

From: [Darlene Boggeri](#)
To: [Kim Boyd](#)
Subject: Cross country building
Date: Friday, July 24, 2020 4:30:33 AM

Letter I65

Kim

We are very troubled & disappointed with the proposed project.

The very large building & parking lot have no place in a family neighborhood much less next to a school. Fix the exciting building but keep it at a realistic size for the neighborhood

I65-1

Why is bigger always better? Living at Tahoe is about the outdoor living, hiking biking, the animals, not the enormous buildings on PUBLIC LAND

Fires are a real threat in Tahoe. How do you propose the extra vehicles & people evacuate with the one road in & out?

I65-2

Traffic— Old Mill & Polaris are already very busy roads. Children walk to school, locals walk on the roads some with dogs to get to the hiking trails. More cars on the road will create a more dangerous situation

I65-3

Water-all the water that will be needed for this project & use of water after

I65-4

We could go on & on but please listen to the people who actually live here & all the concern & don't proceed with this project. Don't destroy the peace & quiet & create more traffic & fire dangers.

I65-5

Robert & Darlene Boggeri
Sophie & Silvio
Polaris Road

Letter I65 Robert and Darlene Boggeri

July 24, 2020

Response I65-1

The comment expresses opposition to the proposed Project. The comment expresses the opinion that the large building and parking lot do not belong in a neighborhood or next to a school. The comment suggests using the Schilling residence building but keeping it at a realistic size for the 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 is noted for consideration by the TCPUD Board during the review of the merits of the Project.

Response I65-2

The comment notes that fires are a real threat in Tahoe and asks how the extra vehicles and people would evacuate with the one road in and out. The analysis of wildfire effects in the Draft EIR acknowledges that the proposed Project site and the Alternative A site are located within a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone (see pages 3-15 and 3-16 of the Draft EIR). The analysis concludes that implementation of the proposed Project or Alternative A would not exacerbate wildfire risks. The Draft EIR also analyzed potential impacts on emergency response and evacuation and concluded that the Project-generated traffic, including for special events, would be appropriate to the capacity of the facility and therefore would not generate traffic volumes that would physically interfere with implementation of an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan (see page 3-12 of the Draft EIR). Also see response to comment I10-8, which addresses wildfire impacts, and response to comment I10-7, which addresses concerns about impacts on emergency response and evacuation. The comment does not provide specific evidence that vehicle trips generated by the Project would not be able to evacuate in the event of a wildfire and 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 I65-3

The comment contends that Old Mill Road and Polaris Road are already very busy roads and that children walk to school along these roads, and locals walk on the roads, some with dogs, to get to the hiking trails. The comment concludes by expressing their opinion that the addition of more cars on the road would create a more dangerous situation.

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 I65-4

The comment makes a general statement about the water that would be needed for the Project. The Draft EIR analyzes the increase in water demand associated with the proposed Project and Alternative A in Impact 3.11-1 beginning on page 3.11-9 in Section 3.11, "Utilities," of the Draft EIR. The analysis concludes that there is sufficient water supply to meet the needs of the proposed Project and Alternative A, although some water supply line improvements may be required if Alternative A is implemented. The comment does not provide any specific evidence related to the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR.

Response I65-5

The comment requests that TCPUD listen to the residents' concerns and to not proceed with the Project. The comment expresses concern regarding an increase in traffic and fire dangers. The Draft EIR acknowledges that the Project would increase traffic volumes along roadways in the vicinity of the Project, but would not result in a significant impact related to traffic (see Impacts 3.5-1 and 3.5-2 on pages 3.5-19 through 3.5-22 in Section 3.5, "Transportation," in the Draft EIR). See response to comment I10-8, which addresses concerns related to wildfire. 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.

From: [jackie Clark](#)
To: [Kim Boyd](#)
Subject: Tahoe XC Draft EIR
Date: Friday, July 24, 2020 6:31:21 AM

**Letter
I66**

As an employee of Tahoe Cross Country I have seen first hand the need for a new building. My main job there is teaching, renting skis and waxing and ski repair. There were so many days that we had more people then equipment, there is just not enough space for any more boots or skis. We also always ran out of places to put customers' personal things when they rented equipment , some would take their things back to the car for lack of storage in the shop.

I would wax on a daily basis, at least ten pairs a day. The waxing bench is right where we rent ski so there would be the constant smell of wax for the employees and customers which I'm sure can't be good. We have a ventilation system but it just isn't good enough. There is also lack of storage behind the bench and it is so small that only one person could wax at a time.

Then there were the lessons. If you ever have come to the nordic center you know how steep the first hill is. Trying to teach a beginner on that is really hard. A new building and a new place would give such a great opportunity to have a great impact on a beginner .

The small community of Tahoe Cross Country could provide a huge impact, we just need the space to do this. Thank you for listening and I hope you will consider this great opportunity to do so.

Thank you,
Jackie Clark

I66-1

Letter I66 Jackie Clark
July 24, 2020

Response I66-1

The comment includes background about the letter author’s experience working at Tahoe XC and the challenges associated with the Existing Lodge. The comment expresses support for the Project. The comment is noted for consideration by the TCPUD Board during the review of the merits of the Project.

From: [Meghan Robins](#)
To: [Kim Boyd](#)
Subject: Tahoe XC Draft EIR
Date: Friday, July 24, 2020 10:44:14 AM

Letter I67

Dear TCPUD,

As a former North Tahoe Middle and High School Nordic skier (class of 2004), I want to comment about the convenience of having Tahoe XC trails out the backdoor of NTHS. Regarding the Draft EIR put out by TCPUD, I think this convenience for students (and parents) is an important consideration specifically for the Transportation section of the Draft EIR. If the Tahoe XC lodge moves to a site closer to NTHS, it will improve accessibility to middle and high school skiers and parents in these ways:

1. **Easier transition from school day to practice.** In my day, Nordic ski team athletes stored our skis and backpacks in our cars or the broken-down ski shed by the bus garage. If you did not have a car, you risked getting your school work and street clothes locked in the high school locker rooms. This happened on more than one occasion. Most of us stored our gear in our cars, if we could. Or friends cars, if that was an option. Otherwise, we rushed back from practice to beat the janitor from locking us out. If the Tahoe XC lodge were closer to the high school, NT Nordic skiers could rely on the lodge's new team locker rooms to store their valuable ski gear, band instruments, and backpacks. And Tahoe XC would be more attuned to the needs of young Nordic athletes.

2. **Bolster Team Pride.** If NT ski teams had convenient access to Tahoe XC's waxing benches (and staff expertise), this proximity would probably bolster the point of pride for NT Nordic ski athletes. We "Nordic nerds" were often forgotten about (out of sight out of mind) by the rest of the school because we're always out on the trails and behind the bus garage. To have a fully established lodge serve as middle and high school team support would show these athletes that Nordic skiing is a serious and well-respected sport and that there is a massive community that encourages and embraces this world of athletics.

3. **One collection point for kids & parents.** I assume that the NT middle and high school teams still start and finish practice at the high school parking lot (by the bus garage), so I assume parents picking up middle school kids are already driving on Polaris. Parents who have kids on the middle school team and in youth programs like Strider Gliders, however, are still having to drive to the middle school, where their kids' school packs and street clothes are, then back to Tahoe XC, where Strider Gliders starts and ends. It would be interesting to know how much traffic occurs specifically between NTHS and Tahoe XC just by parents driving back and forth, back and forth. I do not believe your traffic study does, or could, reasonably measure that specific of a stat. I didn't read one, but maybe I missed it. My suspicion is that some parents are driving laps between NTHS and Tahoe XC, if their kids are in both programs. It is unreasonable to ask a middle schooler to end their practice at Tahoe XC because they need to collect their school belongings back at the middle school. Additionally, now that North Tahoe School serves 5th graders, some of those kids are in Strider Gliders and have to figure out how to get themselves to Tahoe XC and back, while dealing with their school backpacks and ski gear (likely relying on parent transportation). This transportation detail would be solved for parents and kids if the school and lodge were located in close proximity. To that end, I also suggest a walking pack (paved and plowed?!) between the new lodge and the bus garage, because that's the natural cut through kids will take.

I67-1

I hope you find my comments helpful. As a former Strider Glider, former NT school Nordic ski athlete, and current user of Tahoe XC's trails, I fully support the Schilling Lodge Project and believe that the entire community will benefit in great and unexpected ways from this expansion.

I67-1
cont.

Thank you for taking my comments,
Meghan Robins

Letter I67 Meghan Robins
July 24, 2020

Response I67-1

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

July 23, 2020
Tahoe City PUD

**Letter
I68**

Ms. Kim Boyd,

As a resident of the Tahoe/Truckee area since 1971, I have skied at Tahoe XC since the early Skip Reedy days in the late 1970's. In between then and now I developed and served as supervisor for the Diamond Peak XC center on the Mt Rose Hwy for IVGID in the 1990's. Although I reside in Truckee and have had season passes at Tahoe Donner XC for numerous years, the potential for seeing an upgrade for the Tahoe City XC community as identified in Site D - Full Project in the draft EIR is exciting.

Based on my previous experience running a cross country ski facility, my comments are more operations oriented. The steep terrain directly out of the current location makes it difficult for beginner skiers and others to begin their skiing experience. Ski lessons are also made more difficult without level terrain to teach resulting in less successful experiences for first time or novice skiers. Safety may also be a concern here where beginner skiers have difficulty taking on steeper terrain (and possibly icy conditions) at the end of their day getting back to the lodge. My experience at the Diamond Peak XC was a similar situation with steep terrain at the base lodge. Everything was more difficult, from operations to achieving user satisfaction. The Site D project location would solve these problems.

As the Tahoe area experiences more frequent years of marginal snow quantity, I believe the higher elevation of this site could be important in maintaining operations and keeping the trails open. It can be costly and time consuming if you need to "farm" snow near base lodge areas with low snow levels so skiers can access trails. Operating at the higher elevation may reduce the frequency or eliminate the need to move snow to maintain operations.

Sufficient parking at the facility and traffic flow on nearby roads are important aspects to consider. The Site D project will have 100 parking spaces and according to information on the Executive Summary (EIS), this falls within acceptable parameters for normal operations and also peak days. Also in the Executive Summary is information on traffic volumes and it appears that the use falls within Placer County standards for residential roadways. No mitigation is required for either parking or traffic volumes.

In my opinion, the Schilling building, modified for use as the facility/lodge is a wonderful choice. The historical significance of the building will add character and local culture to the visitor experience. The Schilling building would allow for larger spaces so that facility operations (skiing and mountain biking) can be more efficient and also provide an appropriate atmosphere for community gatherings/meetings.

Greg Mihevc
Truckee, CA

I68-1

Letter I68 Greg Mihevc
July 24, 2020

Response I68-1

The comment includes background information about the letter author's experience with cross-country skiing, 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: [Jennifer Lees](#)
To: [Kim Boyd](#)
Subject: We support the Tahoe Cross-Country Lodge Replacement Project
Date: Friday, July 24, 2020 11:24:31 AM

Letter I69

Hi Kim,

Thank you for your work on this project. My husband and I support the Tahoe Cross-Country Lodge Replacement Project, as proposed. The proposed location is perfect for our community as there is ample parking and open space to support it. There is not enough safe parking at the current location. It is scary when you end up out on the street with a Chariot, two kids, skis, and boots slipping around. Perhaps someday a second exit road through the edge of Burton Creek could provide fire emergency and traffic alleviation, but we cannot miss the opportunity for a world-class rated winter facility in a great location with a beautiful historic lodge.

I69-1

Thank you again,

Jennifer & Dan Stoll

Letter I69 Jennifer and Dan Stoll

July 24, 2020

Response I69-1

The comment 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: [Will Stelter](#)
To: [Kim Boyd](#)
Subject: Tahoe XC Draft EIR
Date: Friday, July 24, 2020 12:57:03 PM

**Letter
I70**

Hello Kim,

I'm sorry I'm on the last day here, I hope I'm not too late. Please confirm receipt and likewise if the below comment is within the comment period.

Comment per below:

I'd like to thank Tahoe XC and TCPUD for preparing a thorough document. It is nice to see such a well thought out analysis and review of options, all with the goal of addressing existing operational deficiencies and enhancing the Cross Country center. As a winter time destination area, together with North Tahoe's desire to promote snow sports and provide options for locals and visitors alike, this proposed project is a positive step toward showcasing North Tahoe as the world class area for outdoor recreation we all know it is. Likewise it is nice to see mitigation of impacts to a less than significant level. Impacts aside, a simple review of Google Earth with the adjacent school, track, multiple fields, etc. makes site D the most desirable from a common sense perspective. A great yin yang relative to shared parking, school athletic programs, etc.

I70-1

Thank you for a great project.

Will S.

Letter I70 Will Stelter
 July 24, 2020

Response I70-1

The comment expresses support for Site D for the proposed Project and 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.

Jeffery Harris
P.O. Box 5742 (Polaris Road)
Tahoe City, CA 96145
JDH@Eslawfirm.com

Letter
171

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

Re: **Tahoe XC Draft EIR**

Dear Ms. Boyd and Board of Directors:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment. I support this Project and have no strong preference as between the possible Sites. My comments are focused mainly on cumulative impacts, traffic, parking, and enforcement measures to preserve the quality of life and avoid significant impacts on Highlands' residents.

I71-1

1) **The Project Should Discuss The Potential Cumulative Impacts Associated With The Proposed Dollar Creek Crossing Project On The Former Nahas Property.**

While the DEIR mentions the Dollar Creek project, the potential cumulative impacts of the proposed Project with the reasonably foreseeable Dollar Creek Project should be discussed in separate sections in each of the twelve (12) environmental disciplines in Sections 3.1-3.12 of the Final EIR.

I71-2

Although several sections discussed the potential combined effects of these two major projects in the Highlands, the potential cumulative impacts should be discussed in each Subsection of Section 3, *Environmental Setting, Environmental Impacts, And Mitigation Measures*. A separate subject heading in each of these twelve Subsections of Section 3 of the FEIR will ensure that the FEIR adequately considers the potential for cumulative effects.

2) **The Traffic Analyses Should Be Updated To Consider Potential Cumulative Impacts Associated With Connection With The Reasonably Foreseeable Dollar Creek Crossing Project.**

To satisfy the Project Objective to “[c]onstruct a new lodge that minimizes effects on the neighborhood,” the traffic impacts should consider the combined effects of the Project with Dollar Creek Crossing.

I71-3

In particular, the traffic analyses should assume two separate scenarios. First, the analyses should assume that the Dollar Creek Crossing has no traffic connections to Village

{00522712;2}

Road or the Highlands. It is logical to assume that if the traffic from Dollar Crossing is not allowed to bleed into the Highlands through connection, the cumulative traffic impacts on the Highlands may not be significant. Second, the traffic analyses should also analyze a worst case scenario where the Dollar Crossing Project is connected to Village Drive or otherwise connected to the Highlands, allowing the traffic impacts from both projects to combine into significant effects.

