Snippets about Lake Tahoe



• South Lake Tahoe is having a meeting about the Harrison Avenue project on April 24 from 6-8pm at the senior center.

• Lake Tahoe South Shore Chamber of Commerce is hosting a Health and Wellness Roundtable on April 30 at noon at the agency's conference room in Stateline. Bring lunch, dessert and beverages will be provided. The event is free.

• Five Pleasant Valley wineries (Auriga, Holly's Hill, Miraflores, Narrow Gate, Sierra Vista) will host Rocks & Rhones on May 24-25 from 11am-4pm. Tickets are $30 before May 1, $35 after that or $40 at the door. For more info, go online.

• Tahoe Mountain Sports contributed more than $10,000 to multiple local nonprofits in 2013.

• Rob Weizer is now the head golf pro at Tahoe Donner Golf Course.

Climber rescued from Lover's Leap

By Cathy Locke, Sacramento Bee

Helicopter crews with the California Highway Patrol's Valley Division were kept busy Friday, rescuing a man who had fallen

from a cliff in El Dorado County in the morning and helping recover the body of a drowning victim in Nevada County in the afternoon.

About 10am, a helicopter crew responded to a request by the El Dorado County search and rescue team to assist a 20-year-old man who had fallen from a cliff at Lover's Leap, near Strawberry. The area is popular with rock climbers.

The man was climbing when he slipped and fell approximately 50 feet, striking a ledge. He then fell an additional 50 feet until his climbing rope broke his fall, CHP officials said.

Because of the severity of his injuries, the man was flown to Renown Medical Center in Reno, where he was admitted, the CHP reported.

Read the whole story

Then and now: Al Tahoe Market



Al Tahoe Market
Photo/Lake Tahoe Historical Society

This building fronting Highway 50 and Harrison Avenue in Al Tahoe was owned by Frank Globin from the 1920s. It included a

gas station, grocery store, bar and restaurant, and a U.S. Post Office.

It also featured hotel rooms upstairs.



The building today. Photo/Bill Kingman

A fire in the spring of 1956 destroyed most of the building, but surviving today is its historic south end with the classic stone chimney, steep roof, and a basement (unique in Tahoe).

It has housed Rojo's Tavern since the mid-1970s. Previously, it was named Felix's.

– Bill Kingman

Gyll: 'The department is in a tailspin'



Michael T. Gyll

Publisher's note: ***Lake Tahoe News asked the three Douglas County sheriff's candidates a series of questions. The responses are running in the order they were received. All but one question is the same.***

Name: Michael T. Gyll

Age: 44

Occupation: Retired Nevada state police officer, Nevada Department of Public Safety, investigation division, headquarters commander.

What groups, nonprofits, other civic involvement are you part of outside of work?: Douglas County Parks and Recreation coach, Carson Valley Little League, National Rifle Association, Veterans Administration.

In Tahoe during the morning commute there are often multiple deputies out on Highway 50. How is enforcing speed the best use of limited resources?: Having patrols on the streets during commute hours is not just about enforcing speed limits. Officer presence is a deterrent. Those citizens who would not normally drive erratically, or push their driving abilities and their vehicle's abilities are much more likely to do so during commute hours due to being late for work or that always important meeting. When citizens drive beyond their ability they become a serious hazard to those who have planned their day accordingly. During commute hours vehicle crimes are not

the only crimes that occur. Having deputies patrolling the highways also puts them in areas which would reduce response time to calls for service because they are already mobile and in the area.

When the South Shore is busy rental units often have so many vehicles they spillover onto the streets to create a problem for locals and pose a safety issue. Currently, nothing is being done about this issue. What do you think should be done to address this ongoing issue?: Discussion/awareness town hall meeting with property managers and/or owners about the issue. Having grown up in South Lake Tahoe I understand the need for tourism and the effects it has on "locals" daily routines and lifestyles. The challenge is this; how do we create an environment that is safe and effective for visitors and locals while continuing to thrive as a tourist destination. When emergency response is hampered because of this issue, immediate and swift response should occur. If it is a nuisance issue, then discussion, time and understanding will have to be sought by all parties involved. If a solution or compromise is not realized then enforcement should take place. But all attempts to remedy the situation should be attempted prior to contacting law enforcement. To have law enforcement respond to non-emergency issues pertaining to parking would not be the "best use of limited resources."

