

TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE

TRPA/Zoom

September 25, 2024

Meeting Minutes

CALL TO ORDER AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

Vice Chair Mr. Settlemeyer called the meeting to order at 3:17 p.m.

Members present: Ms. Aldean, Ms. Gustafson, Mr. Kieckhefer, Ms. Leumer, Mr. Settlemeyer

Members absent: Mr. Hoenigman

I. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Mr. Hester stated that there are no changes to the agenda.

Mr. Settlemeyer deemed the agenda approved as posted.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Ms. Gustafson moved approval of the June 26, 2024 minutes as presented.

Motion carried-voice vote.

III. [Informational presentation on amendments to the Homewood Mountain Ski Area Master Plan, 5145 West Lake Boulevard, Homewood, California, Placer County Assessor's Parcel Number's 097-060-044, et.al, TRPA File Number CEPP2014-0636-03](#)

Ms. Regan thanked the community for coming out today. We can see the passion you feel for Lake Tahoe, Homewood, and the West Shore. On behalf of TRPA and the Board, I assure you how seriously we're taking this item. The West Shore is a beloved part of Lake Tahoe, and we genuinely care about your concerns. It's important to understand that this is an informational item, and no action will be taken today. We want to hear from you and share our perspective. While we may have differing opinions, we can express them respectfully. We are committed to working collaboratively in the coming months as we develop this process.

Mr. Nielsen said we're here to hear from the public and the committee to gather feedback on ideas we have about public access and other issues. No action is being taken today; we're working towards recommendations in the coming months.

A Master Plan is not a specific development permit but rather a higher-level planning document. It looks at broad approaches and how we could approve something consistent with the Regional Plan, including land coverage, transit, and air quality, but without specific details, which come later at the planning level.

REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE

September 25, 2024

TRPA Master Plan definition: “A plan for a defined area that provides more detailed planning to ensure that projects and activities in the area are consistent with the Goals and Policies, the Plan Area Statements or community plans, and the Code. A specific or Master Plan shall not be construed as a project approval and its adoption shall not guarantee approval of any level of development.” TRPA handles Master Plans around the basin including those for marinas, airports, and ski resorts.

TRPA Recreation Policy Statement: The Regional Plan, Chapter 5, Recreation Element states on page 5-1: It shall be the policy of the TRPA Governing Board in development of the Regional Plan to establish and ensure a fair share of the total Region capacity for outdoor recreation is available to the general public. While you’re used to seeing quantitative data from the Regional Plan about water and air quality, this is more qualitative. This policy is important as it directly relates to public access, a key issue in the Homewood Master Plan Amendment that we will discuss today.

The Homewood Master Plan approved in 2011, aims to restore Homewood as a key gathering center for the West Shore and maintain the heritage of a ski resort that can be enjoyed equally by local residents and visitors. The goal statements from that plan remain unchanged with this amendment. Many people in the resonate with preserving Homewood's reputation as a small, family-friendly resort enjoyed equally by locals and visitors.

In 2011, the TRPA Governing Board certified the Environmental Impact Statement and approved the Homewood Master Resort Community Enhancement Program. This program offered incentives, such as residential units and increased Commercial Floor Area, in exchange for environmental improvements like enhancements to transit and water quality.

(presentation continued)

Mr. St. Michel will introduce some concepts related to public access. You’ve likely heard questions about whether public access will be provided at Homewood in the future. The applicants are proposing to allow long-term public access, and we need to discuss ways to ensure that this access remains in place for the long term. This issue is one of the largest hurdles to clear in the review of the application. Our challenge is to identify enforceable specifics that will guarantee the general public has long-term access to the ski area. Preserving public access is central to ensuring future operations remain consistent with the Environmental Impact Statement certified in 2011; consistency with the Community Enhancement Program, which focuses on creating a community asset where people can enjoy and gather, similar to Heavenly Village; and long-term consistency with the vision and goals outlined in the Master Plan.