I71-3
cont.

Since Dollar Creek Crossing has not committed to a traffic and circulation plan, both scenarios (connection of Dollar Creek to the Highlands and no connection) are reasonably foreseeable and must be studied.

3) **New Traffic Count Surveys Should Be Performed to Account For the Greater Use of the Polaris to Village to Fabian Route Used During the School Year and Peak Winter Months.**

Both analyses discussed in Comment 2 above, should take into consideration the greater use of Polaris Road compared to Old Mill Road. During the school year, the High School and Middle School traffic predominately uses Polaris Road as do the buses, garbage and recycling services, and other vehicles to support the High school and the Middle School. During Winter months, more traffic uses Polaris to avoid the steeper grade of Old Mill. The Polaris to Village to Fabian route’s heavier flow results in greater impacts at the intersection of Fabian and Highway 28.

I71-4

During school hours and during Winter months, it can be nearly impossible to make a left turn onto Highway 28 from Fabian. This existing, baseline condition of a lack of safe access and egress at Highway 28 and Fabian is especially true when snow and ice combine with heavy ski-related traffic headed toward the West Shore resorts, Alpine Meadows, and Squaw Valley. With the hundreds of new vehicle associated with the Dollar Creek Crossing project, these already unsafe conditions will be further exacerbated.

The analysis of this existing propensity for greater use of Polaris Road to Village to Fabian should be supported by more recent traffic count studies to ensure accuracy. New traffic counts on all routes should be performed to establish an accurate baseline (adjusted to recognize that COVID-19 has suppressed traffic in the vicinity).

4) **To Mitigate Impacts On Highland Residents, The Project Should Continue the Current Practice of Imposing Non-Resident Parking Restrictions In The Highlands and Requiring Resident Parking Stickers.**

To prevent the significant effects of overflow parking impacts to Highlands’ residents, the project should require as a mitigation measure resident parking stickers. There are already parking restrictions with the existing Tahoe XC lodge, prohibiting parking on one side of the street and prohibiting certain seasonal parking. Similar restrictions commensurate with the existing parking prohibitions and limitations should be imposed to make enforceable the

I71-5

{00522712;2}

mitigation measures to prevent overflow parking from creating a significant adverse effect in the Highlands.

I71-5
cont.

5) To Ensure Public Safety, The Project Should Include Sidewalks, Curbs And Gutters In The Vicinity Of The Lodge.

To ensure the safety of the users of the TXC lodge and the residence of the Highlands, the project should include curbs, sidewalks and gutters in the vicinity of the Project’s Lodge. It is clear that there will be times when users of these important recreational facilities may have to carry their gear and belongings some distance. This will be particularly true if the Lodge is served with local transit (bus stops). Sidewalks, curbs, and gutters in the vicinity of the Lodge will ensure public safety during peak use periods (weekends and Holidays).

I71-6

Thank you for your hard work on this important project.

Sincerely,



Jeffery D. Harris

{00522712;2}

Letter I71 Jeffery D. Harris

July 24, 2020

Response I71-1

The comment provides an introduction to letter, stating the comments focus on cumulative impact, traffic, parking, and enforcement measures to preserve the quality of life and avoid significant impacts on residents of the Highlands neighborhood. The comment also expresses support for the Project. The comment is noted for consideration by the TCPUD Board during the review of the merits of the Project.

Response I71-2

The comment suggests that the cumulative impact analysis of the Dollar Creek Crossing project should be discussed in a separate subheader in each of the resource topic sections of the Draft EIR.

As stated on page 3-4 under the "Project List" header in Section 3.1.5, "Cumulative Setting:"

Probable future projects considered in the cumulative analysis meet the criteria described above: they are in the proposed Project vicinity and have the possibility of interacting with the Project or Alternative A to generate a cumulative impact (Table 3.1-2 and Figure 3.1-1). This list of projects was considered in the development and analysis of the cumulative settings and impacts for most resource topics within the geographic scope of each resource topic (as listed in Table 3.1-1).

As noted on page 3-3 in the Draft EIR regarding the geographic scope within which it would be feasible for the Project and a cumulative project to combine to result in a cumulative impact:

The geographic area that could be affected by the Project varies depending on the environmental resource topic. When the effects of the Project are considered in combination with those of other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects to identify cumulative impacts, the specific projects considered may also vary depending on the type of environmental effects being assessed.

Table 3.1-1 on page 3-4 of the Draft EIR describes the geographic scope of the analysis for each resource area. For example, the geographic scope of the analysis for air quality consists of the Tahoe region for regional air pollutants, and the Project vicinity for air pollutants with localized effects.

The Draft EIR includes a list of the projects considered for purposes of assessing cumulative effects. This list appears in Table 3.1-2 on page 3-5. The table includes the proposed Dollar Creek Crossing project, which is identified as in preliminary planning stages.

The Dollar Creek Crossing project is proposed to be located at the northeast corner of the intersection of SR 28 and Fabian Way. This site is located approximately 0.5 mile south of the Alternative A site, and approximately 1 mile southeast of the proposed Project site. As of preparation of this Final EIR, this cumulative project is still under development and options presented to the public have been revised throughout the public outreach process. Several development options are under consideration. At the time of preparation of the Draft EIR, the estimate of residential units was developed based on what would be allowable for the site under the Area Plan (up to an estimated 214 residential units). As of January 2020, three options were presented with residential units ranging from 174 to 204 residential units (Placer County 2020). These plans are preliminary. The environmental review process for this proposal has not commenced. To provide the current understanding of the Dollar Creek Crossing project and clarify the cumulative impacts between this project and the proposed Project, the description of the Dollar Creek Crossing project is updated below and in Chapter 2, "Revisions to the Draft EIR," in this Final EIR. The clarification presents the range of potential residential units that are less than and not substantially different than initially identified in the description of this cumulative project; thus, the clarification does not alter the conclusions with respect to the significance of any environmental impact.

The description of the Dollar Creek Crossing project in the third column of the ninth row in Table 3.1-2 on page 3-5 in the Draft EIR is revised as follows:

Placer County is in the preliminary planning stages with a developer for an affordable housing project at this site. Because of the nature of the project in its early planning stages, a preliminary estimate of the number of multi-family residential units that would be allowed for these parcels was calculated using the density limits in the Area Plan and the parcel area; it is estimated that the development could include up to 214 residential units that would primarily be multi-family units with a few single-family units. This estimate does not account for site constraints or other considerations that could ultimately reduce the number of residential units. Additionally, it is possible that, once submitted, the project application would propose a mix of multi-family and single-family residential units and community space commercial. As of January 2020, the low end estimate of residential units is 174 and the upper limit estimate is 204. Two of the options propose access to the site from SR 28 and Fabian Way. One option proposes access to the site from SR 28, Fabian Way, and Village Road. At this time, it is assumed that vehicle access to the project site would be provided on Fabian Way and State Route (SR) 28.

Additionally, to provide consistency throughout the Draft EIR, the description of the Dollar Creek Crossing project in Section 3.5, "Transportation," is updated below and in Chapter 2, "Revisions to the Draft EIR," in this Final EIR. The clarification presents the range of potential residential units that are not substantially different than initially identified in the description of this cumulative project; thus, the clarification does not alter the conclusions with respect to the significance of any environmental impact.

The description of the Dollar Creek Crossing project in the third bullet starting on page 3.5-31 of the Draft EIR is revised as follows:

- ▶ The potential Dollar Creek Crossing project is located in the northeast corner of the SR 28/Fabian Way intersection. As this project is in the early planning stages, the specific details regarding the proposed land uses and site access were not available at the time of completion of the traffic modeling. Thus, a preliminary estimate of 169 new multi-family residential units was assumed to be constructed, with 50 percent of the vehicle trips to and from the site accessing the property via a driveway on SR 28 and the other 50 percent assumed to access the site via a potential new driveway on Fabian Way. Standard Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) trip generation rates were used to estimate the trip generation for the 169 units. As of May 2019, the Dollar Creek Crossing project proponents indicated that the project could include up to 214 residential units, which would almost entirely be multi-family residential units and a few single-family residential units. As of January 2020, the low end estimate of residential units is 174 and the upper limit estimate is 204. The difference between the modeled number of residential units and the most recent available greater number of residential units presented in May 2019 and January 2020, is are not anticipated to result in a substantial change in the cumulative traffic analysis such that there would be a change in the impact conclusions discussed below.

The cumulative impact analysis in each of the resource topic sections of the Draft EIR considered the potential cumulative impacts between the proposed Project and cumulative projects that would have impacts that could cumulatively combine with the proposed Project to result in a potentially significant cumulative impact. Whether such cumulative effects may occur depends on the resource area being discussed. The potential for cumulative impacts from the Dollar Creek Crossing to occur are specifically described in relation to traffic (see pages 3.5-31 and 3.5-32 of the Draft EIR), utilities (see pages 3.11-18 and 3.11-19), and energy use (see page 3.12-9). Traffic and utilities are the two areas in which the proposed Project and the Dollar Creek Crossing project have the potential to result in cumulative environmental effects. The Dollar Creek Crossing project will be required to undergo its own environmental review and will be required, if feasible, to minimize any potentially significant impacts to a less-than-significant level.

In response to the comment, to clarify the potential cumulative impacts that could occur from implementation of the Project and the Dollar Creek Crossing project, the cumulative analyses in Section 3.3, "Biological Resources;" Section 3.4, "Archaeological, Historical, and Tribal Cultural Resources;" Section 3.6, "Air Quality;" Section 3.7, "Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change;" Section 3.8, "Noise;" Section 3.9, "Geology, Soils, Land Capability, and Coverage;" and Section 3.10, "Hydrology and Water Quality," are revised below and in Chapter 2, "Revisions to

the Draft EIR," of this Final EIR. As described in the revisions below, these clarifications do not alter the conclusions with respect to the significance of any environmental impact.

The following edits are made to the biological resources cumulative impact analysis on pages 3.3-26 and 3.3-27 in Section 3.3, "Biological Resources," of the Draft EIR:

The primary biological resource issues relevant to cumulative impacts, where the proposed Project or Alternative A have the potential to contribute to impacts generated by other projects, are effects related to special-status plant species (Impact 3.3-1), tree removal (Impact 3.3-2), invasive plant species (Impact 3.3-3), and wildlife movement (Impact 3.3-4). Past projects and activities have resulted in the decline of some native plant populations and rarity of some species, and the introduction and spread of various noxious weeds and other invasive plant species in the Project region, resulting in habitat degradation and other adverse effects on biological resources. The current presence and spread of noxious weeds and invasive species in the Project region, and the decline of some native plant populations and species, are considered significant cumulative impacts. The significance level of existing cumulative effects related to tree removal and wildlife movement generally in the Tahoe region is less clear. Existing and foreseeable future projects have the potential to continue these trends, although current policies, regulations, and programs currently minimize the potential for the further spread of noxious weeds and invasive species and loss of rare or special-status plants. For example, the Dollar Creek Crossing project is proposed on 11.5 acres of undeveloped land near the proposed Project and Alternative A sites. The proposed Dollar Creek Crossing project is located adjacent to residential development, neighborhood roads, and SR 28 and a portion of the site has been previously disturbed. However, the site may provide opportunities for wildlife movement and construction of the project could disturb wildlife movement in the area. While the Dollar Creek Crossing project may result in preserving 60 percent of the site for open space, construction activities would still result in tree removal and have the potential to adversely affect special-status plant species and cause the spread of invasive plant species.

Implementation of either the proposed Project or Alternative A would remove native trees and other vegetation, and could potentially cause disturbance or loss of special-status plants if they are present on the proposed Project site, establishment or spread of invasive plants, and disturbances to wildlife movement. However, natural vegetation types on the proposed Project and Alternative A sites (i.e., Sierran mixed conifer and perennial grassland) are fragmented and highly disturbed; and the quality of habitat for native species is limited by existing disturbances and degradation from residential, recreation, and commercial uses on and near either site; adjacent roads; and associated edge effects. As described in detail for Impacts 3.3-1, 3.3-2, 3.3-3, and 3.3-4, direct or indirect effects on these biological resources as a result of the proposed Project or Alternative A would be relatively minor. Additionally, with implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.3-1, potential disturbances or loss of special-status plants would be avoided, minimized, or compensated for. With implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.3-3, invasive plant management practices would be implemented during Project construction and the inadvertent introduction and spread of invasive from Project construction would be prevented.

The proposed Project or Alternative A, when combined with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, including the Dollar Creek Crossing project, would not substantially affect the distribution, breeding productivity, population viability, or the regional population of any common or special-status species; or cause a change in species diversity locally or regionally. Additionally, Project implementation, would not threaten, regionally eliminate, or contribute to a substantial reduction in the distribution or abundance of any native habitat type in the Tahoe region. Therefore, the Project **would not have a considerable contribution** to any significant cumulative impact related to biological resources.

The fifth paragraph on page 3.4-19 in Section 3.4, "Archaeological, Historical, and Tribal Cultural Resources," is revised as follows:

No known unique archaeological resources, TCRs, or human remains are located within the boundaries of the proposed Project site or Alternative A site; nonetheless, Project-related earth-disturbing activities could damage undiscovered archaeological resources, TCRs, or human remains. Like the proposed Project and

Alternative A and other projects listed in Table 3-1, ground-disturbing activities for the Dollar Creek Crossing project could result in discovery or damage of as-yet undiscovered archaeological resources or uncover or destroy previously unknown archaeological resources with ethnic or cultural values. The proposed Project or Alternative A, in combination with other development in the region, such as the Dollar Creek Crossing project, could contribute to ongoing substantial adverse changes in the significance of unique archaeological resources resulting from urban development and conversion of natural lands. Cumulative development could result in potentially significant archaeological resource impacts.

A new paragraph is added after the first paragraph on page 3.6-19 in Section 3.6, "Air Quality," of the Draft EIR as follows:

The Dollar Creek Crossing project would result in development of up to an estimated 204 residential units that could result in greater construction and operational emissions than the proposed Project or Alternative A and could result in a potentially significant impact on regional air quality. However, the project would be required to reduce significant impacts to the extent feasible and would be required to pay the air quality mitigation fee required by TRPA Code Section 65.2, which would offset the project's contribution to cumulative air quality impacts. Other cumulative projects in Table 3.1-2 would similarly be required to reduce potentially significant air quality impacts, which would reduce contributions to a cumulative air quality impact.

The last paragraph on page 3.7-19 in Section 3.7, "Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change," of the Draft EIR is revised as follows:

As noted previously, climate change is global phenomenon and the result of cumulative emissions of greenhouse gases from emissions sources across the globe. Therefore, climate change impacts, including impacts from cumulative projects such as the Dollar Creek Crossing project, are inherently cumulative in nature and discussed above under Impact 3.7-1.