Do you believe it's better for the head of a law enforcement agency to come from inside or outside the department? Why?: There are pros and cons to both. Pros could be the fact that the person has intimate knowledge of the department's capabilities, personnel issues, department resources, etc. The cons are a high potential for "good ol boy" or nepotism scenarios. This is always an issue with smaller departments. There is also the issue of "If it's not broke, don't fix it" attitude. This attitude comes from individuals who have no vision for the department or community. Just because something works, does that mean it's the right or only way of conducting

business? No. Just because it has been working for the last 16 years does that mean it works for law enforcement in the 21st century? No. Lack of vision and a status quo attitude will not survive in the arena that current issues have with law enforcement. An insider that lacks vision will cause a department to fall further and further behind. An outsider will bring new perspective, a fresh set of eyes and enhance the department's capabilities. You have a lot of qualified personnel within these types of departments that find it hard to advance because of the negative issues described. An outsider will eliminate roadblocks to a qualified person's advancement by having that fresh perspective.

Why do you want to be sheriff?: I believe in this community and love the county I reside in. I have a lot of friends and acquaintances that call Douglas County home and have their business here as well. So when I retired from the state of Nevada, I became more active with those acquaintances and was overwhelmed with the lack of trust they had in their sheriff's department. Most sited bad experiences with the administration. As time went on, discussions were had about what can be done, then it happened, they started asking me about the possibility of running for sheriff. I continually dismissed their advances until one night at the father-daughter dance I found myself surrounded. I wasn't able to dance a single dance with my daughter. That night I thought about what had happened and wondered if there was any thing I could really do. I discussed it with my family, weighing the pros and cons and we decided that since we had so many friends at the sheriff's department and in the communities that my running for sheriff might be the right thing to. It's our community, our friends, our children's future, why not be the loyal resident and invest in our community? That's when I knew it was right and just and that this is what is needed for all.

Why should someone vote for you over someone else?: I have the training, experience and knowledge to move the Douglas County

Sheriff's Department forward in a new direction. With a fresh set of eyes and a new perspective, the sheriff's department will find harmony with the changing demographics Douglas County is experiencing. For far too long the sheriff's department has been steered into the 21st century with 20th century administrative views. With my experience, I can offer the deputies an opportunity to enhance their skills and abilities far beyond their current allowable limits. As for the citizens and communities that make up Douglas County and are served by the sheriff's department, I offer strength and vision as an administrator that has not been realized by an administrator for the sheriff's department in at least 16 years. I started my career as a state trooper, through training, hard work and determination, I was promoted and transferred to the investigation division. I have conducted and/ or supervised many investigations which involve, but are not limited to: illegal/ illicit dangerous drug crimes, officer involved shootings, murder/ homicide, suicide, crimes against children and the elderly, and crimes against public trust. I have supervised sworn police officers and civilian employees, I have had the privilege of hiring well-qualified personnel, and relieving personnel of their duties using progressives steps in discipline which had included termination of service. I have the experience, knowledge and loyalty that the citizens of Douglas County deserve.

What is your stand on medical marijuana?: I believe that the path has been paved for the formal acknowledgment that medical/medicinal marijuana is here to stay. I believe the actual use of marijuana for the treatment of aches and pains is not justified. But I do believe the use of marijuana to enhance appetite and healing for cancer patients is warranted. If it is proven to help with treatment and it was my loved one, I would condone its use.

What kind of enforcement issue would that present for the department?: Medical marijuana is currently lawful in the

state of Nevada. Enforcement is already being addressed and implemented for some time.

