR. The word safety doesn't appear.

I64-7

In point 3.7 (Greenhouse Gas Emissions) you state the impact of up to 4 years, so are you suggesting the build would take 4 years, resulting in 4 years of disruption to road usage, neighbourhood noise etc....? 4 years of 8 am to 6.30 pm, daily as stated in 3.8 Noise.

I64-8

3.7-1 Greenhouse Gas Emission and climate change

You list one way to mitigate this is by installing rooftop solar panels. But these are a much more expensive way of increasing renewable energy on the grid. The big problem with the California Energy Commission’s new mandate (passed May 9th 2018 and came in to affect this year) is cost. It is a feel-good change that is a questionable public policy and, in this instance, it will add significant cost to the building of the Schilling Lodge and associated buildings.

I64-8
cont.

But the problem is without reducing this, global warming will only get worse and this in turn will affect snowpack in the winter months.

Please note; solar panels don’t work with snow load. Solar panels need sunlight to produce power, so if they are covered in snow, they will not generate electricity. Even if they are tilted at an angle, snow will take time to slide off and this will dramatically hinder the generation of electricity.

3.8-1; Construction noise. Daily construction times over a 4-year period will dramatically impact the comfort and living conditions for the local community. You state by limiting construction times (to those above) will comply with TRPA required conditions and therefore, existing sensitive receptors would not be substantially affected by construction noise and Project Site D should have less than significant impact related to increases in noise. Are you all mad? Sensitive receptors include, but are not limited to, hospitals, schools, day-care facilities, elderly housing and convalescent facilities. So, this doesn’t even include housing, which is exactly what is present in the Highlands. It is a residential neighbourhood with a school so rest assured, residents will be adversely affected by construction noise.

I64-9

3.8-2; Construction vibration. Once again you fail to mention impact on residential buildings. ‘Less sensitive times of the day’ is cited as a mitigating measure but such a time doesn’t exist in a neighbourhood of full-time residents who live and work at home. Without doubt, construction site vibration will have a tangible negative impact on the neighbourhood quality of life.

Construction vibration can have an adverse effect on homes. Polaris is a populated area and would be very close to vibration sensitive construction site. Construction vibrations are a known nuisance and can damage existing structures, such as homes at Project Site D. The early phase of this construction project will generate vibrations in the near-surface soils, adjacent to homes when;

I64-10

- Site clearing and removal
- Site grading and soil compaction
- Installing deep foundations

Vibrations will travel through the ground and transmit through the foundation to the walls, floor and roof of nearby housing. The first signs of vibration related damage will appear on the interior planes of vertical load bearing walls, as these wall resist the lateral swaying and movement caused by vibrations. Almost all finish materials are rigid and inflexible in nature; examples include cementitious stucco, interior plaster, interior gypsum wallboard, and wall tiles. Damage to rigid finishes would first appear as cracks at the weakest locations in the wall first, which is generally at the corners of window and door openings. The building components can vary from

flexible, such as wood and steel, to rigid, such as masonry and concrete. These components are then typically covered with decorative and cosmetic finishes. Damage resulting from vibrations will affect flexible components at connections, which are the most rigid portions of a flexible assembly. Conversely, damage to rigid components will appear as cracks or postconstruction differential settlement. Rigid components will generally be affected by vibrational forces before flexible components.

So, you should be considering the mitigation measures if this occurs to private homes. As a proactive means to mitigate vibration damage claims, nearby buildings should be inspected prior to and after construction and monitored during construction. A pre-construction survey should document the condition of homes closest to Project Site D and likely to be the most impacted by this.

Can you please confirm that TCPUD will be prepared to a) pay for the pre-construction surveys and b) compensate homeowners in the event of vibration damage to homes?

3.8-3 Operational Event Noise: 55 decibels are the maximum noise level allowance according to your document and in line with Area Plan noise standards. A refrigerator runs at 55 dBA so it is good to see this will be controlled as if a fridge is a comparison, operational noise will be very quiet.

However, seeing the use of amplified sound will be required and as you say, will impact sensitive receptors that must include housing on this list. Amplified sound is defined as not exceeding 71 decibels, which is less than a vacuum cleaner (that is 75 dBA), which I don't believe will be possible. They will no doubt be louder than a vacuum cleaner in order to be heard. Housing DIRECTLY faces Project Site D so will be badly affected all day, every day. This is likely to include into the night with weddings and private events being part of the grandiose plans. This is not acceptable and the suggestion of placing amplified speakers facing away from sensitive land uses (i.e.. Homes on Polaris) **will not** in any way, shape or form mitigate this issue. Sound travels and the fact the structure will be close to homes on Polaris, facing speakers away from homes will not abate noise pollution that adversely affects lives in this populated area.