The discussion of cumulative noise impacts on pages 3.8-21 and 3.8-22 in Section 3.8, "Noise," of the Draft EIR is revised as follows:

Construction Noise and Vibration Levels

Impacts related to short-term ~~p~~Project-related construction noise and vibration levels are localized in nature, based on audibility and distance to sensitive receptors. The proposed Project and Alternative A potential construction noise and vibration impacts are discussed in Impacts 3.8-1 and 3.8-2, above. The construction noise and vibration sources from construction of the proposed Project or Alternative A in conjunction with other cumulative projects, such as the Dollar Creek Crossing project located approximately 1 mile from the proposed Project site and 0.5 mile from the Alternative A site, would not accumulate to cause broader environmental impacts, so by their nature, cumulative impacts would not occur. Therefore, the contribution of construction noise and vibration from the proposed Project or Alternative A **would not be cumulatively considerable.**

Operational Event Noise

Noise generated by outdoor events and gatherings at the Schilling Lodge would primarily influence the immediate ~~p~~Project vicinity, as noise levels would diminish at increasing distances from the source. Further, anticipated noise levels from the events would not exceed applicable standards, and therefore, noise levels at increasing distance from the proposed Project site and Alternative A site would be even lower, thus would not combine with other area sources. Further, events at the Schilling Lodge would be infrequent and temporary and would implement Mitigation Measure 3.8-3 that would require amplified noise at events to meet performance standards to ensure that noise levels would be below Placer County noise standards and reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level. Considering the anticipated low noise volumes described in Impact 3.8-3, above, and the temporary and infrequent nature of the events, noise would not combine with noise sources from cumulative projects, including the Dollar Creek Crossing project located approximately 1 mile from the proposed Project site and 0.5 mile from the Alternative A site, to result in substantial increases in noise. Therefore, the contribution from the proposed Project or Alternative A **would not be cumulatively considerable.**

Operational Traffic Noise

Operation of the project would result in additional traffic on local roads associated with events taking place at the Schilling Lodge as described in Impact 3.8-4, above. In the future cumulative scenario, additional growth and development is anticipated associated with the cumulative projects in Table 3.1-2 that would likely also result in additional traffic on local and regional roadways. However, traffic increases associated with the proposed Project and Alternative A are directly associated with the anticipated size of the events being held at the lodge, which would not change in the cumulative scenario. Visitation at the lodge is and would continue to be driven by the cross-country ski trails, use of the trails in the summer, special and other events at the lodge and would not be driven by the lodge itself. Thus, the traffic analysis assumes a conservative 10 percent increase in the daily visitation at the lodge over existing conditions. Additionally, for the proposed Project, there would be a minor change in travel routes for accessing the Schilling Lodge instead of the Existing Lodge, which would redistribute some of the vehicle trips in the Highlands neighborhood. Thus, similar to the ~~p~~Project-level noise analysis for the proposed Project and Alternative A in Impact 3.8-4, ~~p~~Project-generated traffic increases in the future cumulative scenario would not result in traffic noise that exceeds established local standards and would not be substantial such that when combined with cumulative projects such as the Dollar Creek Crossing project a significant cumulative impact would result. Therefore, the contribution from the proposed Project or Alternative A **would not be cumulatively considerable**.

The second and third paragraphs on page 3.9-15 in Section 3.9, "Geology, Soils, Land Capability, and Coverage," of the Draft EIR are revised as follows:

The proposed Project, Alternative A, and many of the cumulative projects, including the Dollar Creek Crossing project, would create additional land coverage within the cumulative analysis area. However, all projects within the Tahoe Basin would be required to comply with TRPA land coverage regulations. In cases where excess coverage is permitted (such as within Town Centers or for linear public facilities, public health and safety facilities, or water quality control facilities), all coverage exceeding the base allowable would be purchased and transferred from within hydrologically connected areas or retired from sensitive lands. In addition, all land coverage within LCD 1b must be mitigated at a ratio of 1.5 acres of restoration for every 1 acre of disturbance (TRPA Code Section 30.5.3).

The proposed Project, Alternative A, and the cumulative projects, including the Dollar Creek Crossing project, would result in grading and excavation, and soil disturbances that could cause erosion. However, all construction projects in the Tahoe Region must meet requirements and regulations of the TRPA, Lahontan RWQCB, Placer County, and federal, other state, and local agencies. The TRPA Code restricts grading, excavation, and alteration of natural topography (TRPA Code Chapter 33). In addition, all construction projects located in California with greater than one acre of disturbance are required, by Lahontan RWQCB, to submit an NPDES permit which includes the preparation of a SWPPP that includes site-specific construction site monitoring and reporting. Project SWPPPs are required to describe the site, construction activities, proposed erosion and sediment controls, means of waste disposal, maintenance requirements for temporary BMPs, and management controls unrelated to stormwater. Temporary BMPs to prevent erosion and protect water quality would be required during all site development activities, must be consistent with TRPA requirements, and would be required to ensure that runoff quality meets or surpasses TRPA, state, and federal water quality objectives and discharge limits. The Dollar Creek Crossing project would be required to comply with the requirements and regulations of the agencies listed above, including TRPA land coverage regulations, and would be required to prepare and implement a SWPPP. Compliance with these regulations and implementation of BMPs as part of the SWPPP would reduce potential erosion and water quality impacts to a less-than-significant level and the project would not combine with other projects to result in a significant cumulative impact.

The third full paragraph on page 3.10-16 in Section 3.10, "Hydrology and Water Quality," of the Draft EIR is revised as follows:

The proposed Project, Alternative A, and the cumulative projects, including the Dollar Creek Crossing project, through construction-related disturbance and increases in land coverage, have the potential to increase the volume of stormwater runoff, thereby increasing the concentrations of fine sediment particles, nutrients, and other pollutants in the surface and groundwaters of the Lake Tahoe Basin. Improper use of fertilizers and snow storage in unprotected areas or in close proximity to SEZs can also introduce pollutants into surface and groundwaters. These potential effects are controlled through compliance with a suite of protective regulations. Any project exceeding one acre in size, which would include the Dollar Creek Crossing project, is required to develop a SWPPP that identifies water quality controls that are consistent with Lahontan RWQCB and TRPA regulations. The SWPPP must include construction site BMPs, a spill prevention plan, and daily inspection and maintenance of temporary BMPs, and post construction BMPs to protect water quality during the life of the Project. In addition, TRPA requires all projects to include permanent water quality BMPs that control sources of sediment and urban pollutants. Any project with a landscape or vegetation component must develop a fertilizer management plan and snow storage areas must be located away from SEZs and equipped with any necessary BMPs. Additionally, because retrofitting existing development with water quality BMPs has been difficult to enforce, water quality improvements are often seen through new development or redevelopment processes where these BMPs are required as a condition of permit approval. TRPA also requires that each project be designed to infiltrate the 20-year, 1-hour design storm event. In special circumstances where this is not feasible, the Project must provide documentation that its stormwater is fully infiltrated by an offsite facility (TRPA Code Section 60.4). Because of the strong protective water quality regulations within the Tahoe region, the potential effects of the proposed Project, Alternative A, and other cumulative projects, including the Dollar Creek Crossing project, would be reduced such that the proposed Project and Alternative A **would not contribute** to the existing adverse cumulative water quality condition.

Response I71-3

The comment states that to satisfy the Project objective to “[c]onstruct a new lodge that minimizes effects on the neighborhood,” the traffic impacts should consider the combined effects of the Project with the Dollar Creek Crossing project. The comment suggests that the traffic analyses should assume two separate scenarios; the first scenario assuming that the Dollar Creek Crossing has no traffic connections to Village Road or the Highlands neighborhood and the second scenario assuming a worst case scenario where the Dollar Crossing Project is connected to Village Drive or otherwise connected to the Highlands neighborhood, allowing the traffic impacts from both projects to combine into significant effects. The comment states that since Dollar Creek Crossing has not committed to a traffic and circulation plan, both scenarios (connection of Dollar Creek Crossing to the Highlands neighborhood and no connection between the two) are reasonably foreseeable and must be studied.

Information concerning traffic generated by the proposed Dollar Creek Crossing project is provided in Section 3.5, “Transportation,” of the Draft EIR, and in the transportation study included as Appendix D to the Draft EIR. (See pages 22 – 28 in Appendix D of the Draft EIR.)

As detailed on page 3.5-32 under the “Cumulative Impacts” section in Section 3.5, “Transportation,” of the Draft EIR, the Dollar Creek Crossing project was included in the future cumulative background traffic volumes used in the cumulative transportation analysis. Additionally, as detailed on pages 3.5-31 and 3.5-32, because the Dollar Creek Crossing project is in the early planning stages specific details regarding the site access were not available at the time of completion of the traffic modeling; and thus, a preliminary estimate of 169 new multi-family residential units was assumed to be constructed, with 50 percent of the vehicle trips to and from the site accessing the property via a driveway on SR 28 and the other 50 percent assumed to access the site via a potential new driveway on Fabian Way, with no direct connection from the Dollar Creek Crossing project onto Village Drive.

Fabian Way does provide access to the Highlands neighborhood, and as shown on pages 3.5-32 and 3.5-33 of the Draft EIR, Project roadway intersections were determined to operate at acceptable conditions under the cumulative scenario. Thus, it is unlikely that distribution of trips from the Dollar Creek Crossing project onto roadways in the Highlands neighborhood from a driveway onto Village Drive would decrease intersection LOS under the cumulative scenario such that the potential cumulative LOS impact would be substantially greater than the cumulative impact analysis in the Draft EIR that had only considered a driveway onto Fabian Way. Under the scenario considered in the Draft EIR that only

looked at a driveway onto Fabian Way from Dollar Creek Crossing, the portion of traffic generated by that project traveling to the schools at the end of Polaris Road could either travel on Fabian Way to Old Mill Road to Polaris Road or could travel from Fabian Way to Village Road to Polaris Road, much like what could occur with a driveway onto Village Drive. Analysis of a scenario that would include a driveway for Dollar Creek Crossing onto Village Road would therefore not likely substantially change the travel routes for vehicles going from the development to the schools at the end of Polaris Road such that there would be a significant cumulative impact on traffic in the Highlands neighborhood. Although additional conceptual plans for the Dollar Creek Crossing are now publicly available that show different access options, including one option showing a driveway onto Village Drive and an option showing driveway access onto Fabian Way and SR 28, it is still unknown which access would be used (Placer County 2020).

The cumulative traffic analysis included in the LSC Transportation Study (Appendix D) analyzed the potential effects of the Dollar Creek Crossing project. This analysis assumed a 169 unit multi-family development with traffic using both a site driveway on Fabian Way between SR 28 and Village Road and a site driveway on SR 28 east of Fabian Way. To address this comment, two additional analyses were conducted. The first analyzed 169 units with 100 percent of access on a single driveway along Village Road north of Fabian Way, and the second analyzed 169 units with 100 percent access on a single driveway along SR 28 east of Fabian Way. These analyses focus on the future summer with proposed Project conditions, as a review of Tables 5 and 6 of the LSC Transportation Study indicates that this is the project scenario that would result in the worst delays.

The key study intersection that would be impacted by the change in access patterns is the SR 28/Fabian Way intersection. This is the case for both scenarios because even if all access were to be provided solely on Village Road, the faster travel times on SR 28 as compared to Fabian Way indicates that Dollar Creek Crossing drivers would continue to use Fabian Way to access SR 28 rather than using Old Mill Road. With all access to Dollar Creek Crossing provided via Village Road, LOS at the SR 28/Fabian Way intersection would be C (16.6 seconds of delay on the worst-movement [southbound]). LOS at this intersection with all access directly onto SR 28 would be B (14.0 seconds of delay). As LOS under all access scenarios achieves the LOS standard, there is no potential for a significant impact on neighborhood access regardless of the access option assumed for the Dollar Creek Crossing (for up to 169 units). The difference between the modeled number of residential units and the most recent available greater numbers of residential units presented in May 2019 and January 2020, is are not anticipated to result in a substantial change in the cumulative traffic analysis such that there would be a change in these impact conclusions.

For the reasons described above, the potential driveway alternatives associated with the Dollar Creek Crossing project would not alter the conclusions with respect to the significance of any environmental impact. The comment is noted for consideration by the TCPUD Board during the review of the merits of the Project.

Response I71-4

The comment states that both suggested analyses discussed in comment I71-3 above, should take into consideration the greater use of Polaris Road compared to Old Mill Road. The comment describes their understanding of traffic patterns in the Highlands neighborhood throughout the year. The comment expresses the opinion that the Dollar Creek Crossing project would contribute new vehicle traffic in the neighborhood. The comment suggests that the traffic analysis should be supported by more recent traffic count studies.

As indicated on page 3.5-1 of Section 3.5, "Transportation," in the Draft EIR, traffic counts were conducted in 2015, 2016, and 2018 to support the traffic analysis included in the Draft EIR.

Please see Master Response 1: Transportation Safety regarding the traffic safety concerns noted in the comment. The comment does not provide any evidence to support the notion that new traffic counts would be substantially different from the traffic counts used for the purposes of the traffic operations analysis. Additionally, since winter counts were used as the basis for the traffic analysis, the impacts of school and other winter traffic are already included, and there have been no substantive changes in the surrounding area that would increase traffic volumes. Therefore, there is no need for new winter counts. Additionally, new winter counts would not be valid due to COVID-19, particularly as the middle and high schools are not conducting in-person classes. 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 I71-5

The comment suggests that to minimize potential impacts on Highlands residents associated with potential overflow parking, the Project should continue the practice of imposing parking restrictions in the neighborhood.

As described in response to comment O1-3, a detailed analysis of parking supply and demand is contained within Section 6, "Parking Analysis," of the Transportation Analysis prepared by LSC included in Appendix D of the Draft EIR. Additionally, Impact 3.5-4 analyzed the potential for the Project to result in inadequate parking conditions (see pages 3.5-24 through 3.5-27 of the Draft EIR). The parking area at the proposed Schilling Lodge would include a 100-space parking lot, which would provide 54 additional onsite parking spaces over existing conditions (see page 3.5-25 of the Draft EIR). The expanded supply of parking would reduce the potential for spillover effects in adjacent neighborhoods, including the Highlands neighborhood. Additionally, on peak days when parking demand exceeds the parking lot limit, visitors could be directed to park at the Existing Lodge. The impact summary for the proposed Project on page 3.5-27 concludes:

Implementation of the proposed Project would result in the potential for a maximum of seven peak winter days during which residential street parking may need to be utilized. Additionally, residential overflow parking may be required on as many as nine additional days per year during which large special events or premier events would be held. However, provisions to minimize the use of residential parking, such as carpooling, would be incorporated into event planning and implemented. Given that overflow residential parking already occurs during large events at the Highlands Community Center, and that the existing parking lot cannot accommodate existing demand on peak skier days, which already total more than seven per year, implementation of the proposed Project would result in an improvement to existing conditions in the neighborhood as a whole, and therefore result in a **beneficial** impact related to parking.