What do you believe is needed for a good relationship between the sheriff's department and county commissioners?: Open door access and complete transparency. There should not be administrative secrets between the sheriff and county commissioners. We should all be working to the same common goal, safety for our citizens and visitors to Douglas County. This can be achieved by open and frank communication. Barriers such as egos and personal agendas have no place in the Sheriffs administration.

If the commissioners cut your budget by 10 percent, what program or people would you cut? Please be specific.: None. First of all a 10 percent budget cut is unrealistic. If any cuts to the budget are made, I would reallocate resources, seek additional funding through OCJA and ensure that prevention, enforcement and presence in not diminished.

What is your relationship with businesses at Lake Tahoe that work with the sheriff's department on various events? If anything, what would you consider changing?: I would have to decline this answer due to the fact venues are always changing and effecting Lake Tahoe differently each and every time. I must take a fluid stance and let it be known that every venue in Douglas County will be carefully scrutinized to ensure the safety of all who attend and/ or participate.

The sheriff's department has always refused to make the New Year's Eve celebration at Stateline a sanctioned or permitted event. The casinos have asked for this and have wanted to expand the festivities, but DCSO says no. Do you believe this is a good policy? Why or why not? And how would you address it?: For those of us who remember the '80s and '90s celebrations, I believe New Year's should have been a sanctioned or permitted event. But today's attendance numbers and the economy the way it is, it would be difficult to

justify the additional expenses and personnel costs. If the casinos wanted to expand, where would they expand to? I think the enhanced outdoor venues during spring, summer and fall should give county commissioners an excellent perspective as to what would one additional venue really matter. If the county commissioners and the residents want to move forward and look at sanctioning or permitting the event, then I to would be willing to readdress the issue. If you stand back and watch, a lot of what happens at Lake Tahoe should be addressed during the 4th of July arguments that are up coming.

The sheriff is a political position, something you don't have experience with as a trooper with the NHP. What do you see as your biggest challenge and how will you overcome it?: First of all, I started my law enforcement career as a state trooper employed by the Nevada Department of Public Safety, Highway Patrol Division. After working hard to attain all that I could as a state trooper, I promoted to the rank of detective and was transferred to the investigation division which is still under the Nevada Department of Public Safety. After a time of working undercover as a narcotics detective, I was promoted to sergeant and was the administrative and operational supervisor. I was charged with the coordination of a local task force which consisted of state detectives, detectives from three counties, agents from DEA, and agents from the Office of the Military and a traveling narcotic task force which was staffed with state detectives and assisted any of the 17 counties in the state of Nevada with trouble areas that a local detective or team would be unable to accomplish enforcement activities. I was responsible for the budgets, grants, training, equipping and evaluation of all personnel and responsible for all operational issues. I was then promoted to lieutenant and headquarters commander for the investigation division. I directly supervised two multi-agency task forces, the major crimes unit, the polygraph examiners unit, the Nevada Threat Analysis Center, administrative personnel assigned to headquarters, NTAC and Fallon. I was

responsible for statewide budget as it pertained to training, travel, vehicle procurement, supply procurement, uniforms, salaries, fringe benefits and emergency deployments and/ or events such as air race crashes, floods, fires, active shooter incidents or any requests from other federal, state, local or municipal law enforcement agencies. So I know I have the experience, training, knowledge, demeanor and loyalty it takes to be the sheriff of Douglas County. I know I have the skills and abilities to perform those duties of the Douglas County sheriff. I have the political experience and more to be a very effective Douglas County sheriff. Task forces and threat analysis centers are very political and are watched closely from the executive branch of Nevada government.