Noise is one of the most pressing issues in this entire process. Noise pollution seriously affects lives. Exposure to noise can cause high blood pressure, heart disease, sleep disturbances and stress. It can affect all ages groups especially children. Children who are exposed to noise have been found to suffer from stress and other issues such as impairments in memory, attention level and reading skill. It also impacts the health and wellbeing of wildlife. Animals use sound for a number of reasons, including to navigate, find food, attract mates and avoid predators. Constant noise pollution makes it difficult for them to accomplish these tasks, which ultimately affects their ability to survive.

The pleasure of XC skiing is peace & quiet and the great outdoors with no lifts required and minimal impact on the environment. You need a pair of ski boots, poles

I64-10
cont.

I64-11

and boots and of course snow. Yet everything you are proposing for Site D does exactly the opposite and negates the very essence of the spirit of the sport.

I64-11
cont.

Operational needs; I can't see a direct section relating to this, but we wanted to highlight the fact the lower elevation of existing Site A versus Project Site D Polaris is 76ft. The argument that flatter terrain to start your Cross Country exercise is ludicrous as XC skiing is all about exercise and it could be argued that the higher elevation is much more exposed to sunshine therefore snow quality is likely to be diminished.

I64-12

Global warming is driving significant changes in our winters and with continued greenhouse gas emissions, temperatures are set to increase. The consideration of Site D as an alternative to Site A could be very short lived with the impact of climate change that is happening now. You would need to consider a site of approximately 8000' in order to maximise usage for the next 20-30 years.

I64-13

What is not mentioned in the document but is concerning;

- Private events

How can you credibly apply terms such as 'adaptive reuse' and 'community uses' to a project that significantly modifies an historic structure? These terms also concern a neighbourhood that need clarification of the word 'use' as private events such as weddings will further disrupt the lives of locals.

The primary concerns being:

- Noise
- Traffic flow
- Parking
- Debris left from outdoor events
- Alcohol

I64-14

As we said many years ago, the Lodge should stick to being a sports facility that includes Cross Country skiing in the winter and mountain biking in the summer. No more and no less. The Tahoe basin has sufficient venues to serve wedding needs so the notion of being all things for everyone is simply not relevant. Post COVID-19 all local and existing wedding venue businesses will need all the help they can get, and this lodge idea will only take away busines from them.

Private events create significant issues that need not be present, such as additional space and facilities that you simply don't have without major disruption. Also, no need for gyms, storage facilities (as everyone arrives and departs in a car so they can store their own kit at home) and so the list goes on. The original size of the Lodge has spiralled out of control due to the inappropriate and elaborate ideas from those involved. Stick to your core business and don't think it is easy to operate and be successful operating commercial off shoots.

- Alcohol

I64-15

Not mentioned in this document and it should be. The concerns =

- The sale of alcohol near the school.
- The sale of alcohol at private events

We believe the law states no distilled spirits can be sold within 200 yards of any school and 100 yards for wine. Project Site D has got to be close to the 200-yard law but even if it isn't, this proximity is concerning.

Alcohol creates a chain reaction of associated issues, i.e. drink driving, violence, drug abuse, sexual promiscuity, smoking and fire risk.

Site D (Polaris) is an un-lit street with no sidewalks so add alcohol to this (and the list of associated issues above) and you have a potentially fatal situation. The danger is real. Will the TCPUD be responsible for any accidents (fatal or not) caused by the re-location of this lodge to Site D?

- Impact on house prices

Not mentioned in the DEIR report. There is a possibility the re-location of the Lodge to Site D will have a negative impact to the surrounding homes and their values. In the case of this happening, are the TCPUD offering indemnity to those affected?

- Cost & financial control

If we understand correctly the land is owned by the TCPUD and you would rent it to the TCCSEA. Who therefore would have primary control over event bookings? We are guessing the TCCSEA as they have carte blanche to generate as much income as possible. If this is the case, can you publish strict guidelines as to what is permitted? The DEIR states ; provide opportunities for additional special events, community events, and private events. This needs defining.

How would putting a privately-owned facility on publicly owned land preserve the financial responsibility and transparency of TCPUD's property tax funds? Could you answer that please.

In summary:

This has already taken 6 years and it is laughable. We are in favour of no project and the return of this Lodge to the donor.

The disruption and expense to gain 76ft and a few extra parking spaces is preposterous. Go outside and measure 76ft.