Furthermore, a maximum number of Large Special Events could occur at the Schilling Lodge (see pages 2-14 and 2-15 in Chapter 2, "Description of the Proposed Project and Alternative Evaluated in Detail," in the Draft EIR) and would be reviewed by the applicant for consistency with the Management Plan and attendance would be capped. TCPUD would also review event activity for compliance with the lease agreement. Parking would be managed for these events through a potential agreement with the school and carpooling incentives would be provided, as discussed under Impact 3.5-4 on page 3.5-25 of the Draft EIR (the text in the third full paragraph on page 3.5-25 is edited here to correct a grammatical error and is included in Chapter 2, "Revisions to the Draft EIR," in this Final EIR):

Tahoe XC is hosts to several large annual athletic events, which are generally limited to two or three per season and not more than seven per year. These events can draw an attendance of up to approximately 250 people, including participants, organizers, volunteers, and spectators. In addition to these large athletic events, up to two premier events (e.g., the Great Ski Race) would occur at the site each year, which can draw an attendance of up to about 500 people. The premier events already occur at the Existing Lodge, and no new premiere events would occur as a result of Project implementation.

Parking for both large and premier events would be within the Schilling Lodge parking lot and at the school under the specific agreement described above. Event planning for Tahoe XC must make provisions to avoid substantial overflow parking into the surrounding neighborhood. To this end, carpooling incentives would be incorporated into special event planning and operation and overflow parking on nearby residential streets would not occur during such events.

For these reasons, the Project is not expected to result in significant environmental effects with respect to event parking. Accordingly, there is not a need to mitigate any potential parking impacts that may occur along the streets near the Schilling Lodge. However, it is possible that the kind of parking limitations proposed by the comment could be made a condition of permits required by Placer County or the future land lease or agreement with TCPUD. Whether to adopt such conditions would be a policy matter; such conditions would not be required to address potentially significant environmental effects. The comment is noted for consideration by the TCPUD Board during the review of the merits of the Project.

Response I71-6

The comment asserts that the Project should install curbs, sidewalks, and gutters in the vicinity of the proposed Schilling Lodge to ensure public safety during peak use periods. See response to comment A2-2, which addresses roadway improvements along the Project parcel frontage with Polaris Road or Country Club Drive that would be constructed consistent with the Placer County Design Standards and Guidelines. The comment is noted for consideration by the TCPUD Board during the review of the merits of the Project.

From: [Stephanie Schwartz](#)
To: [Kim Boyd](#)
Subject: Tahoe XC Draft EIR
Date: Friday, July 24, 2020 4:33:31 PM

**Letter
I72**

To the board members of TCPUD,

I read through as much of the EIR as I could and I strongly believe that moving the Tahoe XC building to the proposed new site on Polaris Rd next to the Middle School and the High School is a completely unnecessary move. In these times in which we are constantly evaluating what is “essential,” I think you must agree at how UN-essential this project is.

I must let you know at this point in this email that I have lived in Tahoe City for 30 years and have lived in the Highlands for 18 years. I am a Nordic skier, a mountain biker and a trail runner. I have 2 teenage children who both participated in the exceptional strider gliders program. In short, I love Tahoe XC and the trails that encompass it. I think that the existing building absolutely needs to be updated and perhaps made a bit bigger. I also understand the need for more parking. I, however, am completely opposed to moving the site to the end of Polaris Rd.

I know it is possible to rework the existing site, get more parking, easier skier access and a renovated building. This idea, by the way, was originally established 5 years ago as what the community in the Highlands wanted/wants. The final issue, snow pack at the existing site versus snow pack at the proposed sight is almost laughable. I have photos showing that when you see dirt at the existing site, you also see dirt at the proposed sight. In fact, Tahoe XC stops grooming along the trail closest to the High School FIRST!

Relocating the Tahoe XC to the end of Polaris Rd creates enormous traffic problems (as stated in the EIR.) It also puts too many people at the end of a dead end street, endangering lives.

I truly hope you are listening to the concerns of the people who live in the Highlands, the people who will need to live with the unnecessary impacts of this unnecessary project.

Please vote to renovate the existing lodge and work with the existing site. It could really be wonderful!

I72-1

Thank you for your consideration,
Stephanie Schwartz

Sent from my iPhone

Letter I72 Stephanie Schwartz

July 24, 2020

Response I72-1

The comment expresses opposition to the proposed Project located next to the schools. The comment provides background for the letter author related to their experience cross-country skiing and using the trails near Tahoe XC. The comment asserts that relocating the lodge to the end of Polaris Road would create traffic problems. See Master Response 1: Transportation Safety, which addresses concerns related to traffic from the Project. The comment expresses support for Alternative A. The comment is noted for consideration by the TCPUD Board during the review of the merits of the Project.

From: [Linda Williams](#)
To: [Kim Boyd](#)
Subject: Tahoe XC Draft EIR
Date: Friday, July 24, 2020 5:24:50 PM

**Letter
173**

Dear Kym,

My name is Linda Williams and I am writing to you to convey my strong support for the Schilling Lodge project at the Tahoe City Cross Country Ski Center. As a resident of Lake Tahoe since the early 1960s, I attended Tahoe Lake School from kindergarten through 8th grade and have been an avid alpine skier since childhood. In more recent years I’ve cultivated a love of Cross Country skiing. I have enjoyed the wonderful year round trails of TXC for winter striding, skate skiing and special events, and as a hiker and bike rider during every season. My son, a more recent Tahoe Lake and North Tahoe alum, participated in the Strider Glider program in grammar school and was on the Cross Country ski team in middle school.

The Schilling Lodge represents a “win win” for North Lake Tahoe – both in terms of preserving and repurposing a beautiful architectural building important to Tahoe’s history, but also by providing much needed physical expansion and improvement of the facilities at TXC. Unlike other historic structures preserved as museums, the public will be able to experience this inviting home in much the same way the Pennoyer and Schilling families did. Whether warming up after an afternoon of skiing the trails or sharing stories over hot cocoa or a meal with family and friends, the Lodge will provide a wonderful home base for exploring Tahoe's natural bounty, and for building bonds with family and friends in our community.

The new location for the Lodge affords multiple benefits. Not only does the site cluster several public uses together, but it provides a real asset to the students at both the middle and high school. Adjacency to our educational facilities will allow student athletes to walk directly and safely to their afterschool programs -- to use the team locker room, rent skis, have a quick snack or walk to their Strider Glider lessons (5th graders).

The Schilling Lodge will be an asset to the broader community as well. The aesthetic and layout of the space will offer significant improvements over the existing TXC facilities, including allowing small and medium sized gatherings. Groups like non-profit organization meetings, office Christmas parties, and family reunions will be a perfect fit for the size. A sense of community is built on gatherings like these.

In sum, the Schilling Lodge is a unique, historic treasure to reconstruct for public benefit. I heartily endorse this project for our North Lake Tahoe area and personally look forward to firsthand enjoyment of the “new” Schilling Lodge with family and friends.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,
 Linda Williams
 P. O, Box 14, Tahoe City, CA 96145
 Cell: 530-388-0537

I73-1

Letter I73 Linda Williams
July 24, 2020

Response I73-1

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: [Julie](#)
To: [Kim Boyd](#)
Subject: Tahoe XC: Opposition to New Lodge
Date: Friday, July 24, 2020 8:11:05 PM

Letter 174

> To the board members of TCPUD,
>

> I have lived in North Tahoe since 1991. I am a Nordic skier, a mountain biker and a trail runner. I have a daughter who participated in the excellent strider gliders program. We love Tahoe XC and the trails that encompass it. I think that the existing building needs to be updated and perhaps enlarged. And also a need for more parking. I, however, am OPPOSED to moving the site to the end of Polaris Rd.

I
I74-1

> I have to believe it is possible to rework the existing site: get more parking, easier skier access and a renovated building. This idea was originally established 5 years ago as a community collaboration.

> Relocating the Tahoe XC to the end of Polaris Rd creates traffic problems (as stated in the EIR.) Have you ever dropped your kid off at the middle school at 8:30 on a snowy morning?

I
I74-2

> It puts too many people at the end of a dead end street, potentially endangering lives. And now more people will be up there.. with 100+ new kids slated to join North Tahoe HS this fall.

> It also plops a big building in the middle of untouched wilderness. Is this really necessary?

I I74-3

> I truly hope you listen to the concerns of the people who live in our community, the local people who will need to live with the unnecessary impacts of this unnecessary project.

I
I74-4

> Please VOTE to renovate the existing lodge and work with the existing site.

>
> Thank you for your consideration, Julie Barnett

Letter I74 Julie Barnett

July 24, 2020

Response I74-1

The comment expresses opposition to the proposed Project located next to the schools. The comment provides background for the letter author related to their experience cross-country skiing and using the trails near Tahoe XC. The comment expresses support for Alternative A. The comment is noted for consideration by the TCPUD Board during the review of the merits of the Project.

Response I74-2

The comment notes concerns regarding Project-related traffic and public safety on Polaris Road. Please see Master Response 1: Transportation Safety regarding the concerns noted in the comment related to congestion and traffic associated with implementation of the proposed Project. Additionally, 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. This comment does not provide specific evidence that the traffic analysis in the Draft EIR is inadequate, inaccurate, or incomplete. The comment is noted for consideration by the TCPUD Board during the review of the merits of the Project.

Response I74-3

The comment asserts that the proposed Project would locate the Lodge in the middle of untouched wilderness. Areas within the Tahoe Basin that are considered "Wilderness" are described in the Lake Tahoe Regional Plan as (TRPA 2012:2-12):

designated and defined by the U.S. Congress as part of the National Wilderness Preservation System. These lands offer outstanding opportunities for solitude and primitive, unconfined recreation experiences, and they contain ecological, geological, and other features of scientific, educational, scenic and historic value. The wilderness designation is intended to protect and preserve such areas for present and future generations. These lands are managed to prevent the degradation of wilderness character. Natural ecological processes and functions are preserved, and restored where necessary. Permanent improvements and mechanized uses are prohibited. Wilderness District lands within the Tahoe Region include portions of the Desolation, Granite Chief and Mount Rose Wilderness Areas.

Thus, the comment is incorrect that the proposed Project would be located on untouched wilderness. The proposed Project site is designated for recreation use (see response to comment I35-6), is located next to urban development (e.g., schools and residences), and the use of mechanized equipment occurs on this land (e.g., use of grooming equipment on the cross-country ski trails in winter). Also see response to comment I35-6, which addresses the land use and zoning designation on the proposed Project site and Alternative A site.

Response I74-4

The comment requests that TCPUD listen to the concerns of the people living in the community. The comment expresses support for renovating the Existing Lodge and working with the existing site. The comment is noted for consideration by the TCPUD Board during the review of the merits of the Project.

July 24th, 2020

Letter
175

Tahoe City Public Utility District
Kim Boyd, Senior Management Analyst
PO Box 5249,
Tahoe City, CA. 96145

To Whom It May Concern,

Please consider this letter as evidence of enthusiastic and unstinting support by the Schilling Family for the joint TCPUD and Tahoe Cross Country Ski Foundation project known as "The Schilling Lodge".

The refurbishment and repurposing of the old family summer home is strongly consistent with the core values our family has believed in for generations.

My grandparents, who built this home, were avid outdoor enthusiasts, and loved everything about Lake Tahoe. They eagerly shared their love for the Sierras and the abundant recreation opportunities with their family, friends, and guests.

With equal fervor, they supported community involvement, environmental stewardship, and the repurposing of items deemed no longer suitable for their original intent.

My Mother, the late F. Tracy Schilling, knew about the potential repurposing of the home prior to her passing in 2013. She remarked many times on her delight that our home, always a hive of family activity, would become meaningful and relevant to the larger Tahoe community should this project be realized.

Tracy Schilling believed strongly that "Family should be treated like guests, and guests should be treated like family, that way everybody is happy". She extended that same courtesy to anyone showing up at our front door, and she would be filled with delight to know her belief in the power of a gracious welcome and a plate of freshly baked chocolate chip cookies could extend to the larger community.

The building is ideally suited to accommodate multiple interests and engage many members of the community in a warm and congenial atmosphere.

As the family member tasked with managing the property for the last 35 years of our ownership, I can think of no finer way to honor the building and the intentions of both my family and also of our buyer, Mr. John Mozart.

The stated goal of providing an improved experience for the recreational user while preserving a small portion of the area's history feels like a worthy and winning combination.

In reviewing the Lodge Replacement and Expansion Draft EIR, I am impressed by the comprehensive scope of the report. Having lived year-round in the Tahoe/Truckee area, the conclusions reached in the report regarding potential impacts feel sound and correct. Proposed mitigations for the identified impacts seem both appropriate, and achievable. The

I75-1

reasoning and methodology used to arrive at various conclusions in the report appear transparent, data driven, and unbiased.

It is my great hope that this project is able to address any remaining community concerns with the care and sensitivity they deserve.

It is my even greater hope that this project moves forward with the sincere support and engagement of the larger North Tahoe Community.

Thank you for your consideration.



Alexandra Schilling Santos
(805) 544-2995
(805) 423-2200
juno57@live.com

I75-1
cont.

Letter I75 Alexandra Schilling Santos

July 24, 2020

Response I75-1

The comment includes background information about the letter's author as family of the original owners of the Schilling residence, 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: [Terri Viehmann](#)
To: [Kim Boyd](#)
Subject: FW: Tahoe XC Draft EIR Comments
Date: Wednesday, July 29, 2020 4:12:29 PM
Attachments: [image002.png](#)
[TCPUDRecordCorrespondence.pdf](#)

Letter
176

From: Carol Pollock [mailto:carol_pollock@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Friday, July 24, 2020 2:16 PM
To: kboyd@tcpud.com; Dan Wilkins <d.wilkins@tcpud.org>; John Pang <jpang@tcpud.org>; scottzumwalt@gmail.com; Gail Scoville <gscoville@tcpud.org>
Cc: Terri Viehmann <tviehmann@tcpud.org>
Subject: Tahoe XC Draft EIR Comments

We have owned a house in the Highlands for 24 years. Through the years we have observed and enjoyed many projects undertaken by the TCPUD. The taxes we paid here have been well spent in support of a vibrant community. Of the many responsibilities of the TCPUD, the most important is to protect public safety. Unfortunately, the proposed project at Site D is a significant risk to public safety. A project at that location will adversely affect Highlands residents; as well as students, their families, and staff of the High School and Middle School. We hope that the TCPUD in evaluating the application from the TCCSEA will consider their responsibility to protect public safety--despite the DEIR's stated aligned TCPUD objectives with the applicant. And we request that the TCPUD support reasonable modification of the project at Site A to reduce or eliminate the impacts on public safety.