Douglas County sheriff's deputies make less than South Lake Tahoe police officers and El Dorado County sheriff's deputies. Does this hamper efforts to recruit employees? Do you believe deputies should be paid more? Why or why not? If yes, how would you go about getting them more money?: Of course I believe deputies should be paid more. When you are looking for a professional position as a deputy pay is only one part of the deciding factor to work or don't work for a specific agency. If all you wanted was higher wages, you would move to Las Vegas and work for Metro or Henderson. But if you want quality of life for you and your family and know that you are being paid well for the work you are doing and can wake every morning, look out your windows and see the majesty in front you being the Sierra Nevada, Carson Valley and Lake Tahoe, then the reduced pay is worth it. When elected sheriff I will of course lobby the county commissioners for better pay and work with the association to ensure my employees don't fall further behind in regards to pay and benefits. As for your comparisons, SLTPD and EDSO, it's apples and oranges, California and Nevada, but when you compare salaries to other Northern Nevada counties, Douglas County deputy wages are comparable.

What is lacking in the department right now in terms of personnel or equipment or other resources? How would you address those needs?: Douglas County Sheriff's Department with regards to personnel and equipment is as always lacking personnel. Equipment is always attainable, but qualified applicants are not. The department could stand to increase its number of sworn personnel, but that all hinges on the economy and county commissioners. As for other resources, well, we are professional law enforcement officers, we always want the newest and greatest tools to perform our duties, and wish we had resources available to us like major metropolitan police departments.

What do you think is the biggest issue facing Douglas County Sheriff's Office and how do you plan to resolve it?: Morale. The department is in a tailspin and the administration thinks it is fine so long as the administration can keep quiet the masses. The first issue I will broach is the morale issue and I will do this using peer and supervisor evaluation and review methods. If I was to start at the top, all I might get is smoke and mirrors and never get the core of the problem. I have found through my years of supervisory experience that most often the view of a suspected problem is less hazy and very real if you look at it from the line level personnel perspective. This goes along with my "new perspective, fresh set of eyes" platform. It's time that deputies are again proud of not only the profession they have chosen, but the department they have chosen to work for.

What is one do-over you would like to have in terms of a professional decision you have made?: I would have become a fireman.

Tell us something about yourself that people might not already know?: I was raised between Lake Tahoe and Placerville. My father was an El Dorado County deputy sheriff and my mother worked for the casinos. I went to Meyers Elementary, Sierra House Elementary, Pinewood Elementary, and graduated from

South Tahoe High School.

Editorial: Orcas would pay the price if SeaWorld show banned

Publisher's note: ***This editorial from the April 8, 2014, Sacramento Bee.***

It would be a shame if there were no more Shamu shows – and not just for humans.

If the animal advocacy groups supporting proposed legislation to ban orcas in captivity have their way, orca shows at SeaWorld would be shut down permanently. But don't believe that it will be a "Free Willy" ending; a ban could do real harm to the very animals it seeks to protect.

Assembly Bill 2140 by Assemblyman Richard Bloom, D-Santa Monica, would amend the California Fish and Game Code to prohibit orcas from being used for entertainment purposes and from breeding in captivity. Only one place in California has orca shows and breeds them – SeaWorld in San Diego.

This is bad legislation for a number or reasons, beginning with the fact that the state Legislature isn't the body that ought to be deciding if marine mammals should be held in captivity.

Read the whole story

Barton accepting health grant applications

Barton Health has $25,000 to give out in grants to organizations that help the underserved populations and have a lasting impact on the community's well-being.

Barton Health will fund programs that address South Lake Tahoe community's most pressing health needs – substance abuse, access to healthcare and mental health.

The objective is to fund projects that serve a large portion of the South Shore community. In past grant cycles, between five and ten organizations were selected.

The deadline to apply is June 27. Grantees will be notified in September and grants will be awarded at the National Philanthropy Day celebration on Nov. 7.

Funding for Barton Health Grants is provided by Barton Health through donations from the Barton Foundation.

Grant applications and details are available online.

For more information, contact Kindle Craig at 530.543.5612.

Search does not turn up body

at Cascade Lake

After hours of searching, the El Dorado County search and rescue team did not find a body at Cascade Lake.

A hiker on April 9 had told deputies she had seen a body floating in Cascade Lake. She had been hiking near the shoreline on the north east portion of Cascade Lake. She said that the body floated up toward the surface of the water and then sank back down and went out of view. The hiker returned to the lake and directed a deputy to the exact location of the sighting.

