Letter: Camp Rich helps at Bread & Broth

To the community,

Camp Richardson Historic Resort and Marina was the Adopt A Day of Nourishment sponsor for Bread & Broth's dinner on April 7. Their generous donation fed over 85 guests and their fun and helpful sponsor crew joined with B&B crew members to pack the "giveaway" bags and then manned the serving line to greet each guest and serve the tasty roast beef dinner prepared by B&B's talented cooks.

"We are delighted to participate in Adopt A Day, said Vanessa Santora, Camp Richardson's sales, events and marketing manager.

Also helping the B&B volunteers from Camp Richardson were Lorraine Leonard, payroll supervisor; Travis Lauinger, retail manager; Gina Marie Hunt, group sales coordinator; and Charlie Gaspar, front desk manager. From the setup to the take down and cleanup of the dinner, these five energetic volunteers were happy to help as needed.

"The B&B staff is so welcoming and friendly," added Santora said. "Thank you for allowing us to give back to the community we love."

Concern and caring is the common theme that B&B's dinner sponsors demonstrate and Camp Richardson Resort and Marina and their volunteers are no exception. B&B is grateful for and thanks our caring community supporters as they feed the hungry and those in need.

Carol Gerard, Bread & Broth

Opinion: TRPA – 45 years of stewardship

By Joanne Marchetta

In this time of nature's awakening as winter once again turns to spring, another important milestone is upon us. This year marks the 45th anniversary of the formation of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency as a unique bi-state agency in the United States focused on regional environmental goals. Perhaps it is this unique jurisdiction that has at times made the agency a crucible for fiery debate and discourse over how to protect one of our nation's most treasured natural resources. Despite the heat of the crucible, significant environmental progress continues to emerge.



Joanne Marchetta

Last week, as if in cadence with the turning of the season, a federal judge ruled in the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency's favor in litigation on the 2012 Lake Tahoe Regional Plan update. In his decision, the judge stated that we had done our homework and that enacting the new plan was based on sound science. Now, we can pivot to join forces with the community to advance the next environmental leap forward and to rebuild bridges with stakeholders who questioned progressive policy

direction.

The decision, although important, is not the only cause of renewal. A broad coalition of people willing to step in and lead the Tahoe basin forward formed out of the process to update the Regional Plan. The spirit of cooperation from environmental groups, business leaders, and citizens that rose out of the plan's formation is still going strong and much-needed improvements to Lake Tahoe's regulatory framework have not stopped since its passage. Homeowners are getting a break for installing stormwater infiltration around their properties and incentives are in place for increased restoration and more walkable, bikeable town centers. Updating the plan was an important milestone since it had not been thoroughly updated since its original adoption more than a quarter century ago.

Other signs of progress and renewal are inescapable around the Lake. TRPA shares its 45th anniversary this year with the first Earth Day. The awakening of our stewardship of the environment coincides with our desire to work across political lines to develop innovative environmental policies. Over the span of decades, we were able to stop runaway growth and curb sources of pollution. Today, two-thirds of Lake Tahoe's environmental targets have been achieved or are showing improvement. We know we have more to do and, like all of you, we are spurred onward by the principles of stewardship embodied in every Earth Day.

In the next environmental leap forward, TRPA, researchers, and other water quality agencies will hone in on policies to improve near shore water quality as well as deep lake clarity. We will continue to control invasive species and maintain one of the most successful watercraft inspection programs in the nation. We will continue supporting efforts to reduce forest fuels and encouraging property owners to complete defensible space measures around their homes and raise the safety of our communities.

In each of these efforts, property owners, residents and visitors all have a part to play. The cooperation, personal action, and constructive compromise that will continue Lake Tahoe on a path to sustainability does not come from a rule book. It comes from all of you. It is my sincere hope that nature's awakening this spring enlivens and spurs you to find out what you can do to help restore Lake Tahoe and to take part.

Joanne Marchetta is executive director of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency.

Letter: Historical society not contacted about Barton Ranch

To the community,

The future of the Barton Ranch brings sadness thinking that one of the last ranches will be torn down.