Mr. St. Michel said public access is a significant issue for this project. We have heard from the developer; Homewood have stated their intent to keep the mountain accessible to the public. This is crucial because, as Mr. Nielsen mentioned, the existing Master Plan, the 2011 Environmental Review, and Homewood's inclusion in the Community Enhancement Program all assume the status quo regarding public access to and enjoyment of Homewood's recreational opportunities. Our challenge is to ensure that Homewood's operations remain consistent with these existing approvals, which, at this time, we understand they are not seeking to change. If Homewood wants to proceed as proposed, as a publicly accessible mountain, we need to consider how to implement and protect this public access. We have prepared a list of discussion points that we think are important to get your feedback today.

Mr. Davita, Partner with Discovery Land Company said notwithstanding anything from the past, we understand that the Master Plan addresses public access to the mountain. We are not asking for any

REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE

September 25, 2024

changes to those requirements. Everyone will continue to have access to Homewood Mountain Resort on a first-come, first-served basis, with no exceptions.

Later in the presentation, we will share our proposed public access language that the TRPA has requested. We are here today only to request revisions to the site plan to enhance the skier experience and improve the overall look and feel of the development while maintaining all key components and requirements of the project. We want to move forward with the gondola and other ski infrastructure improvements for everyone's benefit and bring the approved Master Plan to fruition with our proposed site plan improvements.

These guiding principles are taken directly from the approved Master Plan. They include updating and preserving Homewood's basic personality, restoring Homewood as a key gathering center, maintaining the heritage of the ski resort for local residents and visitors, minimizing traffic impacts, and preserving the character of Homewood by developing new facilities that reflect the existing architectural style. Everything in our application conforms to these principles. The approved Master Plan also included a list of project components derived from the vision for updating infrastructure and creating a bed base that currently does not exist. Our application continues to include these elements, such as replacing the aging chairlift with a gondola, upgrading the Ellis chair, improving snowmaking, adding up to 225 residences, a hotel, 13 on-site workforce units, a new base facility with food and beverage options, a parking garage with 272-day parking spaces, and a mid-mountain lodge with community amenities.

Why are we proposing revisions? We want to modify the site plan to enhance the Homewood skier experience, respond to current conditions and requirements, and ensure the project fits better into the West Shore neighborhood. This includes repositioning the gondola, responding to updated code requirements, and making the project more practical and safer by relocating the gondola base terminal to the base area. We are also reducing the massing to open view corridors for the project and refining the building architecture. Importantly, access to recreation for the general public will remain unchanged, as will all other representations in the existing approvals.

Over the past 18 months, we have conducted extensive community outreach, including over 30 community meetings and presentations to thousands of residents on the West Shore. These have been recorded and shared on our informational website, and we have offered public tours of the approved and proposed gondola locations. Community access is a crucial subject. This application represents a Homewood project that continues to provide community access in full conformance with what was approved in the Master Plan in 2011. The proposed revisions do not change public access requirements. Everyone will be able to ski at Homewood on equal footing.

We also state that new strict monitoring and enforcement provisions will ensure public access. Homewood Mountain Resort's skiing products and packages, such as season passes and day tickets, will be available for purchase by any member of the general public on a first-come, first-served basis. Access to all skiing recreational areas on the mountain, including lifts, will remain open to anyone with a valid ski pass or ticket during operating hours. Access to restrooms, lockers, recreation retail, and parking facilities will also be available to the general public on a first-come, first-served basis during operating hours, with some amenities potentially requiring a fee. Parking reservations may be necessary during peak periods.

Homewood Mountain Resort shall submit an annual report to the TRPA staff demonstrating compliance with these requirements. Violations of these permit conditions may result in monetary penalties or other enforcement actions determined by the TRPA Governing Board.

(presentation continued)

Mr. Porter said this is an approved project. Homewood consists of three main development locations: The North Base adjacent to Highway 89, the South Base located just further south, and the mid-mountain located at the top of the Gondola terminal, an old Madden chairlift location. Our team has worked diligently to maintain the key elements and layout within the approved Master Plan while also breaking up the scale, mass, and positioning of buildings. The land uses and their locations are consistent between the two plans. The overlay of the 2011 Master Plan in red and the current Master Plan revision in beige. You can clearly see both the similarities in building positioning while also noting the improvements made by separating the village structures and pulling the gondola down closer to the core of the village while keeping it centrally located. This will enhance the day experience.