The department does not have any reports of missing or lost persons in the vicinity of Cascade Lake.

The dive team and CalStar could not locate a body.

– Lake Tahoe News staff report

Rafting season could evaporate quickly

By Paul McHugh, Sacramento Bee

California boasts some of our globe's hardest-working water. It flows off ski slopes, rolls past wildlife habitats, tumbles into reservoirs, then gushes through pipes and turbines, sprinklers and faucets. En route – particularly in a drought year – water managers horde every drop they can capture, and parcel it out according to an elaborate rubric of contracts

and agreements.

Thanks to that essential arrangement, northern and central portions of the state will score a whitewater recreation season that will be surprisingly long and robust, but only on dam-controlled rivers such as the Klamath, Trinity, and south and middle forks of the American and the Tuolumne.

On popular free-flowing rivers, such as the Kings, Merced and California Salmon, would-be rafters and kayakers should look online to study flows and weather, talk to outfitters, and stay poised and ready to leap onto these streams in April and May. Once their thin snowpacks melt and flow down the canyons, they'll be done.

So much for the general whitewater season profile.

Read the whole story

Opinion: Ski area concerned about Squaw's incorporation

Publisher's note: ***This letter was submitted to Placer County LAFCO Executive Officer Kristina Berry and is reprinted with permission.***

Dear Ms. Berry:

I am writing on behalf of Squaw Valley Ski Holdings, LLC ("Squaw Valley") as an interested party with respect to the Olympic Valley Incorporation proposal ("The IOV Proposal"), which is presently pending review with Placer County Local Agency Formation Commission ("LAFCO"). California Government Code Section 56668(m) provides that "any information or

comments from the landowner or owners, or voters, or residents of the affected territory" shall be considered by LAFCO in the review of an incorporation proposal. Section 56375 also provides that LAFCO shall have the power to "review and approve with or without amendment, wholly, partially, or conditionally, or disapprove proposals for changes of organization or reorganization, consistent with written policies, procedures, and guidelines adopted by the commission."



Andy Wirth

In light of this discretion provided to LAFCO in reviewing proposals for incorporation, Squaw Valley urges LAFCO to carefully review the IOV Proposal and any evidence offered in support or against the IOV Proposal throughout the incorporation process, with special emphasis on the economic issues that the new city proposed would face. Given the evidence that is currently available, we are deeply concerned as to the viability of the IOV Proposal. Squaw Valley urges LAFCO in its review of this matter to also consider amended incorporation boundaries that exclude Squaw Valley.

Squaw Valley first opened in 1949. For over 60 years, Squaw Valley has been one the anchors of the community, and today is, by far, the region's largest landowner, employer and economic driver. A few statistics may be helpful:

• Squaw Valley owns 2,300 acres, nearly 40% of the size of the proposed new city

• During peak season, we employ well over 2,000 people and

attract over 350,000 guests each year

• We pay approximately $1 million annually in property taxes

• We collect over $1.3 million in sales taxes annually

• We collect over $700,000 in transient occupancy tax (“TOT”) annually

• The aquifer that supplies water to all valley residents is located largely within land owned by Squaw Valley

• In the last three years alone, Squaw Valley has invested over $35 million directly into on mountain and village improvements

At Squaw Valley, we cherish our history and our place in the community. Unlike many ski areas that adopted the names of existing towns – Vail, Aspen, Sun Valley, Telluride to name but a few – Olympic Valley effectively was created through Squaw Valley’s hosting of the 1960 Winter Olympics. However, much has changed both in the greater Placer County area and in the ski industry over the last 60 years. Whether it is investment in infrastructure – such as roads and bridges, water and sewer systems, or schools – or private development improvements, a community must continually re-invest to meet the needs of its citizens. This is certainly true for a business such as Squaw Valley. The improvements that were in place at Squaw Valley when it hosted the 1960 Winter Olympics would not be sufficient to allow Squaw Valley to survive today. Squaw Valley must be able to invest to be competitive with an ever changing landscape. Investments by Squaw Valley benefit the entire community through new jobs, new taxes and new amenities for all to enjoy.