I must dispute a comment that Gary Midkiff says that he called the Lake Tahoe Historical Society and offered the buildings if we would remove them.

He said this was three or four years ago. I was president of the society from 2009-2011 and I knew nothing of this. Dick Young was president from 2006-2008 and was sites chairman before. If anyone called with such an offer, we would have been thrilled.

Possibly Mr. Midkiff called the El Dorado County Historical Society. They are in Placerville and have little interest in

us.

Lynne Bajuk, Lake Tahoe Historical Society past president

Opinion: Time to be earthquake prepared

By Sam Rohn

With April recognized as national Earthquake Preparedness Month, Liberty Utilities would like to remind customers about steps they can take to ensure their safety during a natural disaster such as an earthquake.

While most of Liberty Utilities' service territory does not typically experience the magnitude of earthquakes recently seen in Southern California, it is always best to be prepared for any type of natural disaster.

Just like customers should do with their own families, Liberty prepares for potential disasters by having a plan and practicing it with our employees as well as first-responders and others in our community.

Liberty Utilities offers the following safety tips to help customers develop a disaster preparedness plan:

Before:

- Have an emergency plan and conduct drills with your family and childcare providers.
- Know how and when to turn off electricity, water and gas at the main switch or valve.
- Have an emergency supply kit that includes water, food,

a first aid kit, blankets, a supply of needed medications, a portable radio, flashlights, a battery powered mobile phone charger, fresh batteries and a crescent or adjustable pipe-type wrench for turning off gas and water mains if necessary.

- Securely anchor water heaters, heavy appliances and heavy furniture that could topple.
- Keep flammable liquids away from water heaters, furnaces, stoves and other potential ignition sources.
- Know the safe spots in each room, like under a sturdy desk or table. Remember to stay away from windows, mirrors and heavy objects that can topple over.
- Plan evacuation routes from home, work, school and other places you frequent.

During:

- If you are indoors, stay inside. Get under a sturdy desk or table.
- If you are outdoors, get into the open, away from buildings, trees, walls and power lines. Be alert for falling debris.
- If you are driving, pull to the side of the road and stop. Do not park under overpasses, power lines, light posts, trees or signs. Stay in your car until the earthquake is over.

After:

- Check for injuries and ensure that everyone is safe.
- If the power goes out, unplug major appliances to prevent possible damage when the power is turned back on. Keep a light on to let you know when power is restored.
- During a power outage, use battery-operated flashlights instead of candles due to the risk of fire. If you must use candles, keep them away from drapes, lamp shades and small children and never leave them unattended.

- Treat all downed power lines as if they are energized and extremely dangerous. Keep yourself and others away from them. Call 911, and then notify Liberty Utilities at 800.782.2506.
- If you smell or hear escaping gas, get everyone outside to a safe location away from the building and upwind where you can no longer smell natural gas. Once outside, use your phone to call 911 and your gas company (Southwest Gas at 877.860.6020 or PG&E at 800.743.5000).
- If you smell or hear gas escaping, and are able to do so safely, shut off the gas at the main gas service shutoff valve using a suitable tool like a 12 to 15 inch adjustable pipe or crescent-type wrench. The valve is normally located near your gas meter. Do not shut off the valve unless you smell or hear gas escaping.

Once you shut-off the gas, do not turn it back on. If the gas service shutoff valve is closed, contact your gas company or another qualified professional to perform a safety inspection before the gas service is restored and the appliance pilots are lit.

If you suspect a gas leak, do not use electrical switches, appliances or telephones, because sparks can ignite gas from broken lines. Do not check for a gas leak with a match or an open flame.For more safety and readiness information, visit Liberty Utilities' website.

Sam Rohn is Liberty's manager of environmental, health, safety and security.

Letter: Barton Ranch Complex important to Tahoe

To the community,

Regarding the Barton Ranch Complex article, published April 9: The Lake Tahoe Historical Society (LTHS) appreciates and thanks *Lake Tahoe News (LTN)* for bringing this story to the attention of the community. If not for the *LTN* story, this issue would have continued to rest on the back pages of another local newspaper. Our concern is that there has not been adequate time for the community to be aware of the situation, become informed of the circumstances, and have sufficient time to craft informed responses to the draft Negative Declaration the property owners prepared and submitted to the city.