With COVID affecting all our lives, the impact of which will be felt for many years to come, you can expect reduced revenue for the existing TXC operation. Rumour has it that Squaw are considering moth-balling this winter, which will invariably impact the local community/employment/loss of business/potential failure of local businesses and have dire consequences. Now is not the time to be ploughing public funds in to an floundering sector.

There is no mention of snow making plans. Climate change is a known threat and Tahoe have suffered poor winters over the years so having a provision for snow

I64-15 cont.

I64-16

I64-17

I64-18

I64-19

making facilities is essential for any ski operation. Money would be better spent investing in this rather than focusing on the Schilling Lodge.

Thank you for your time reading this.

Debbie White & Paul Niwano

I64-19
cont.

Letter I64 Debbie White and Paul Niwano

July 23, 2020

Response I64-1

The comment expresses opposition to the proposed Project. The comment also notes that the Draft EIR does not appear to include an alternative that would construct the Schilling Lodge at Site A with minimal modifications. In Chapter 4, "Alternatives," the Draft EIR considered two alternatives that would include minimal modifications to the historic building at Site A: (1) Site A – Reduced Project alternative that is described on page 4-3 of the Draft EIR, and (2) Site A – Modified Project alternative that is described on pages 4-10 through 4-14 of the Draft EIR. See response to comment I10-16, which addresses consideration of other alternatives and provides reasons why smaller Lodge alternatives were dismissed from further consideration or were not selected over the proposed Project. 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 I64-2

The comment states that mitigation for tree removal for the proposed Project (Mitigation Measure 3.3-2) could include realignment and reconfiguration of parking and a reduction in parking requirements, which would negate one of the main criteria for a new site; and that effects of tree removal on habitat, wildlife, and plants would not be worth the cost. The potential options for minimizing tree removal referenced in the comment apply to both the proposed Project and Alternative A. As described in Mitigation Measure 3.3-2 beginning on page 3.3-20 of the Draft EIR, the Project (either the proposed Project or Alternative A) will avoid and minimize the removal of trees, especially those larger than 30 inches diameter at breast height (dbh). This avoidance and minimization will be achieved through Project design to the greatest extent feasible and during the TRPA permitting process. The options of realigning and reconfiguring parking, and reducing parking requirements, are provided as examples of some of the design features or modifications that could be implemented to protect large trees and that are typically considered during the TRPA permitting process for projects. The comment offers no specific information or evidence that the analysis presented in the EIR is inadequate; therefore, no further response can be provided.

Response I64-3

The comment questions the conclusion that the proposed Project (Site D) would not alter travel patterns or increase traffic volumes to the extent that the capacity of a residential roadway would be exceeded.

The comment provides no evidence to support the claim that the Project would result in the exceedance of the 2,500 vehicles per day threshold for residential streets and cause an exceedance of roadway capacity. Additionally, the remainder of the comment does not raise any CEQA issues or address the adequacy of the Draft EIR analysis. 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 I64-4

The comment indicates that parking has been one of the stated reasons for moving Tahoe XC from Site A to Site D, provides parking comparisons between the two locations, and expresses an opinion opposing Site D.

As described in comment O1-3, a detailed analysis of parking supply and demand is contained within Section 6, "Parking Analysis," of Append D in the Draft EIR. The aforementioned parking analysis evaluates the current demand of the Existing Lodge and determines the capacity needed at the proposed Project. In evaluating the parking needs of a specific site, it is usually desirable to use data collected at that site, if available. This is supported by ITE in their Parking Generation manual, which states that a survey of a site in a comparable local condition should always be considered as one potential means to estimate parking demand. Consistent with the Area Plan Implementing Regulations the parking analysis would be submitted for TRPA and County approval during the development review process. This comment does not raise environmental issues or concerns regarding the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the parking analysis within Draft EIR. 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 I64-5

The comment states that it is impossible for Polaris Road to support lane closures and detours during construction that are detailed in the Draft EIR.

As detailed in response to comment I35-11, Impact 3.5-5 starting on page 3.5-28 of the Draft EIR addresses potential construction-related traffic impacts resulting from implementation of the Project and includes Mitigation Measure 3.5-5, which requires the applicant to prepare and implement a temporary traffic control plan during construction activities. Impact 3.5-5 starting on page 3.5-28 describes that the duration of construction, number of trucks, truck routing, number of employees, truck idling, lane closures, and a variety of other construction-related activities are unknown at this time. Therefore, it is not known whether the Project would require lane closures and detours. 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 I64-6

The comments states that there is a mitigation measure that includes a shuttle bus program and posits the question of where cars are going to park for a shuttle bus to pick up and drop off. The comment concludes by expressing a lack of understanding as to how this is a feasible solution.