I 176-1

Site D Proposed Project.

Public safety impacts of project at site D: Residents on Polaris and Old Mill would be immediately affected by increased traffic from Site D. Anyone using those streets, regardless of their residence, will also be endangered. Pedestrians and bicyclists are already at serious risk from the level of traffic on those streets. Adding more traffic to and from Site D will increase danger to drivers, pedestrians and bicyclists. The current Transportation section, upon which a variety of conclusions are based, is inaccurate. **We request that an accurate traffic count of existing traffic on Old Mill and Polaris be included.**

I 176-2

Traffic safety on Old Mill and Polaris. There are many reported instances of speeding on Polaris and the Transportation section acknowledges the dangerous, icy conditions on Old Mill. Residents have also provided photographs and descriptions of frequent accidents. The Transportation section acknowledges that most GPS systems will direct traffic up and down Old Mill, subjecting drivers to a difficult road, and making use of that road by Old Mill residents even more dangerous and challenging. **The Transportation section must include realistic ways to eliminate this danger. Additionally, a detailed analysis needs to be prepared to realistically estimate the increase in traffic that would be generated by new and expanded activities, including year round activities and programming, and both large or small special events at Site D.**

Alcohol consumption. Alcohol is described in the DEIR as prohibited from sale, but not from consumption. The DEIR describes potential special events large and small that may be allowed at the Proposed Project. These events would generate additional traffic, and drivers and occupants may have been consuming alcohol. Alcohol could be consumed at Site D, adjacent and contiguous with the schools. Not only is this clearly inappropriate, is it legal? **Please include an analysis of the consequences of alcohol consumption at both Site A and Site D. How would controls be enforced? The only mitigation is no alcohol consumption allowed at either Site D or A.**

I 176-3

Emergency evacuation and access The schools and residents on Polaris have one way in and out in the event of emergency. **Please provide an analysis of how the additional traffic at Site D**

I 176-4

impacts safe evacuation or emergency services from fire or law enforcement; and how specifically those impacts would be mitigated.

I76-4
cont.

The DEIR makes statements regarding **traffic noise consequences** for Site D and concludes that they are of no consequence and do not require mitigation. **Please provide proof of those conclusions.**

I76-5

The applicant TCCSEA states the following advantages of Site D: higher elevation (less than 100 ft difference), beginner terrain and occasional shared parking with the schools. These potential advantages are outweighed by the severe impacts on public safety outlined above. The location advantages could be provided in other ways.

For example, **a shuttle bus from Site A could provide safe transportation back and forth. We request that this alternative be considered.** The TCCSEA also states that the impacts of warmer weather would be mitigated by a much larger lodge of 10,000 sq ft. While we agree that an improved, attractive lodge with a reasonable amount of parking is a significant enhancement it will not mitigate the consequences of less snow or on its own attract people. **Please provide evidence that an expanded lodge at Site D or A would offset the impacts of low snow and warmer weather.**

I76-6

Site A proposed project:

The project described in the DEIR is a massive increase in size and coverage from the current lodge at that location. The proposed lodge of 10,000 sq ft. and 100 parking places create significant aesthetic degradation and has increased traffic consequences. The increase in size does not provide a community benefit but one that is primarily for the expanded commercial benefit of the applicant. **Please provide explanation of how aesthetics are not adversely affected.**

I76-7

Schilling Lodge Ownership for Project A or D:

Explain how the proposed project would “preserve the financial responsibility and transparency of TCPUD’s property tax funds,” and how a facility designed around the applicant’s own membership/commercial functions qualifies as being for “community use”? **If the project is to be transferred to the TCCSEA, please indicate how use be monitored? How will use decisions be made that do not adversely affect the public safety of the community as opposed to the interests of the TCCSEA?**

I76-8

SUGGESTION: A Modified Site A Project for the TCPUD to consider to eliminate the adverse consequences of the proposals for Site D and A

We understand and support the desire of the TCPUD and the TCCSEA to provide an improved visitor and resident experience. We believe this could be more appropriately and safely accomplished with a **Modified Project at Site A**. Since 2016 residents of the Highlands and elsewhere have requested that the TCPUD consider a Modified Project at Site A. The correspondence from the TCPUD’s own files is attached to this email.

I76-9

The Schilling Residence at its current size of 4600 sq ft or even slightly larger would be a major functional and aesthetic improvement for the TCCSEA, building users and for the adjacent neighbors. It would eliminate the public safety issues generated by Site D. It reduces transportation

impacts , since it is located next to a three season Multi Use trail available to bicyclists or pedestrians and to an adjacent bus stop. The current parking could be expanded by 10 spaces to an increase of 60 paid spaces. Additional offsite parking could be provided by use of Multipurpose trail parking lot (currently 20 spaces). A shuttle could be available to transport visitors arriving by public transportation to Site A. Parking adjacent to the Lodge should only be available on paid basis to encourage use of public transportation and carools. **We request that the an evaluation of a Modified Project at Site A be conducted and included in the EIR** This alternative was rejected by the applicant for reasons, that as currently stated, are inaccurate. **The DEIR section on Alternatives Modified Site A needs to be corrected. An excerpt of the relevant portions of Section 4 Alternatives from the DEIR follows this email. When corrected we request that the TCPUD include a Modified Project for Site A.**

I76-9
cont.

Thank you for your attention,

Bruce and Carol Pollock

FROM DEIR

4.1.2 Environmental Impacts of the Tahoe Cross-Country Lodge Replacement and Expansion Project

Impacts associated with implementation of the proposed Project and Alternative A are evaluated in Chapter 3, "Environmental Setting, Environmental Impacts, and Mitigation Measures." The summary table (Table ES-1) provided in the "Executive Summary" chapter presents a detailed summary of the potential environmental impacts of implementation of the proposed Project and Alternative A.

4.2 ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED AND NOT EVALUATED FURTHER

The EIR must also identify any alternatives that were considered by the lead agency, but were rejected during the planning or scoping process and briefly explain the reasons underlying the lead agency's determination. The following alternatives were considered by TCPUD but are not evaluated further in this Draft EIR. The following summary provides a brief description of these alternative proposals and the rationale for their dismissal. The general location of these alternatives are identified in Figure 4-1. **CP note: this is excerpted to include only the two sites currently under consideration, with an emphasis on Reduced Project Site A.**

I76-10

.. Site A – Reduced Project. The Site A – Reduced Project alternative would involve construction of a new lodge at the site of the Existing Lodge. Like Alternative A, this alternative would include demolition of the Existing Lodge*1 and construction of a new lodge using the repurposed Schilling residence. The building footprint could be similar to that of the proposed Project and Alternative A and would include a basement, but would not include an addition to the building. The size of the building would be approximately 6,229 sq. ft. This alternative could have the same number of parking spaces as the proposed Project and Alternative A. Although this alternative may reduce some environmental effects of the proposed Project (e.g., incrementally smaller increase in traffic), it was rejected from further evaluation because it would not have sufficient space to meet the needs of existing and future operational needs of the Project applicant (e.g., open interior space for a gear rental area) and would not substantially reduce any adverse environmental effects, as compared to the proposed Project. Additionally, due to the distance from the school, the location of this alternative would be less ideal than the proposed Project site for a shared parking agreement with the school for parking during special events. The cost and effort to provide utilities (e.g., power, gas, water, fire line, sewer, telephone, and data) would be similar to Alternative A, which would be greater than at the proposed Project site (Olson-Olson Architects 2017). **Provide data regarding providing utilities, since this would not be necessary on an already developed site.**

I76-11

4.3 ALTERNATIVES SELECTED FOR FURTHER EVALUATION

Alternatives to the proposed Project that are analyzed at a comparative level of detail include:

- .. No Project Alternative,
- .. Site A – Modified Project, and
- .. Site D – Reduced Project.

The locations of Site A – Modified Project and Site D – Reduced Project alternatives relative to the proposed Project and Alternative A are shown on Figure 4-2

Table 4-1 compares the site development features of each of the alternatives. The proposed Project and Alternative A are evaluated in detail in Chapter 3, "Environmental Setting, Environmental Impacts, and Mitigation Measures." Where construction, operation, physical characteristics, phasing, and other features would remain the same as the proposed Project, the reader is directed to the details in Chapter 2, "Description of Proposed Project and Alternative Evaluated in Detail." The alternatives descriptions herein focus on describing the elements that differ from the proposed Project.

Table 4-1

Site Development Features of Each of the Alternatives

76-12

Item
Lodge ¹
Parking
School Connector
Patio
Kinder Sled Storage
Bike Racks
Yurt
Trees to be Removed
New Land Coverage ⁹
Site Grading/Excavation

Notes: cu. yd. = cubic yard; sq. ft. = square feet; dbh = diameter at breast height; NA = not applicable

¹ The size of the lodge provided here includes the basement space, where proposed. For Site A – Modified Project, the size of the lodge includes the total area of the lodge building and the areas containing the extra storage buildings and wax area, but not including the yurt.

² The Existing Lodge building combined with the areas containing the extra storage buildings and wax area, but not including the yurt, encompass 3,621 sq. ft.

³ This includes the size of the Schilling Lodge combined with the size of the Existing Lodge. **Why is this combined? Existing lodge to be demolished per writ.**

⁴ Estimate obtained from tree survey data provided by TTCSEA in 2020.

⁵ Estimate for Site A – Modified Project provided by TTCSEA in 2019. **Provide actual data from objective source.** No such estimate was provided for Site D. The estimate of total trees to be removed will be less than for the proposed Project.

⁶ Estimate derived by Ascent Environmental in 2020 based on a review of tree survey data provided by TTCSEA.

⁷ The Project components contributing to land coverage for the proposed Project are detailed in Table 3.9-4 in Section 3.9, "Geology, Soils, Land Capability, and Wetlands."

⁸ The Project components contributing to land coverage for Alternative A are detailed in Table 3.9-5 in Section 3.9, "Geology, Soils, Land Capability, and Wetlands."

⁹ The land coverage estimates are conservative and higher than the coverage that would actually occur with development of each alternative because it includes the area of the proposed Project components. Source: Compiled by Ascent Environmental in 2020.

I76-12
cont.

RECORD CORRESPONDENCE RE THE TXC PROJECT (DEC16-DEC18)

There may be format differences from original correspondence due to conversion of the pdf files used in the TCPUD's official database, which also precluded the legible display of several attachments. The Items are presented in (more or less) chronological order to relate incoming correspondence and TCPUD responses.

On Dec 21, 2016, at 4:46 PM, **Cindy Gustafson responded** (as shown in bold below) to the following questions previously asked of both the TCPUD and TCCSEA by Highlands Homeowner Paul Vatisas:

1. What are the "two originally discussed sites" that Don Heapes referred to in Friday's meetings please? **Don will need to address which sites he was referring to at the meeting.**
2. Residents wish to participate in all formal public processes, so please provide them at least three weeks advance notice of all such meetings and people can arrange their busy schedules to attend. Who is 'on point' for this at the TCPUD, and who should concerned locals contact to get on that list? **Terri Viehmann is the District Clerk and handles all agenda requests. She can be contacted (at the email above) for notification of agendas and workshops related to this subject. The Board will review public outreach related to this subject at the January 20th, 2017 meeting. TCPUD follows the California Brown Act for notification requirements for public meetings. You should also contact Tahoe XC to request notice of any public meetings they will conduct.**
3. What other sites has TCCSEA considered for a relocation of the lodge (e.g., on the School or State Parks property)? What are TCCSEA's stated reasons for wanting to relocate from a site that everyone I know agrees is fine? **This is a question for Tahoe XC and their consultants.**
4. What is the TCPUD's budget for this project (e.g., staff time, analyses, etc.)? How does this break down for Jan-Jun of 2017? Is TCCSEA reimbursing these costs to the TCPUD? **The monitoring of this potential project and possible development of agreements with Tahoe XC has been included in our management goals for 2017. We roughly estimated between 40- 60 hours of management's staff time. Exact cost will depend upon the staff/legal counsel assigned to the review. Reimbursement from Tahoe XC has not been requested. TCPUD has supported the operations of this non-profit (and others such as North Tahoe Arts, Little League, and AYSO soccer) when they are providing recreation services that are within our mission and scope of services since their costs are typically less than TCPUD's costs.**
5. What is the TCPUD's currently proposed budget (if any) for any proposed evaluation, permitting, materials, construction, or any other internal/external/cash costs associated with the new lodge; in 2017, 2018, beyond? **See above (nothing budgeted for future years at this time).**
6. What was the full cost of running the existing facility in the 12 months to end November 2016? **Both Tahoe XC and TCPUD are responsible for costs at the existing site. A joint report would need to be prepared to fully answer this question.**

I76-13

TCPUD will run a report on our expenditures and provide it to you after the holidays.

7. What numbers has TCPUD obtained to reflect the same costs for the proposed new building over 12 months? **TCPUD staff have not spent time on estimating the projected costs for a new building. (We don't feel it appropriate until there is a specific proposal - building size, location, programming, etc).**

8. What other options exist for reducing the current costs (e.g., better insulation), and what is their cost to implement? **TCPUD has not completed an analysis of the options for the existing building. (see next answer)**

9. Has anyone (other than Cindy) raised any issues regarding the cost of the building? **Yes, P&R committee members, staff and Tahoe XC have discussed the long term capital investment required for the existing building/site as we reviewed the scope for TCPUD's P&R Master Plan. This building is being included in our first phase – the Asset Replacement Plan due to be completed in 2017.**

10. Our HOA is one of the regular and frequent users and we have not had an issue with the existing site as is. How can the TCPUD can evaluate a rebuild option without also looking at other actions to reduce the cost of running/maintaining the current building, and without calculating and sharing the ROI from such alternatives? **You are correct that the TCPUD Board will request this type of analysis be done if and when a project is proposed. .**

11. When will all the affected neighbors be notified of any proposed date(s)? **The public involvement/outreach plan for the site analysis is the subject that was requested by our Board of Directors to be brought back for discussion at the January meeting.**

12. What is the plan to contact neighbors who are only in the area part-time? **The public involvement/outreach plan would include this information.**

13 What is the site that Mr. Heapes said in the meeting that the scoring is raising the bar by providing a factual basis for whatever the TCCSEA decides, and is the scoring exercise simply an attempt to force the TCCSEA's preferred site over the general public's clearly stated preferred location? **These appear to be questions for Tahoe XC.**

14. My understanding today is that TCCSEA is the lead on this project, and that the TCPUD is being consulted only as the landowner. Is that correct? **That is correct.**

18. At the previous public meetings, we were told that TCPUD would not be funding the proposed new lodge or its evaluation costs in any way. **The TCPUD Board has approved funding in 2014, (and augmented it in 2016) toward site assessment and public outreach. The total approved was \$13,430.**

On Dec 22, 2016, at 7:29 PM, **DONALD HEAPES** (of the TXC) wrote:

Merry Merry Christmas All. In general, public record of TCPUD Board Meeting contains answers to all questions put forth to me. The January 20 TCPUD Board Meeting is good opportunity for clarification on anything as required. We will be announcing dates soon for a series of 4 Public Workshops between the end of January and Middle of February. We are excited to bring the Community into this effort. As expressed at TCPUD Board Meeting Process. We sincerely feel that is the best forum for discussion and understanding and hope you can appreciate that. Hope Everyone enjoys this wonderful season and look forward to the good efforts we all will make in the New Year.
Respectfully Don Heapes

I76-13
cont.