As I was quoted in the article, the issue is whether the ranch will be given a fair opportunity to survive. The society recognizes the property owners' rights and agrees with a 2011 city staff report regarding the Barton Ranch Complex (BRC) that stated, "Plans for this historic ranch should be economically viable to the property owner."

The city staff report describes the historical importance of the ranch and cites various regulatory rules to be considered with regard to projects on the ranch. The report goes on to say, "Demolition of the structures associated with the Barton Ranch Complex requires review and approval of the TRPA Governing Board."

The TRPA Regional Plan and Code of Ordinances includes detailed language that describe its responsibilities to historic resources and the TRPA reviews required for the issuance of permits affecting those resources. Until the *LTN* article was published there has been no information in the

press regarding TRPA involvement in the BRC permitting and/or the draft Negative Declaration process. At what point does the TRPA become involved in BRC permitting?

The TRPA issued a permit to the property owners in 2010 to demolish two historically insignificant buildings at the rear of the ranch. In that permit, TRPA instructed the owners, “Due to its designation as historic resource, no additions, modifications or removal of any other structures located in the Barton Ranch Complex is allowed.”

It seems to us the TRPA needs to be involved in the current process.

At last year’s tourism summit, travel to historic resources was featured as a growing interest of visitors. Developing this property as a cultural resource for the community and its visitors would certainly provide a wholesome family attraction. A history center would provide a shoulder season draw for visitors looking to enjoy Tahoe’s beautiful and less crowded fall season. Perhaps the California Tahoe Conservancy (CTC) has surplus real estate it could offer the owners in trade for the ranch. The ranch property could be combined with the adjacent CTC acreage. The CTC acreage is currently proposed to become part of a greenbelt that when combined with the BRC could become a community park.

It has been asked why the LTHS waited until the last moment to get involved. The society first became aware of the owners’ intention to demolish the ranch in early December 2013 and attempted to meet with the property owners to discuss options and visit the property. The property owners received our inquiry, but declined to meet with the LTHS. The property owners have not made any recent attempts to reach out to the LTHS on this matter.

The LTHS would like to request more time and opportunities for increased community involvement to determine the future the

ranch. The society plans to prepare a response to the draft Negative Declaration to request more time to explore options. The ranch has languished in its current condition for several years; a few more months will not make a difference

The LTHS is at a great disadvantage in this situation. The LTHS has been told by the TRPA that the society is not recognized by the agency as a nominator of resources for the agency's historic resource register. The LTHS believes community support and involvement are necessary to preserve the Barton Ranch.

The society is a nonprofit organization. It relies solely on membership dues, donations, and fundraisers for financial support. The society receives no financial support from the city, county, state, or federal governments. The society is an independent entity and not a part of the larger El Dorado County Historical Society. The business of the society and activities at the museum are performed by a very small group of dedicated and active volunteers.

There are sources of funding available to historical societies through larger organizations and grants, however, finding, writing, and supporting gifts and grants can be time-consuming, complicated, and in some cases it takes money to obtain money.

If you are interested in preserving the history of Lake Tahoe, especially the history of the south end of the lake, including Meyers, please consider becoming a member of the Historical Society, and if you're able, become an active volunteer.

Sincerely,

Lee Vestal, chair, Historic Sites Committee and board member Lake Tahoe Historical Society

Letter: Library enriches South Lake Tahoe

To the community,

I came to South Lake Tahoe in 2008 and while house hunting I stopped in to look over our South Lake Tahoe Public Library. I told my husband I had to see what the library looked like. I would not make a final decision on moving here unless I saw that there was a suitable library to sustain my love of reading and researching.

Once I moved here I quickly became involved in the community and now serve in many capacities that involve the use of our library. I am a child advocate of El Dorado County and have brought my children from foster care to the library for programs and library materials. With my joining the friends, I worked to restart an adult book club, have served on the board, conducted a grant supported summer art program, and now lead the World Explorers Pen Pal Club. Through these programs I have seen young children, parents, grandparents, community citizens from all walks of life thoroughly enjoy and learn from library resources and programs.