See response to comment A2-6, which describes that the mitigation measure requiring the TDM plan was removed because development of the TDM plan is a required part of the Placer County development review process consistent with Area Plan Policy T-P-12. As detailed in response to comment A2-6, the specific measures and associated details of a TDM plan, such as 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. 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 I64-7

The comment states that there are clear safety risks associated with the increase in traffic generated by the proposed Project that need to be addressed. The comment notes that Polaris Road has no sidewalks and is not lit; and thus, an uptick in traffic volumes will affect pedestrian, resident, and neighborhood safety. The comment concludes that safety has not been specifically addressed in the Draft EIR.

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 I64-8

The comment asks if the 4-year construction period assumed in the GHG analysis, and associated impacts, would actually occur and states that Section 3.8, "Noise," assumes that construction would occur daily from 8:00 a.m. to 6:30 p.m. See response to comment I41-41, which explains that the estimated construction schedule has been reduced from 4 years to 2 years.

The comment also raises concerns with the recommendation to install rooftop solar photovoltaic (PV) panels included in Mitigation Measure 3.7-1. The language of Mitigation Measure 3.7-1 provides flexibility to the Project applicant by providing several onsite GHG-reducing recommendations to lower Project-generated emissions to zero. The applicant may use PVs to reduce emissions; however, if PVs are found to be infeasible, the applicant may implement other mitigation tools to achieve zero net emissions. No edits to the Draft EIR are required in response to this comment. The comment is noted for consideration by the TCPUD Board during the review of the merits of the Project.

Response I64-9

The comment states that daily construction over several years would impact living conditions for the community and that the analysis did not include residents in the definition of sensitive receptors. As described on page 2-22 of the Draft EIR and updated in Chapter 2 of this Final EIR, construction is anticipated to begin in 2022 and end in 2024. Second, sensitive receptors are defined generally on page 3.8-10 in Section 3.8, "Noise," of the Draft EIR as land uses where noise exposure could result in health-related risks to individuals and specifically includes residences. Further, the Draft EIR identified residences that would be closest to the proposed construction activities for purposes of conducting a worst-case noise analysis, as described under Impact 3.8-1 of Section 3.8, "Noise," of the Draft EIR.

Regarding noise impacts, negative health effects tend to occur when people are continually affected by intrusive noise during sensitive times (e.g., sleep). For this reason, TRPA and Placer County have adopted ordinances that allow construction noise during the less sensitive times of the day. This is because construction noise, while occurring with other typical daytime noise-generating activities (e.g., vehicular traffic, music, ambulance sirens), does not stand out on its own as a substantial noise source, especially at increasing distances from the source. It is also important to note that the analysis in the Draft EIR was conservative and based on worst-case noise levels for the loudest phase of construction. Typical construction noise fluctuates during the day over different locations and over the duration of the entire phase, not resulting in the same level of noise exposure at the same receptor for extended periods. As discussed under Impact 3.8-1 beginning on page 3.8-14 of the Draft EIR, due to the temporary nature of construction activity and that construction would comply with daytime noise limits, construction noise would not result in adverse health impacts at nearby receptors. No further analysis is needed.

Response I64-10

The comment states that the vibration analysis failed to mention impacts to residential buildings, including potential damage to structures, and that pre-construction surveys should be conducted as well as compensation for damage should be provided. Impact 3.8-2 beginning on page 3.8-16 in Section 3.8, "Noise," of the Draft EIR evaluated the potential for construction vibration to result in human disturbance as well as damage to existing structures. As discussed on pages 3.8-16 and 3.8-17 of the Draft EIR, anticipated construction activities would not be located within distances where vibration has the potential to result in building damage. Therefore, impacts to existing structures were deemed less than significant. Because impacts would be less than significant, no additional mitigation such as a pre-construction survey or indemnification plan is required. Further, the comment does not provide any evidence that the vibration impact analysis presented in the EIR is inadequate; therefore, no further analysis is required.

Response I64-11

The comment states that the mitigation proposed to reduce impacts from amplified sound will not be adequate and that the new noise sources will adversely affect residents in the area. First, noise standards are set by regulatory agencies to preserve the nature of a community or neighborhood and intended to protect the health and safety of the community. Thus, new noise sources that are kept to below the applicable noise standards would not pose health or safety concerns. As required by Mitigation Measure 3.8-3 beginning on page 3.8-18 in Section 3.8, "Noise," in the Draft EIR, amplified sound sources would be required to be designed to minimize noise exposure through the use of intervening buildings and speaker location. Further, the mitigation measure requires that any proposed amplified sound source also be measured and shown to comply with Placer County noise standards prior to Project approval. Thus, the requirements in Mitigation Measure 3.8-3 ensure that any new noise source would not exceed Placer County noise standards and thus would not result in excessive noise levels at nearby receptors such that adverse health effects would occur. No further analysis is necessary.