The need for investment is especially evident as shown by the stresses borne by Squaw Valley and the greater community over the last several winter seasons resulting from the poor snowfall. Far removed from the summer activities at Lake

Tahoe, the success of Squaw Valley today is virtually entirely dependent on the period from December through March. Squaw Valley invested millions of dollars in on-mountain improvements over the last few years. Had we not done so, it is quite likely this year that the mountain would not have opened until well after the Christmas holiday season, would have had much more limited terrain available when opened, and ultimately would have been forced to close earlier. Such a scenario would have resulted in lost jobs and decreased tax revenue. In order for us to serve our current guests and employees and to diversify so as to not be solely reliant on either winter or on mountain activities, additional development at Squaw Valley – well planned and fully vetted through the County's processes – needs to occur. However, if the IOV Proposal that is presently before LAFCO were to be successful, we believe its effect on Squaw Valley could be so negative that it would threaten our ability to undertake future investments.

Squaw Valley would provide the single largest source of revenue to the proposed new city, and the rhetoric that has been employed by the IOV proponents has been troubling. Although the proponents' public relations efforts assert that the incorporation campaign is entirely a local endeavor, this is in fact not the case. The proponents have had to resort to "crowd funding" from individuals and groups who are not residents of the proposed city in an attempt to gain the funds necessary for their efforts. This raises concerns that the incorporation effort is not truly representative of the community, as well as being under-funded. To date, just 159 registered voters of the proposed new city (which is less than 1% of the registered voters in Placer County) have come out in support of the IOV Proposal by signing a petition to proceed with the proposal. In addition, the community of Alpine Meadows rejected the proponents' efforts to include it within the proposed city.

Incorporation proponents have also made promises about improving roads, increasing snow removal and providing other services, but have failed to provide any substantial analysis showing that a new city could even match the level of services already provided by Placer County. They have presented very little information as to financial viability of a new city, and have disclosed none of the unintended consequences that will flow from incorporation that have not been well thought out. If the IOV Proposal leads to incorporation, tax revenue that would otherwise benefit all of Placer County would flow to a city covering a number of square miles but containing, as we understand only 538 registered voters. We believe that this revenue will be insufficient to support a viable city, and that removing it from Placer County will deprive both Olympic Valley and the greater Placer County of economies of scale and much needed dollars to fund services and improvements that benefit all of us.

There are approximately 7,500 homeowners (property owners, time share owners and/or part time residents) within the boundaries of the proposed incorporation who are not residents for voting purposes of the proposed city and thus do not have the ability to vote on the IOV Proposal. These “non-represented” homeowners are approximately 13 times greater in number than those entitled to vote on the IOV Proposal. In addition, Squaw Valley, despite being the owner of roughly 2,300 acres or 40% of the proposed city, also has no vote in the election because it is not a “registered voter.” This is a highly unusual situation for an incorporation effort. LAFCO therefore must provide particularly careful analysis of the proposed city’s likely viability.

The rhetoric that has characterized the incorporation effort by IOV casts serious doubt on whether the financial viability of the proposed new city is first and foremost in the minds of the proponents. Various news articles show that the predominant justification advanced for the IOV Proposal has

been the proponents' opposition to development within the valley, particularly that proposed for Squaw Valley. As one proponent succinctly put it at a meeting on November 13, 2013, the purpose of the IOV proposal is to "bring KSL to their knees. " At one point, the Incorporate Olympic Valley website read that their goal was to "delay development [at Squaw Valley] by at least seven years." It has been further reported that the purpose of the IOV Proposal meetings was to determine whether Olympic Valley and Alpine Meadows could "form a new city as a way to exert control over the outcome of KSL Capital Partners' plans to expand the Squaw Valley Village." At one meeting, Peter Schweitzer, an IOV Proposal proponent, presented the reasons for seeking a new city, one of which was for the newly formed city to stop or change development that was already underway. Schweitzer further indicated that the year and a half to three year period of the incorporation process left "plenty of time to impact the [Squaw Valley] village expansion project, especially if it gets tied up in court."