The revised Master Plan maintains all key elements from the approved 2011 Master Plan, including creating a bed base across the north area with 71 residences and a 73-unit boutique hotel. It also provides additional services such as food and beverage offerings, ticketing, commercial retail shops, restrooms, lockers, rental spaces, and a large day skier parking facility with 272 stalls.

To the south, this area was always contemplated as a residential enclave, and the Master Plan revision upholds this. The revision consists of repositioning the structures on the site while reducing residential units from the approved 95 down to 51. The south base is separated by a pedestrian bridge spanning across Homewood Creek. A key portion of the south base development will be to restore and improve the stream environment zone. Additionally, the approved 2011 Master Plan noted that maintenance facilities should be moved to the mid-mountain, and all-day skier parking should be shifted to Lot 4 on the north base. We are implementing both of those changes with no deviations.

Looking at the approved mid-mountain lodge and the proposed layout, all key elements are consistent with the approvals, including a community pool facility, maintenance building, gondola, and lodge. The one difference is the request to include the cabin storage structure, which will improve the overall skier experience and extend the life of the gondola cabins. No further changes are made at the mid-mountain.

Beyond the two-dimensional plan comparisons, our team has analyzed the rendered views to ensure conformance with the approved scenic evaluation. The 2011 Master Plan view from Highway 89 to Fawn Street, and the revised rendering, which highlights consistency with scale, character, and architectural elements. This is a significant improvement, particularly at this corner and to the garage itself. A view from Highway 89 into the village core shows the revised layouts have split up the continuous north base structures, creating a wonderful view corridor both up the mountain for folks along the roadway and down to the lake from the ski run above. This added view corridor blends the development into the scale and character of the surrounding neighborhood. A view along Highway 89 you can see residential units at Lots 7 and 8. No drastic changes have occurred here.

As mentioned, Homewood was approved as a Community Enhancement Program Project (CEP). We have obligated ourselves to not just to meet but exceed standards. The Master Plan revision meets all CEP requirements. Specifically, we're pursuing green initiatives, reducing total development coverage beyond our obligations of 13 percent, and improving forest health through the forest fuels reduction work, which has just begun. We're also required to restore 500,000 square feet on the mountain, and today we've restored over 600,000 square feet.

REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE

September 25, 2024

Additionally, alternative transportation programs identified within the approved 2011 Master Plan are still key components of our current Master Plan revision. We have maintained key elements of the land plan, including a shuttle drop-off location and a public bus transit stop in front of the north-based skier parking lot for both employees and visitors. Our plan revisions and reduced density have resulted in an overall reduction in traffic trip generation. We will continue to prioritize traffic management throughout the implementation of the development and into annual operations, monitoring traffic patterns, reporting findings, and taking action annually as required by TRPA.

From a timeline perspective, work has begun on Lot 3, and once the Master Plan revision is approved, we'll shift our focus to the north base community gathering center. After completing work at the north base, we'll then focus on the south base residential enclave. Importantly, the key improvements to the mountain skiing experience and the community will occur concurrently with the built product. These include the fuels reduction program, which is underway and will continue for years, mountain improvement efforts, and the removal of the old Tahoe Inn, among others. We will make additional improvements to the mountain as we progress through the development process.

Overall, we're extremely excited about the progress our team has made with the Master Plan and the improvements made to the building layouts, massing, scale, and character. We are confident that the revisions made to pull the Gondola down to the village core are an overall improvement, and we continue to maintain a conformance approach to this Master Plan.

Mr. Nielsen said this public access issue is new to TRPA. There isn't language I can simply pull from the Heavenly Master Plan and apply to this project, primarily because, in Heavenly's case, it's public land. Restricting public access to public land is a very difficult thing to do. Here, however, except for about 200 acres, it's private land. That's why this is a new conversation for us. We're looking for feedback. Are we considering the right ideas? Are there things we haven't thought about? We're seeking the community's response to our initial ideas and any additional considerations related to public access.

Mr. St. Michel said nothing in the current approvals imposes explicit conditions on public access. However, all previous approvals have assumed a publicly accessible mountain and no impacts to recreation. If that assumption has changed, we could find ourselves facing a new type of project. If it hasn't changed, we'll need to ensure that public access continues as previously assumed in these existing approvals. When we think about what providing public access means, we have to grapple with several questions. For example, who does "the public" refer to? Does it include everyone, or are there distinctions between certain real estate owners or groups and the general public? What does "open to the public" entail? Are we discussing access to recreation only, or will we also consider amenities and services like equipment rentals and food and beverage options? How much public access is necessary? Should there be a minimum amount of access provided? If we simply state it's open to the public, how do we ensure there's a baseline level of access? Should we define this with specific metrics, such as a certain number of season passes available to the public?