My present work with teens in the Juvenile Treatment Center has led me to search out young adult books throughout the library system for possible recommendation for our book club. The friends have supported book purchases and possible grants for funding. As part of the friends, I have organized a group of givers for World Book Night, now in our second year. On April 23, we will be giving away books all over the city. These programs, provided at our library, serve all ages in our community in so many ways besides the books on the shelves.

Please support Measure L to keep our library open as a vehicle for providing for so many of our community needs.

Lynne Brosch, South Lake Tahoe

Opinion: Developing raw land would harm North Shore

By Ann Nichols

East West Partners, you remember them, the Colorado developers that bought Truckee when no one was looking? Think Ritz Carlton, Old Greenwood and the Grey's Crossing bankruptcies filed in 2010.

Just when you thought it was safe, now in partnership with Sierra Pacific Industries who owns the land, they are back currently calling themselves Crew. An application has been filed with Placer County to begin the process to build clustered development (whatever that means) on top of the ridge on 112 acres inside the Lake Tahoe Basin. It's called the Martis Valley West project. You know Highway 267 at the top of Brockway Summit? Take a left on Mt. Watson Road (aka Fiberboard Freeway), go in about a mile and you are there. The development will spill over the ridge into Martis Valley with a total of 760 units and 6.6 acres of commercial.

Currently the acreage is zoned forest, but East West wants to change that zoning to allow residential development. They aren't saying how many units will be inside the basin. We've heard 200. How much land will be covered, how many trees will be cut down, how much commercial will be located there or how tall the buildings will be? East West says they will give us the details at a later date, but they want the zoning changed

now. Wrong. Tahoe deserves a standalone detailed application first.

This expansion of the urban boundary at Tahoe could be allowed thanks to TRPA's Regional Plan update. Remember TRPA's no growth guarantees? The justification is a conservation easement on 6,000 acres outside the Lake Tahoe Basin on the east side of Highway 267. I guess if you save land in New York City you get to build at Tahoe. Talk about a dangerous precedent?

In 2011, East West Partners announced a partnership with KSL Capital Partners, the owners of Squaw Valley and Alpine Meadows. We can certainly look forward to more bad ideas in the future unless we stop this now. We only have until April 28 to comment on the Notice of Preparation for the environmental report. There will be other opportunities to comment and save an important North Shore recreation area between Kings Beach and Tahoe City. Save Mt. Watson Road. Let's get on it.

Check it out the project online.

Here is evidence of my previous statements.

Ann Nichols is president of the North Tahoe Preservation Alliance, a 44-year resident and California-Nevada Realtor.

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

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

Letter: Truxlers should be applauded

To the community,

Now that the smoke has cleared on the fireworks show, it’s time to tip my hat and raise a glass to the Truxlers. They have helped open our eyes to see that the South Shore of Lake Tahoe is an epicenter of ecological hypocrisy. It’s said we love the lake, but don’t anyone do a thing that messes with the flow of greenbacks that fill South Shore pockets regardless of the harm an event could do or will do to the lake ad basin.



Bill Crawford

Especially pitiful is the verbal assault launched against the Truxlers because they exercised their lawful right to file a lawsuit to address what they believed needed to be remedied, the blight on the shoreline caused by the fireworks show. Many comments, such as Councilman Tom Davis', were down right threatening. He said that the Truxlers had better withdraw their lawsuit. It sounded like an or else. Or else what? And that was the tone echoed by many who commented on the subject. You had better get out of Dodge if you don't like what's going on here.

It appears that too many in town would damn freedom's bell if the lawsuit had continued. Well, the hot heads can simmer down. There will be a 4th of July fireworks show. And it would be right on that day for all of the church bells to ring loud and clear at an appointed hour to remind all of us why we celebrate on the 4th of July. Let freedom ring. We need to hear liberty's bell now and forever.

Bill Crawford, South Lake Tahoe

PS: I am reminded by what happened to the Truxlers that Henrik Ibsen wrote a play "An Enemy of the People" that dealt with a similar situation in a resort town in Norway. The play should be performed here by the college. It would be a dose of good medicine for a town that needs it.