Another cited objective behind the IOV Proposal, as reflected in numerous media articles, is control of tax revenue (as well as of land use and development). However, "control of tax revenue" in a setting in which the new city has inadequate financial resources raises significant issues. Based on the statements of IOV proponents referenced above, we believe it is probable that, in such a setting, a new city motivated by the objectives of the IOV proponents would seek to impose higher taxes and fees for services on Squaw Valley with the intent both to supplement inadequate city finances and to restrict existing and proposed future operations. In such a scenario, we would then likely be forced to significantly increase the annual cost of services, whether in the form of ticket prices, season passes, or members' locker fees, and begin charging for parking to create off-setting revenue sources to pay for these tax increases. These steps could impact members' locker room and free parking, which are highly

valued “local” benefits for residents both inside and outside the new proposed city boundary.

The IOV Proposal is based on two exceedingly important assumptions. First, the IOV Proposal assumes that if incorporation is successful, Squaw Valley will continue to be competitive in the market place and will provide rising revenues annually to fund operations of the new city. Second, the IOV Proposal seems to assume that any development which does proceed at Squaw Valley will automatically be economically successful. Each of these assumptions could easily be wrong, based on a variety of factors. If development that is necessary to keep Squaw Valley competitive is restricted, or if weather, economic factors, or the new city’s failure to invest in public infrastructure or services serve to depress profitability, this will likely leave the new city without sufficient funds to be self-supporting. It cannot be denied that the success of a new city as proposed is inextricably linked to and dependent on the success of Squaw Valley.

Regardless of any new development at Squaw Valley, business owners and other taxpayers in the valley will also likely be faced with higher taxes and fees because the IOV Proposal proponents have not considered all costs that will be required for a new city. These include but are not limited to preparation of a General Plan and the associated and required environmental impact report, provision of planning and other administrative services, and providing for the city’s fair share of affordable housing requirements under State law. The incorporation proponents seem to believe that virtually all municipal services can be contracted out to others to provide, which is manifestly not the case. If additional services and planning needs and necessary administrative staff are not provided, the city will not be able to meet its basic public service obligations. In this scenario, badly needed improvements to amenities and lodging for guests and employees

at Squaw Valley could well become infeasible. Placer County would be irreparably harmed, since a weakened Squaw Valley would harm not only us but also our employees, the overall economy of the region, and the residents of Placer County as a whole.

Another important tax issue relates to the shifting of tax revenues from Placer County to the new city, especially with respect to TOT and resulting legacy costs. Any Revenue Neutrality Agreement will require that incorporation be revenue-neutral as to Placer County. We anticipate that the County's loss of TOT and other revenues through the incorporation will certainly require that Placer County continue to receive a portion of the tax revenues brought in by the proposed city. We believe that, in such a setting, the proposed city will likely face serious pressure to either raise taxes or reduce levels of service provided to residents. The consequences of reduced TOT tax funds in Placer Country will also harm development, business and the quality of life in the entire region.

We also have concerns with respect to water supply resources within the valley in the event of incorporation. Pursuant to Government Code Section 56668, in its review process LAFCO must consider the timely availability of water supplies adequate for projected needs. Squaw Valley is an overlying landowner in the groundwater basin from which a large portion of the valley's water supply is drawn. Squaw Valley's lodging and business needs, environmental requirements, and snowmaking capacity are all dependent on water availability. If the new city were to seek to restrict water availability to Squaw Valley, this could force Squaw Valley to form a third water service provider (a mutual water company) in the valley to insure water will be delivered for future demand. Any such restrictions on water availability could also impact users outside the boundaries of the city.