On Dec 23, 2016, at 7:57 AM, **Paul Vatistas** wrote:

Don, Please can answer the questions. It will take you less than three minutes. :) If in your response you can't say in brief that you support rebuilding on the current site, then clearly TCCSEA does not support that way forward. In your response as is, it also means you are choosing to completely ignore the public feedback that you already organized and received. Your statement in this email "we are excited to bring the Community into this effort" does not help your credibility with the Community. Are you planning to ignore the majority input of future efforts as well?

To the Board of the TCPUD, I will therefore state the obvious. TCCSEA is not being straightforward with the PUD constituents and rate payers in the District, and with the XC Center's neighbors, (and even I now suspect with the TCPUD itself), and therefore we all have a big problem. I am the elected Vice President of our HOA, and will be forced to advocate against any project if TCCSEA is not "playing straight" with our neighbors. As stated previously, my hope is that our HOA can support an extension to and/or rebuild on the existing site (which is likely the cheaper option because of existing, power, water, sewer, and parking, faster/much cheaper TRPA process). I look forward to further discussion on the 20th (and hopefully Don will answer the simple questions before then).

Regards, Paul

From: Paul Vatistas [vatistas@yahoo.com]

January 08, 2017 7:23 AM

To: DONALD HEAPES Cc: Cindy Gustafson Ron Treabess; Jim Robins;
Ray Garland; Judy Friedman

Subject: Re: Responses to some of your questions

Hope everyone had a good start to the New Year! There was some good skiing (downhill and XC) before this rain set in! Don, do you intend to answer any of my questions properly before the meeting on the 20th? I feel that you don't like what you are hearing, so have chosen to just ignore it. Just as I feel that TCCSEA is ignoring all the clear input it received from the community already on site location.

Regards, Paul Vatistas

From: Paul Vatistas [vatistas@yahoo.com]

January 10, 2017 5:19 AM

To: Terri Viehmann Cc: Cindy Gustafson Subject: Re: 2017 - TCPUD Board and Committee Meeting Calendar ,

Ray tells me that the XC Lodge has been pulled from the Jan 20 Board meeting. **Is that correct?** Any information would be welcome as I plan work commitments around your meetings when I need to attend.

Regards, Paul

On Jan 10, 2017, at 7:52 AM, **Cindy Gustafson** wrote

Hi Paul – TXC has requested not to be on the agenda until after public workshops have been held. That request was made last Saturday. I will be reporting that to the Board of

I76-13
cont.

Directors under my GM Report (no discussion) but there won't be an item on the agenda until February.

From: Paul Vatistas [vatistas@yahoo.com]

January 10, 2017 10:23 AM

To: Cindy Gustafson Cc: Terri Viehmann; Judy Friedman

Subject: Re: 2017 - TCPUD Board and Committee Meeting Calendar

TCCSEA needs to be more up front and proactive. They notified Ray about the meeting but did not notify me or others whose emails they already have. It is almost as if they would prefer we do not attend! Can you ask Don please to build and use an email list for all folks who have expressed interest in keeping updated? I would ask him myself, but he just ignores my emails (which seems like bad PR to me, but these are his choices). Also, all the meetings are scheduled for the Fairway Center. It seems that at least one and maybe two should take place at the XC center(?) Again, it is almost as if they do not want to engage with the Highlands. I feel the TCPUD cannot engage with TCCSEA if they are just on an agenda and not really interested to listening to others.

Finally how are TCCSEA or you going to engage with affected homeowners like Paul Niwano and Debbie White who are currently gone for Jan and Feb? My wife or I have been out on the trails every day this year. Whether the XC center is open or closed, grooming or not. Most of the people we meet out there are local. We talk and they are all (so far) happy with the XC center where it is. Thanks to you for the response (and I feel compelled to note given TCCSEA's lack of performance that you are very good at turning around in less than 48 hours, which I do really appreciate).

Regards, Paul

On Jan 10, 2017, at 7:21 PM, **Cindy Gustafson wrote:**

Hi Paul – With this email I am passing this on to Tahoe XC for consideration on their outreach process. Certainly our Board will be reviewing their process in soliciting public input when determining any future actions. Thanks and stay safe out there – it is really a mess.

From: Paul Vatistas [vatistas@yahoo.com]

January 12, 2017 4:51:19 PM

To: Cindy Gustafson

Cc: Terri Viehmann; Judy Friedman - Paper Trail (judy@tahoepapertrail.com); DONALD HEAPES; Jim Robins

Subject: Re: 2017 - TCPUD Board and Committee Meeting Calendar Date: Thursday, Thanks. But this does not seem right. I think the TCPUD needs to lead the process for what is best for PUD land and property, and actually cannot delegate that responsibility to two random citizens. I will send you some more detail on the issues when I have time over the next two days. TXC is a private entity looking to build a commercial building on TCPUD (public) land. TXC is a winter tenant and one of at least three other entities that regularly use the existing facility (of which one is our HOA). TXC is just one of your tenants, and the other two (at minimum) need to be actively included. The TXC Board is not elected by anyone and is not an agency or Committee of the TCPUD. So basically 3-5

I76-13
cont.

individuals have come to you with an idea, and the PUD have not yet set up a real and inclusive committee or public group. I would recommend this process be led by the Parks and Rec committee. Again, I will send you a more thorough email when I have time.
Regards, Paul

From: Roger Huff (huffmtry@aol.com)

January 21, 2017 8:29:09 AM

To: Cindy Gustafson; judy@tahoepapertrail.com; Ron Treabess; Terri Viehmann Cc: raygarland2@gmail.com; vatistas@yahoo.com; racswift@gmail.com;

Subject: RECORD COMMENT ON TCCSEA'S PROPOSED PUBLIC INPUT PLAN
Greetings, As one of those very interested people who could not attend yesterday's Board meeting, I watched it on video that evening. After evaluating the comments and concerns expressed about this topic, I respectfully request that the following be added to TCPUD's record file:

I strongly recommend that the TCPUD Board NOT endorse the TCCSEA'S proposed public input plan because: - The extremely late and limited dissemination of public notification about this weekend's "workshops," the refusal to postpone them when a Winter Storm Warning tells people to stay home, and proposing the only other sessions during major winter weather months; collectively could be interpreted by some as an attempt to limit public input, and - Holding information forums before TCCSEA is prepared to properly address obvious public concerns about: addition of additional candidate sites beyond the two previously presented; footprint diagrams of buildings, parking, ingress/egress roads, equipment yards, etc. for all candidate sites; and questions regarding the proposed site scoring method would be premature and of limited value as a TCPUD decision basis

I would like to see this project succeed for the benefit of our community, the Highlands homeowners, and all users of this public property including the TCCSEA.
Regards, Roger.

From: Paul Vatistas [vatistas@yahoo.com]

January 30, 2017 6:18 AM

To: Cindy Gustafson Cc: editors@moonshineink.com

Subject: Moonshine Ink article re Schilling Lodge

In their recent article about the Lodge, This seems to be the opposite of what the PUD has stated in its public meetings. "Tahoe Cross Country plans to rebuild the lodge in the Highlands neighborhood outside of Tahoe City in partnership with Tahoe City Public Utility District" In the public meetings that I have attended, Board members and you stated several times that this is a TCCSEA initiative and not a TCPUD initiative. Please can you clarify whether TCPUD is a partner with TXC and/or TCCSEA, in both a general and legal sense. Thank you.

Regards, Paul

From: Paul Vatistas [vatistas@yahoo.com]

January 30, 2017 1:14:47 PM

I76-13
cont.

To: Cindy Gustafson Cc: Ron Treabess; Judy Friedman; Terri Viehmann
 Subject: Highlands Community Center options

Per my public comments today, please find attached details of the items mentioned. I noticed that the meeting was not recorded, so ask that my comments be included in any minutes of today's meeting. Thanks! I believe that it would be helpful to have an agenda item at the March Board meeting to address these important issues. regards, Paul

COMMENTS TO TCPUD Issues related to Highlands Community Center, associated TCPUD land, and proposed Schilling Lodge. January 30, 2017 At the last meeting I requested that there be a separate Board agenda item to review options (beyond the Schilling Lodge) and issues for the Highlands Community Center. I would like to elaborate here on some of the issues that face the TCPUD.

1. Building options. If the Highlands Community Center (HCC) needs additional space, then how much will that cost in the current location? Estimate \$250/sq ft, so maybe only \$250k for each extra 1000 square feet. This seems much lower than building a new Lodge, and should be evaluated using some actual figures. Knowing the costs of a remodel or extension is important as a baseline for financial comparison with other options such as the Schilling Lodge. IF the HCC needs additional parking, that how much will that cost in the current location? Estimate \$3 sq ft, so maybe \$1,000 per parking space (with shared component). Best practice would be to quickly cost out total of 60, 80, and 100 parking spaces, in the current location. Knowing these costs would be useful as a baseline for comparison with other options.

2. Zoning. HCC is supposed to be a meeting center for the community, and not a commercial building. However Tahoe Cross Country (TXC) has been using this building to run a commercial operation for several years now: • Charge for access to the general public • Charge for waxing equipment to the general public • Sell clothing to the general public • Rent out bikes to the general public These are all clearly commercial activities. To my knowledge this part of the Highlands is zoned Residential, and not commercial. The only zoned commercial area that I am aware of is at the corner of Fabian and Highway 28. It seems important that the TCPUD seek out and know zoning for the Highlands area before making any decisions, and share that information with the public.

3. Different rental fees. Pricing from the TCPUD for the HCC has not been the same for different users, and TXC seems to have been given a very favorable deal. • Community members are charged \$97/hour for building rental, minimum 2 hours. • The XC Center has only been charged \$1/year, plus a percentage of revenue. No other user (e.g., Scouts, Highlands HOA) has been offered this very low rent. Quoted TCPUD rental rates are here. http://tcpud.org/assets/highlands_community_center_rental_rates_form.pdf Knowing whether this discriminatory pricing creates a legal problem, and whether the TXC or TCCSEA lease therefore needs to be amended to provide fair pricing, would seem to be important.

4. TXC is in clear breach of the IRS and State of California requirements for a 501(c)7, and has been for many years. • Charge for access to the general public • Charge for

I76-13
 cont.

waxing equipment to the general public • Sell clothing to the general public • Rent out bikes to the general public Since taking effective ownership of TXC, TCCSEA may also be in breach of IRS and State of California requirements for a 501(c)3. Knowing whether TXC and TCCSEA are operating illegally would seem to be of interest to the Board and the public.

5. TCPUD commercial partnership. Given that the TCPUD is getting a percentage of TXC and/or TCCSEA revenues, does that mean that (intentionally or otherwise) that it has become involved in a pure commercial activity at a site that is not zoned for commercial activity. While the TCPUD clearly charges directly for water and sewer, there may be limits to engaging in commercial activity like selling sporting clothing to the general public A legal opinion on these issues would seem appropriate and helpful to both the Board and the public

6. Options currently being evaluated by TCCSEA are missing one key alternative. TCCSEA rationale for the Lodge is that it claims that it needs additional space to expand its activities, grow its customer base, and grow revenue. As stated above, all of this sounds like commercial activity. I attended the January 21 TCCSEA workshop and found it very helpful. As you know, the TCCSEA is undertaking a process to evaluate 5 options, all of which presume that the cross-country center operation needs more space, and therefore needs the Schilling Lodge. However none of these options reflect what the public asked for 2 years ago. The public asked for a layout that most closely matches Option A but with the Lodge on the north side - i.e., demolish the current building and replace it with only the 4000 sq ft Schilling Lodge. This is not reflected in the 5 options that TCCSEA has proposed to date. The TCPUD should be sure to include and review his option (let's call it A-2) as part of its own evaluation process.

7. ADA issues. Both non-profits and public utility districts are subject to the Americans with Disabilities Act. The proposed new Lodge has 2 stories. Has anyone established if it is ADA compliant. It seems that the Board should have available its own legal opinion on this.

8. Responsibility for current building. At the workshop, I asked what was going to happen to the current community center if there was a new Lodge. Don Heapes told me they would not need it if there were a new Lodge, so "it would be the TCPUD's responsibility", and that I "should ask the PUD". It would seem appropriate for the TCPUD to describe its plans for the current lodge if the Schilling Lodge is built (e.g., maintain as is, demolish, other). It would also be relevant to have estimates of what it will cost to operate and maintain the current community center, and to have estimates of what it might cost to demolish this building. And who will be paying those costs?

For all the reasons that I have laid out above today, I request again that the Board set an agenda item for its March Board meeting to cover, at a minimum, all these issues.
Thank you, Paul Vastistas Tahoe City resident

I76-13
cont.

On Jan 31, 2017, at 7:55 AM, **Cindy Gustafson wrote:** Hi Paul – thanks for coming to the workshop yesterday. In response to this email I have asked Terri to send you a copy of the Letter of Intent TCPUD entered into with Tahoe Cross Country Ski Education Association. She will also forward you a copy of our Public Records Request form so we can accurately track and respond to your requests. In response to Kerry and your later emails, I have forwarded to our legal counsel for interpretation on the limitations for use of the property under our agreements. I will ask him to prioritize a response as soon as possible.

Thanks, Paul

From: Roger Huff (huffmtry@aol.com)

February 01, 2017 8:18 AM

To: Cindy Gustafson ; judy@tahoepapertrail.com; Ron Treabess ; Terri Viehmann

Subject: TCCSEA SKI LODGE PROJECT CONCERNS

Good Morning, We attended the 2014 TCCSEA presentation and like a number of other attendees, expressed our support for erecting the original historical building at the present site. After reviewing information on www.theschillinglodge.com Web site yesterday, however, we were extremely surprised to discover that:

- a. The TCCSEA has unilaterally added more candidate building sites, several of which would have very significant adverse impacts on the Highlands; and
- b. The TCCSEA now also proposes to expand the original structure by 3,100 square feet to accommodate their members and commercial operations.

The reason for TCCSEA's delayed revelation of these significant and controversial changes to Highlands homeowners and the general public is at least questionable, and raises other concerns about its motivation for the following: Because a substantial number of Highlands homeowners are part-time or seasonal occupants or are unable to attend local "workshops" due to other commitments, the TCCSEA's public input plan is inadequate, and limiting such events to Tahoe's three principal winter weather months would skew inputs in favor of those more likely to be represented (e.g., TCCSEA Members).