Response I64-12

The comment notes that the proposed Project site is 76 feet higher in elevation than Site A and disagrees with the need to locate the Lodge near flat terrain. The comment also asserts that the higher elevation is more exposed to sunshine and, thus, snow quality would be diminished. See response to comment I35-5 that addresses criticisms of the proposed Project at the proposed location related to the increase in elevation compared to the site of the Existing Lodge. Response to comment I35-5 also addresses the benefit associated with the proximity to user-friendly terrain at the proposed Project site. The comment's opinion does not raise environmental issues or concerns regarding 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 I64-13

The comment states that global warming is driving significant changes in our winters and the benefits of Site D as an alternative to Site A could be short lived in light of the effects of climate change. The comment asserts a site at 8,000 feet elevation would need to be considered to maximize use in the long term. See response to comment I50-6, which addresses concerns related to the effects of climate change on the Project. 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 I64-14

The comment takes issue with use of the terms "adaptive reuse" and "community uses" to describe the proposed modifications to a historic structure. The comment expresses concern related to private events, such as weddings, which cause concerns related to noise, traffic flow, parking, debris, and alcohol use. The comment also disagrees with the need for gyms and storage facilities.

Regarding the potential for weddings to be hosted at the Schilling Lodge, page 2-14 under "Premier Events and Large Special Events," in Chapter 2, "Description of the Proposed Project and Alternatives Evaluated in Detail," states:

As part of the TCCSEA Management Plan, TCCSEA does not intend to host weddings. However, TCPUD and/or TCCSEA could decide, at a future date, that weddings are appropriate to either supplement revenue or for other reasons. For the purposes of this EIR, private weddings are considered a Large Special Event and were included in the Large Special Events analysis and would not be considered an addition to those events.

Table 2-3 on page 2-13 and the "Special Events" section on pages 2-14 and 2-15 of the Draft EIR identify the assumptions related to special events that are considered in the impact analysis in the Draft EIR. The potential concerns related to noise, traffic, and parking from events that may be held at the Schilling Lodge are addressed in Section 3.5, "Transportation," and Section 3.8, "Noise," in the Draft EIR. See response to comment I10-3, which explains "adaptive reuse" of the Schilling residence. See response to comment I10-4, which explains how the Schilling Lodge would serve community uses. The comment is noted for consideration by the TCPUD Board during the review of the merits of the Project.

Response I64-15

The comment expresses concern with the sale of alcohol near the school and at private events. The comment summarizes their understanding of the sale of distilled spirits and wine near a school and states that Site D is likely within a distance from the school that would prohibit the sale of alcohol. The comment expresses concern about secondary effects of alcohol use. The comment asks if TCPUD would be responsible for any accidents caused by the relocation of the Lodge to Site D.

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. Enforcement of laws related to the sale or provision of alcohol is not a topic subject to CEQA review. 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 I64-16

The comment states that the impact on house prices is not mentioned in the Draft EIR and asserts that relocation of the Lodge would have a negative impact on the surrounding homes and their values, and asks if TCPUD is offering indemnity to those affected. The comment provides no specific evidence to suggest that the proposed Project would result in a decrease in home values. The comment's concern related to adverse effects on the value of home values does not raise environmental issues or concerns regarding 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 I64-17

The comment asks which entity would have control over event bookings. The comment requests an explanation of how the Project would preserve the financial responsibility and transparency of TCPUD's property tax funds.

See response to comment I10-2, which discusses TCCSEA would have primary control over booking events at the Schilling Lodge and TCPUD would have primary control over booking events at the Highlands Community Center. See response to comment I41-8, which addresses concerns related to financial aspects of the Project. The comment expressed is not related to a topic that requires analysis in the EIR under CEQA.

Response I64-18

The comment notes the 6-year timeframe that has occurred thus far, expresses opposition to the Project, disagrees with the benefit associated with moving the Lodge to a higher elevation and additional parking. The comment notes the potential effect COVID has and believes there would be reduced revenue for Tahoe XC. The financial aspect of the Project is not a topic that requires analysis in the EIR under CEQA. The comment does not raise any issues related to CEQA or 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 I64-19

The comment notes that there is no mention of snowmaking plans, climate change is a known threat, and Tahoe has suffered poor winters over the years. The comment believes money would be better spent investing in snowmaking rather than on the Schilling Lodge. See response to comment I50-6, which addresses concerns related to the effects of climate change on the Project. 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.