What will be the result of this potential incorporation? We

fear that higher taxes and reduced levels of service will result. Placer County will be deprived of tax revenue which could be used to fund services and improvements needed within the County. What purpose will incorporation serve, if it does not provide better public services than are currently being provided by the County? Will incorporation insure that a better level of land use review for any potential development at Squaw Valley will result? We do not believe that this would be the case. Nearly three years have elapsed since our initial proposal for Squaw Valley was presented. Since that time, Squaw Valley has undertaken hundreds of meetings, large and small, and has solicited the input of the entire region as to potential new development at Squaw Valley. As a result of this extensive public outreach effort, we have modified our plans and submitted a substantially revised and downsized proposal that we believe incorporates the views of all who have participated in the process to date. It will likely take several more years before final action on this proposed development could take place and any meaningful development could occur. We believe that the County's land use review processes are more than adequate to insure that any proposed development at Squaw Valley is properly reviewed, acted upon and controlled.

Given the importance of Squaw Valley to the overall community which extends far beyond the boundaries of the newly proposed city, it is a sad commentary that neither we nor persons who own residential property in the proposed city but are registered to vote elsewhere are able to vote upon the IOV Proposal. Of course, residents of Placer County as a whole are similarly deprived of the ability to vote on an incorporation measure that could have a significant effect on them as well. We request that LAFCO include in its review of the IOV Proposal the consideration of alternate boundaries for the proposed City that would exclude Squaw Valley and the non-voting property owners from the proposed new city. This would preserve the status quo that has worked well for over 60

years. As shown in the attached map of the proposed amended boundaries, such an amendment would conform to Squaw Valley's assessment and ownership boundaries. Excluding Squaw Valley from the incorporation would not create an unincorporated island inconsistent with Placer County LAFCO Policies. Such exclusion would also prevent potential duplication of service and administrative staff responsibilities that could otherwise occur with a new city, including snow removal and overlap in staffing for the administration of ski area-related services.

In conclusion, Squaw Valley respectfully requests, should a complete application be filed for the proposed IOV incorporation and LAFCO commence its formal review of this proposal that LAFCO consider the alternative municipal boundaries recommended in this letter. Squaw Valley also respectfully requests that a thorough and well-documented Comprehensive Fiscal Analysis ("CFA") – examining both the boundaries proposed by the IOV proposal and excluding Squaw Valley – be prepared that addresses in detail the substantial organizational and fiscal problems that it seems clear the proposed new city would face. In addition to the CFA, Squaw Valley also believes that a full EIR must be prepared to study the numerous potential environmental impacts that could arise from this incorporation effort (please see the attached letters from Remy, Moose, Manley, LLP and Economic & Planning Systems, Inc.). Squaw Valley believes that a full and comprehensive study, including consideration of alternate boundaries, is the only way LAFCO can effectively consider and weigh all relevant factors as required during the incorporation review process.

We greatly appreciate LAFCO's courtesy and consideration of this matter.

Sincerely,

Andy Wirth, president and chief executive officer Squaw Valley Ski Holdings LLC

Work on Kingsbury Grade begins

Initial construction work has begun on Kingsbury Grade.

Preliminary construction work will take place on the road shoulders, with flagger controls, through April 30 during the evening from approximately 8pm-6am.

Beginning May 1 through Memorial Day weekend, Kingsbury Grade will be closed near Daggett Summit as full construction begins. During the nearly monthlong period directly prior to Memorial Day, and another monthlong period after Labor Day, Kingsbury Grade will be closed to through traffic near the summit, just east of Tramway Drive. During those times, non-residential traffic will detoured to Highway 50 to get to Lake Tahoe.

Construction will also continue during the summer months between Memorial Day and Labor Day, with Kingsbury Grade open to through traffic, but nighttime construction-related lane closures and delays to be expected. The road will be open with one lane in each direction during daytime hours, weekends and holidays through these summer months.

The approximately $15 million project will reconstruct pavement and make drainage, safety, curb and gutter, sidewalk, lighting and other improvements on areas of Kingsbury Grade from just east of Daggett Summit (Tramway Drive) to the intersection of Highway 50 at Stateline.