The latter is particularly concerning because comments made by the TCCSEA on the aforementioned Web site reveal its definite bias against the present Cross Country (XC) Center site. As the TCPUD's General Manager has already noted, TCCSEA's public input schedule seems overly ambitious and unrealistic; and some are concerned it may be an effort to drive the Board toward a site decision based on incomplete or artificially biased information.

There are also concerns regarding the objectivity, validity, and thoroughness of the TCCSEA's site scoring effort; because: professional expertise of some scorers hasn't been established, the TCCSEA is obviously biased (see Item #2 above), the scoring criteria haven't been described, data sampling times and methods are unknown, and several

I76-13
cont.

critical evaluation areas (e.g., impacts on private property values, additional emergency evacuation route congestion) are not properly addressed.

The current facility is used for local boy scouts, Highland Homeowners' Association meetings, etc., but the modifications and additions proposed by the TCCSEA focus narrowly and almost exclusively on serving its members and commercial operator. The TCPUD can't let myopic self-interest drive this, and must base its decision on what is best for quality of life and safety of our Community, not just the TCCSEA.

Such behavior has resulted in loss of confidence in and respect for the TCCSEA. While we still support a less ambitious effort to erect the originally-sized historic building at the present XC Center site to benefit our community without adversely affecting the private property owners, we must emphatically ask the TCPUD Board to reject TCCSEA's current proposal.

Unless all major stakeholders act in good faith, continuing down the current path would be a serious, costly, and divisive mistake.
Very sincerely, Roger Huff

From: Alex Lesser [alex@pssclabs.com]

February 01, 2017 8:25 AM

To: Cindy Gustafson Subject: Concerns About New Cross Country Lodge Hi Cindy: My name is Alex Lesser. I am the owner of the property at 3061 Polaris Road. I want to voice my extreme concerns about the possibility of moving the site of the Cross Country ski lodge from it's current location. I don't understand why the current location is not suitable to simply rebuild the lodge. All of the current infrastructure on that site can be rebuilt. I have seen that there is a possibility of moving the lodge in back of my property which concerns me greatly. I have two young children that I do not want around this building site and have concerns about the increase in traffic. In addition, this area is a natural thoroughfare for wildlife. Building on this location would be extremely harmful to our environment and negatively impact our neighborhood. Also, I believe maintaining a lodge size of 4,000 sq. ft. makes the most sense. Expanding to a 7,000 sq ft lodge does not seem necessary. Please contact me with any additional information you have about the potential site location.

Alex Lesser

From: Paul Vatistas [vatistas@yahoo.com]

February 01, 2017 11:38:44 AM

To: Cindy Gustafson; Terri Viehmann:

Subject: Fw: Highlands 2014 Fall Newsletter

Hi, Cindy. Stumbled on this email while looking for something else - it was sent out just after the September 2014 meetings. The XC Lodge update reflects exactly what happened, and was written up at the time by Ray. This is why we all feel that Jim "moved the goalposts" on everyone in the fall of last year. I stumbled on some other emails on this topic, including interestingly one from Jim to you, Bob and Matt at the TCPUD, and cc'd to Kevin, sent on August 15 2014. In it he says, "We feel the existing site would

I76-13
cont.

make the most sense ". So the community memory and your written record of what was agreed at the time is exactly as I stated at your December 2016 Board meeting. I would like to point out that I bet you did not receive a single phone call or email from any member of the public regarding the Lodge from October 2014 until October 2016, or until just a couple of months ago. Why? Because the public was happy with what had been agreed.

Regards, Paul

Highlands Home Owners Association Fall 2014 Newsletter excerpt:

FOLLOW UP ON THE TAHOE XC SKI LODGE There was excellent participation in the Open Houses hosted by TCPUD on September 11 and 13 where residents were encouraged to note what they wanted to see and what they did not want to see for the relocation of a donated 4,500 square foot ski lodge. According to Kevin Murnane of Tahoe XC, as a result of the public comments and other internal discussions with the Tahoe XC Foundation, the focus is on the current location on Country Club Drive. Any thoughts of putting it elsewhere in the XC area are no longer being considered. The next step is for the TCPUD Parks and Recreation committee to contract for a feasibility study. The ski lodge will remain standing in its current location on the west shore through this winter. The lodge will then be dismantled and stored and funds need to be raised. Consequently, there are plenty of additional steps that must be taken and Kevin estimates "it might take a few years" before the restored lodge becomes a reality.

From: Rachael Swift [racswift@gmail.com]

February 03, 2017 1:45 PM

To: Cindy Gustafson ; judy@tahoepapertrail.com; Ron Treabess; Terri Viehmann

Subject: Tahoe Cross Country TCPUD - Schilling Lodge Concerns

Dear Cindy and Fellow Members of the TCPUD, As Highlands' residents, we were alarmed to learn of TCCSEA's recent recommendation that several alternate building sites to the existing site on Country Club Lane be considered for a new and much larger skiing facility. Shortly after we purchased our home on Polaris Rd. in 2013, we learned about the donation of the Schilling Lodge to the Tahoe Cross Country Center. Everything we heard or read about this donation indicated that the Schilling Lodge would replace the existing lodge at its current location - which we supported then and now. Specifically, refer to the "2014 outreach to the Highland Homeowners Association" as reported in the 2014 Highlanders Homeowners Association Fall Newsletter by Ray Garland, President of the Highlander Homeowners Association: "There was excellent participation in the Open Houses hosted by TCPUD on September 11 and 13 where residents were encouraged to note what they wanted to see and what they did not want to see for the relocation of a donated 4,300 square foot ski lodge. According to Kevin Murnane of Tahoe XC, as a result of the public comments and other internal discussions with the Tahoe XC Ski Foundation, the focus is on the current location on Country Club Drive. Any thoughts of putting it elsewhere in the XC area are no longer being considered."

To now learn that, our input has been thrown away and a new potential site analysis has been resurrected, with strong bias against the existing site as originally communicated, is

I76-13
cont.

a great cause of concern. (refer to: “What’s wrong with the current TXC lodge facility?” at the FAQ at www.theschillinglodge.com) . We are very concerned that changing the Tahoe XC site to another location as the current communication suggests would have a significant and adversarial impact on the Highlands community, of which they have asked for and received support from on a regular basis.

We believe it is extremely important for the TCCSEA and the TCPUD maintain a strong, open, honest relationship with community based on trust and good will. In 2015, when the Tahoe Cross Country Center fell on hard times after years of low snowfall, it appealed to the community for financial support to continue its very existence. We responded by making a substantial financial contribution. We made this contribution in good faith because we believed TXC benefits the community and the neighborhood. However, TCCSEA’s new proposals to significantly increase the size of the lodge and to relocate the lodge would be a significant change and cause much adversarial impact to the Highlands homeowners and community, changing existing traffic patterns and substantially changing the character of our residential neighborhood.

As homeowners, voters, contributors, and taxpayers, we support keeping the Tahoe Cross Country Center at its current location. The infrastructure for the facility is already in place there and the close-by neighbors are accustomed to the proximity, operations, traffic, other issues associated with the facility. The TCCSEA and TCPUD need to reflect on the importance of having an open, honest relationship based on good will and trust with the community it serves. We supported the TXC Center when it asked us for help in a time of need. Please do not breach this trust by moving this facility and adversely affecting our neighborhood.

Rachael and Bill Swift

From: Bonnie Dodge [bonniefir@icloud.com]

February 12, 2017 8:12 AM

To: Cindy Gustafson

Subject: Schilling lodge

Cindy, I've only recently become aware of the proposed changes to the Tahoe city cross country center and the Schilling lodge project. After briefly reviewing the proposed sites for the reconstruction of the schilling lodge, I can't help but ask why they wouldn't just take down the "inadequate" facility on country club and put the schilling lodge there? That is where folks are already used to the increased traffic flow and parking issues, and where people looking for biking/hiking/nordic skiing access are used to going. Traffic on Polaris is already maxed because of the high school and middle school daily school and events. I don't really understand the scoring cards and who is doing the scoring at all. I'm going to try to come to the forum/open house this afternoon. I know you are probably too busy to reply to individual emails, but just wanted you to know that as a full time resident living on Polaris I am opposed to anything that would increase traffic on our already busy street. And, in the case of the cedarwood site, construction would completely alter the natural beauty of our backyard and, most likely, decrease my property value. We bought this house largely because it backed to natural forest. Having a lodge/parking lot in the backyard would have been a deal breaker if it existed at the time.

I76-13
cont.

Hope to see you this afternoon, Bonnie Dodge

From: "Ray Garland"

February 21, 2017 12:43:20 PM PST

To: Cindy Gustafson

Subject: FW: Concerns about the move of the Nordic Center

Hi Cindy, I responded to this message by suggesting Sheila write directly to you but in case she doesn't I thought you should have this.

Ray

From: Sheila Cepero [ceperowall@yahoo.com]

February 20, 2017 5:19 PM

To: raygarland2@gmail.com Cc: Niall Wall ; Sheila Cepero

Subject: Concerns about the move of the Nordic Center

Hello Ray, My name is Sheila Cepero. My husband Niall Wall and I own the home at 3012 Highlands Dr. We have been informed by our neighbors that there is a proposal to move the site of the existing cross country center. We are unable to attend the meetings but want to convey our opinions and our concerns. We are concerned about the impact to the environment and to our neighborhood. We love the cross country center but we believe that the ideal situation is to make improvements to the existing location even if it is more expensive initially as we think the long term impact to the forest and the neighborhood if moved is more consequential. But if it has to be moved then I believe that the locations near the High School, Sites C and D are the best alternatives, definitely not the end of a cup de sac on our quiet Highlands Dr. street. Please let us know if there is another person/entity that we should be communicating our concerns to.

Thank you. Sheila Cepero and Niall Wall

From: Rachael Swift [racswift@gmail.com]

February 25, 2017 11:57 AM

To: Cindy Gustafson ; judy@tahoepapertrail.com; Ron Treabess ; Terri Viehmann

Subject: TCPUD/TCCSEA Schilling Lodge Public Input Request

Dear Cindy and Members of the TCPUD, We attended the workshop at the Fairway Community Center on Saturday, Feb. 11 and came away from this event with many deep concerns that I have highlighted below.

The bulk of these concerns stem from what appears to be a decision by the TCPUD to instruct the TCCSEA to "exclude" from the discussion the option that most of the Highland's homeowners believed was the working plan of record and what would have the least amount of impact to the neighborhood and the community, - and instead to just focus on a narrow agenda of building a very large, year round commercial enterprise in the Highlands with little regard for how this would affect the people who live there.

We ask that the TCPUD "modify" this ongoing public discussion to "include" the option of upgrading the existing facility in its current location as the needs of the Highlands community and the families who live there must be part of this discussion. This will help

I76-13
cont.

to maintain strong and open communication and trust with the TCPUD and the community.

At the Feb. 11 workshop, one board member told us that the donor of the Schilling Lodge had put up \$1 million dollars to reconstruct the lodge for the TXC center, and that this person has lots of rich friends who are willing to kick in big money as well. Therefore, it will not be necessary for the TCCSEA to go around the community raising “bake sale” money for this project. As neighbors and donors, this is very offensive. It shows that the TCCSEA does not feel that it needs neighborhood support. Very disturbing! A board member told us that it is important that the new lodge be a year round commercial establishment in order to generate a revenue stream in low snow years. However, he had no concern at all about the noise, increased traffic, or public safety issues this would create for the neighborhood. We know several families in the Highlands who have children who attend the high school and who live close enough that their children should be able to walk. However, these parents drive them to school because of speeders, heavy traffic volume, and no sidewalks.

Most people driving to and from the high school on Polaris Rd. travel well above the speed limit. When I pointed out this speeding issue to a board member, he replied that I should “notify the proper authorities about that”. In other words, that is your problem, not ours. A new lodge with 100 parking spots would make this situation much worse. Currently there are quiet times in the Highlands when there is very little traffic – weekends, holidays, and in the summer. A year round commercial establishment would take this away and put heavy traffic on its roads 24/7 all year round. This affects property values, public safety, and the quality of life for its residents.

Is the Highlands even zoned for a year round commercial establishment? We would be very interested to see this specific language in the zoning codes. One board member told us that the new lodge would not sell alcohol, but it would allow alcohol to be brought in for special events. Are you kidding? This is exactly what the Highlands does NOT want – especially in a building in such close proximity to a school.

After speaking with several neighbors and friends in the Tahoe City area, we have found that most people have very little knowledge that this process of expanding and relocating the TXC lodge is even going on. One neighbor told us that she did get a post card in the mail about the Schilling Lodge, but she tossed it because she did not know what the Schilling Lodge was. Another told us that when she saw this post card she also tossed it because she thought this issue of replacing the existing lodge with the Schilling Lodge had been decided 2 years ago – so why should she go to a workshop? If there were instead, - mailings, signage, and advertising that said “Come and Learn about Plans for a Massive Expansion and Relocation of the TXC Lodge” – people would understand what is really going on and take an active interest in this process. You will get real feedback, not carefully controlled feedback. In addition, many homeowners in the Highlands are second homeowners. They do not check their post office boxes often and they are not around to see the few posters that have been put up in town. They come to Tahoe to relax, not to go to workshops. Most of the second homeowners in the Highlands have no idea

I76-13
cont.

that this process is even going on, and if they did, they would be horrified. In this heavy snow winter, it is difficult for second homeowners to even travel here.

The TCPUD, through its instruction to the TCCSEA, and the TCCSEA is not being open and transparent with the community about what it is really trying to do. Our personal opinion is to keep the TXC lodge where it is and scale it down! This is what was agreed to in 2014 by the Highlands community and the TXC board. That said, we believe it is more important that TCPUD modify the existing site selection process to include the option to upgrade the existing site, as that is what the majority of the community believed was the operating plan of record. In that way, the community, TCCSEA, and the TCPUD can have a more fair public dialog, and from that we believe what is best will result.
Bill and Rachael Swift

From: Cindy Gustafson

February 25, 2017 4:24:58 PM

To: Rachael Swift

Cc: Terri Viehmann

Subject: RE: TCPUD/TCCSEA Schilling Lodge Public Input Request Date:

Thank you Rachel. I will pass your comments on to the Board and Tahoe Cross Country Ski Education Association. They will be considered in our future deliberations on this issue.

From: Roger Huff (huffmtry@aol.com)

March 11, 2017 5:52:31 AM

To: Cindy Gustafson; judy@tahoepapertrail.com; Ron Treabess Cc: Terri Viehmann

Subject: CONFLICT OF INTEREST WAIVER REQUEST AGENDA ITEM

The requestor is a respected area law firm, but I am very concerned granting this waiver would needlessly put the TCPUD in a vulnerable position due to current controversies.
Regards, Roger

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

March 12, 2017 11:51:13 AM

To: Cindy Gustafson; Terri Viehmann; Bob Bolton;

Subject: Schilling Lodge input Cindy/Terri

Afternoon. Further to my emails on the above subject, at the workshop yesterday (Saturday 11th March): a) people were verbally told that the placement of the lodge was (quote) "a done deal and it will be going by the school". b) it displayed all the scores on the wall that showed the school site as being the best location. This so called democratic process of having workshops and information gathering, question answering and open discussion with the public seems totally corrupt.

The process is broken, biased, unfair and cannot be trusted. None of the criteria on the score cards are actually asked on the questionnaire on the website so how have the current total scores been established? Why would you publish information that is supposed to be assemble first, review later, issue results? Not show them as you go. And how are they established? Having 1 as the preferred site and 5 the least preferred is

I76-13
cont.

grossly misleading in my opinion. I'm confused when I read the website. In my mind the higher a score in any points based system is the winner, not the loser. So is this part of a plan to mislead people? I'm beginning to think it is. When I see, for example, 'minimum changes to current trails' Existing site 5, Highlands & all other sites 1, how was that score established. I think the criteria should be published so we all know.

I am not in Tahoe this winter but will be back in the summer so how can I be part of this as an absent homeowner, especially this winter? The website is insufficient to consider it the solution as it doesn't go deep enough. I can't be there to discuss the fact I don't feel the existing site should be the least attractive site and to say in my opinion there is actually no changes needed to current trails if the lodge goes on the current site. I will have to sit down and write another email giving my input on the 35 points based criteria in order to register my thoughts. I then hope they can be part of the totals.

A TCPUD member should be the unbiased, neutral party to manage this. It is apparent and fact that locals to the Highlands are too scared to comment and they don't want to speak out for fear of future repercussion or bias. This is because people know the TC personnel too well. It is not a fair process and there is equal fear the information gathered will be filtered. I feel judged by the very first question on the website. I'm not in Tahoe this winter so I'm not a XC member, I'm also not a pass holder and it asks how many members of the family are. Why is this relevant? Please, please review this process or it could turn out to be an unethical mess.

Thank you for your time. Debbie White

From: Alex Lesser [alex@pssclabs.com]

March 13, 2017 1:44 PM

To: Cindy Gustafson

Subject: Acting in Good Faith

Acting in good faith is defined as "honesty, fairness, absence of intent to defraud, act maliciously, or take unfair advantage." It's part of our laws, a fundamental presumption in our contracts, breaches have led to lengthy legal actions and costly judgments, and evidence of repeated failures warrants serious concerns.

Since presenting its Schilling Lodge project to the Tahoe City Public Utility District (TCPUD) Board and Highlands homeowners, the Tahoe Cross Country Ski Education Association (TCCSEA) has:

(1) Blindsided Highlands homeowners with its unilateral changes of plans to: a. Expand the structure from 4,200 sq. ft. to 7,300 sq. ft. to provide spaces for the TCCSEA, ski team members, and its commercial operations; b. Add three more candidate sites to the two originally presented, without effectively notifying the potentially affected Highlands property owners; c. Include parking for at least one hundred cars and several buses, and eliminate the choice of an originally-sized project from consideration;

(2) Neglected to mention the fact that in 2014 a large majority of Highlands residents expressed their strong preference for an originally-sized project at the current site;

I76-13
cont.

- (3) Revealed its bias against the current site on www.theschillinglodge.com Web site, raising questions about the objectivity and credibility of its site scoring efforts;
- (4) Put its members and associates on its site scoring team, instead of residents who know more about the impacts of the sites and whose daily lives are most affected;
- (5) Failed to effectively notify seasonal residents and scheduled local workshops in Tahoe's major winter weather months, which limits their participation and inputs;
- (6) Altered public questions to omit key points of concern without permission, then claimed its modified versions were Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs); and
- (7) Tried to force public input through the Questionnaire on its Web site where it can control information; and encourage decision-makers to trust a site scoring team that is weighted with people who support its agenda.

Most people would not use terms like, "honesty, fairness, absence of intent to defraud, act maliciously, or take unfair advantage" to describe such a pattern of behavior. In the Letter of Intent, the TCPUD promised to "act in good faith"; but the above indicate this may not be the case for all parties, and raises extremely serious credibility questions.

Alex Lesser

From: harry taylor [harrytaylor58@hotmail.com]

March 13, 2017 9:31 PM

To: schillinglodge@tahoexc.org; Cindy Gustafson

Subject: Schilling lodge To: schillinglodge@tahoexc.org Cc cindyg@tcpud.org Re: Schilling Lodge I am a resident of Dollar Point and a user of the Highlands Park on a fairly regular basis. I am writing directly to you via email rather than using the web form, because I am not sure where the web form ends up. I am keen to see the TCPUD work for and with its District voters, and the wider regional community, including me. What is your current address or neighborhood? Dollar Point Check all that apply to you: Part-time resident yes Cross-country skier yes Hiker yes Mountain biker yes Would you like to stay informed? No Email address: harrytaylor58@hotmail.com Please circle your preferred location Option A What positive attributes does your preferred site have? Closest to highway 28, minimizes traffic impact Minimum environmental impact. Will be lower costs than sites requiring new roads. Keep everyone's taxes and rates down. Reduces traffic risks to schoolchildren in the area All the existing residents are used to it being there, so best place for it What are its potential downfalls? None .
Regards, Harry Taylor

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

March 14, 2017 5:47:31 AM

To: Cindy Gustafson; Terri Viehmann

Cc: schillinglodge@tahoexc.org

Subject: TCCSEA annual public meetings not held to date

I76-13
cont.

Cindy/Terri Afternoon. I understand that under the current lease agreement with TCPUD and TCCSEA, annual review meetings should have been held to alleviate original public concerns over previous concessionaires, yet these have not been carried out to date. The problem with this is that had they been held annually as in the agreement, public knowledge and input about this Schilling Lodge would be far more extensive. Our neighbour across the road who is a 2nd homeowner on Polaris had absolutely no idea about the public workshops or the website. I would say this is because he is not a TXC member. The level of communication has not been sufficient to reach enough of the general public. If the structured annual meetings had been carried out, perhaps this would have proved more informative. So what happens now considering this part of your agreement has not happened? Is this considered a breach?
Kind regards, Debbie White

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

March 14, 2017 8:34:30 AM

To: Cindy Gustafson; Terri Viehmann; schillinglodge@tahoexc.org

Subject: Schilling Lodge

Hi Cindy and Terri It has been brought to my attention that the annual review meetings should have been held in accordance with the current lease agreement with the TCPUD and TCCSEA. It appears that these have not been carried out to date. Had such meetings been held, the general public knowledge and subsequent input about the Schilling Lodge would perhaps have been much greater. In fact it is quite clear that some of our neighbours on Polaris remain oblivious to such workshops and/or the website. This may be because they are not a cross country member but it is quite clear that there has not been sufficient communication in order to meet the general public. Surely such meetings would have avoided this scenario. Why were these meetings not carried out?

Kind regards, Paul

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

March 14, 2017 9:00:41 AM

To: Cindy Gustafson; Terri Viehmann; schillinglodge@tahoexc.org

Subject: Schilling Lodge score card - my input Attachments: DW, Schilling Lodge score card table, 140317.pdf Cindy/Terri Please find attached my input for the scoring system that I would like to be used as part of the evaluation process considering I cannot make any public workshop.

Thank you, Debbie White

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

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

March 14, 2017

Due to the fact I am not in Tahoe at present so don’t have the opportunity to attend the workshops, here is my input relating to each criteria that has generated a score card being used to establish the most suitable site for this lodge. My comments below are in red italics and they indicate my input for each point. If they are blank, I have no comment.

I76-13
cont.

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

From: Ivona Bergendiova [bivonka@gmail.com]

March 14, 2017 9:08 AM

To: schillinglodge@tahoexc.org Cc: Cindy Gustafson

Subject: Schilling Lodge I am a resident of Tahoe Donner and a user of the Highlands Park for occasional X-country, and I have frequently used it for hiking in the summer. I am writing to you directly because we discussed this topic with our friends how the public process is not working fairly. My friends and local residents are disappointed and upset due to secrecy and no transparency of this project. Here are my comments per the form. What is your current address or neighborhood? Tahoe Donner Check all that apply to you: TXC day ticket buyer Full-time resident Cross-country skier Would you like to stay informed? Yes bivonka@gmail.com Please circle your preferred location Option A What positive attributes does your preferred site have? I like the side where it has always been. Minimum environmental impact/environmentally friendly Closest to highway 28 minimizes traffic impact Being away from High School to reduce risk to schoolchildren What are its potential downfalls? None

Regards, Ivona Bergendiova Resident

From: Ivona Bergendiova [bivonka@icloud.com]

March 14, 2017 9:13 AM

To: schillinglodge@tahoexc.org Cc: Cindy Gustafson Subject: Schilling Lodge I am writing to you directly because I have heard from friends how the public process is not working fairly. After long discussion and presented information we are concerned. I am a resident of Tahoe Donner and a user of the Highlands Park for occasional X-country, and I have frequently used it for hiking in the summer. I enjoy peaceful and quiet area. Here are my comments per the form. Current neighborhood: Tahoe Donner. TXC day ticket buyer Full-time resident. Cross-country skier Email address bivonka@icloud.com Please circle your preferred location Option A Positive attributes of your preferred site have: Best site – keep it where it has always been Minimum environmental impact and is environmentally friendly Closest to highway 28, so minimizes traffic impact Reduces risks to schoolchildren What are its potential downfalls? None

Regards, Ivona B. Kojnok

From: Roman Kojnok [romanlaketahoe@gmail.com]

March 14, 2017 9:20 AM

To: schillinglodge@tahoexc.org, Cc: Cindy Gustafson

Subject: Proposed Schilling Lodge

I am a resident of Truckee and a user of the Highlands Park for occasional X-country and snowshoeing in winter, and for hiking and biking in the summer. I am writing to you via email rather than using the web form, because I do not trust that the web form entry will find its way to you after what I have heard of the process. I am keen to see the TCPUD work for and respect the wishes of its District voters and the wider regional community, including me. Current neighborhood: Tahoe Donner. TXC day ticket buyer. Full-time

I76-13
cont.

resident, Cross-country skier/snowshoer. Email address romanlaketahoe@gmail.com
 Your preferred location Option A What positive attributes does your preferred site have?
 I think these are obvious, but they include Closest to highway 28, so minimizes traffic
 impact Minimum environmental impact/environmentally friendly Will be lower costs
 than sites requiring new roads. Let's keep everyone's taxes and rates down. Reduces
 traffic risks to schoolchildren in the area All the existing residents are used to I being
 there What are its potential downfalls? None
 Regards, Roman Kojnok

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

March 14, 2017 10:27:28 AM

To: Cindy Gustafson; Terri Viehmann; schillinglodge@tahoexc.org; Terri Viehmann;
 schillinglodge@tahoexc.org

Subject: Schilling lodge annual meetings

Dear Cindy and Terri Following my email concerning a lack of annual meetings, I have
 several other points I would like to raise concerning the Schilling Lodge construction.

What should be a democratic process is evidently flawed in numerous ways. Holding
 workshops to gather public opinion and encourage discussion is meaningless if people are
 then simply told at said workshops that the lodge is (quote) "a done deal and it will be
 going by the school" and displayed the scores showing the school site to be the best
 location. Furthermore, the questionnaires on the website do not contain the score cards
 criteria which beggars the questions how the current total scores have been calculated?
 These results are supposed to be collected and reviewed before being presented so why
 have you been broadcasting them throughout the process?

There is also the issue of the scoring which I believe to be completely misleading in
 having 1 as the preferential option. Surely the higher the score should be the more
 suitable the site? You have provided no reasoning for how they have been scored, as if
 we are simply supposed to accept the given score without any explanation. I would
 appreciate a more thorough explanation or for the criteria to be published.

As someone who is not in Tahoe during the winter how am I supposed to contribute to
 the process? I do not consider the website as sufficient in its content or information or as
 a way to interact with the project. Moreover there is no way for me to offer my opinion as
 I cannot attend the workshops to join the discussion. I am going to have to answer the
 questions in an email in order to fully offer my thoughts on the questions, as personally I
 do not think that simply giving a number out of 5 is satisfactory as feedback.

Finally I feel strongly that a TCPUD member should be managing the process in a neutral
 manner. I know that many locals do not wish to speak out for fear of bias or future
 repercussion as they know TC people well. This process is being done in a way to
 exclude as many as possible, personally I will not be in Tahoe in the winter, I do not hold
 XC membership nor a pass. Why is it relevant how many people there are in my family? I
 hope you will take what I have written on board and seriously reconsider the manner in
 which this project is being undertaken.

I76-13
 cont.

Kind Regards, Paul

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

March 14, 2017 11:16:54 AM

To: Cindy Gustafson; Terri Viehmann; schillinglodge@tahoexc.org

Subject: Score card feedback

Dear Cindy and Terri Please find attached a copy of the Schilling Lodge score card that I have entered my feedback onto. I hope these comments will be taken into consideration Due to the fact I am not in Tahoe at present so don't have the opportunity to attend the workshops. Here is my input relating to each criteria that has generated a score card being used to establish the most suitable site for this lodge.

Regards, Paul

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

From: Val Service - Phill Robinson

March 14, 2017 11:58:10 AM

To: Cindy Gustafson; Terri Viehmann

Subject: Schilling Lodge, Highlands

Cindy Afternoon. I am a regular visitor to Tahoe and have been for 18 years. I spend my time enjoying the trails in the Highlands hence writing to you about the proposed Schilling Lodge Project. I know the Lodge has its own website and questionnaire but I prefer to email you directly to ensure my comments are noted. I have been doing my homework and it is widely known that the preferred site for the new lodge (that will be 7200 sq ft and not the original 4000 sq ft that was donated) will be on Polaris Road.

I strongly believe the most sensible solution is to construct the donated lodge of 4000 sq ft at the original site referred to as Option A. This will minimise major disruption and upheaval within the area. It will also reduce environmental impact, traffic issues, impact on the community and cost. There is no need to undertake such a drastic and damaging project when the current site works. Option A gives a known identity close to the highway, allowing the construction of the lodge to take place in the quiet, off peak times (summer) to provide a new and improved current facility. As far as I see, there are no potential pitfalls to retaining the site and improving the current facility. There is so much I could say but I'm not sure how far to go. If you would like any further input from me I would appreciate hearing from you.

Thank you for your time., Phill Robinson.

From: Kerry McGillivray

March 14, 2017 at 5:21:37 PM

To: Cindy Gustafson

Subject: Schilling Lodge score card tables attached.

Hi Cindy The Schilling scorecard has been circulated so I have commented where appropriate for a local residents perspective.

Regards, Kerry McGillivray

I76-13
cont.