Next, we need to consider full equality versus preferential access. Should we address priority access issues, like reserving parking for certain groups? Pricing is another critical factor. Without controls on pricing, access could effectively be denied if prices are set too high. We also need to think about enforcement and reporting. How will TRPA enforce any conditions in the approval? What kind of reporting is required, and how frequently? One idea is to use a third-party auditor who can independently report findings to TRPA.

Lastly, we need to consider how public comments on Homewood's draft language will be handled. To

REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE

September 25, 2024

what extent do we want the public to provide feedback? If we develop our own language, should it go through a public vetting process? These are the key issues we need to address moving forward.

Committee Comments & Questions

Ms. Aldean asked if we have a handle on the historic public use numbers, establishing a baseline of some sort.

Mr. Nielsen said yes, there are numbers, though they're held closely by the applicants. Generally, the data shows an average usage of about 1,500 visitors on a good day. Over the last 10 years, business at Homewood has changed, especially as infrastructure has aged and epic passes have encouraged visitors to explore multiple resorts. The busiest day recorded exceeded 3,500 people, which is very crowded, and this has been confirmed through data and discussions with mountain operations.

Ms. Aldean said we talk about PAOT (People at One Time). Under the provisions of the Master Plan, the limit was set at 1,704 PAOTs per day during the winter months.

Mr. Nielsen said that's correct, but that should not be interpreted as an upper limit on the number of people on the mountain. It serves as a recreational capacity measuring stick. For example, Heavenly also has a PAOT allocation, but we're not out there counting the number of skiers daily and shutting down the resort at that number. It's an average usage metric, influenced by two criteria: How busy the resort has been over time during a specific period and the uphill lift capacity of the mountain. That PAOT number changes when we adjust the uphill lift capacity, adding lifts or increasing chair counts. We can't control the number of people going to Homewood or factors like weather and the economy. Unless there's an increase in uphill lift capacity, that number remains unchanged.

Ms. Aldean said my sense is that there are concerns among locals in the Homewood area about being priced out of the market, which you alluded to. I think it would be equitable for those who invest in private residential units to receive some accommodation regarding lift ticket prices. The community should have access to a local resident discount, while those coming into the basin from elsewhere should pay the highest prices. Visitors contribute to vehicle miles traveled (VMT) unless they're using public transit. Pricing is a key issue. Without limitations or benchmarks, the local population risks being priced out of the market. This concern needs to be taken seriously in our discussions with the applicants.

Additionally, I wonder if the applicant would agree to include a disclosure regarding the public access commitments made in the purchase documents for residential units. This could prevent misconceptions about the future of access such as concerns that the hill might close after public funds have been used to subsidize development and retire the debt. It's crucial that anyone buying a unit at Homewood is aware of these commitments. If I were purchasing a residential unit, I would want that information clearly stated. This recommendation serves not only to assure the people of Homewood but also to protect the developer from potential misunderstandings.

I appreciate the annual compliance reports. I'm assuming there will be participation in the collection and review of that data. Will this responsibility fall to anyone else, or will it be part of the third-party auditor's role?

Mr. St. Michel said I think it's essential to establish a framework for reporting information, especially if we're considering conditions tied to a permit. This information should be reported to either the

REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE

September 25, 2024

Agency or a third party, which can then use it to assess compliance with public access requirements.

Ms. Aldean said we'd need to establish how many members of the public are accessing the mountain on any given day. It's important to create parameters that ensure the reporting requirement isn't so burdensome that it's difficult to comply with. However, we want to confirm that public access is being honored and that the mountain is being used by both homeowners and visitors from outside the area. This could be included as part of the annual audit, where we review those numbers and verify their accuracy.

Ms. Gustafson said we're here today due to public comments made by Discovery in various venues, along with the history of their projects elsewhere. There's concern that similar developments here could gradually reduce public access. The primary worry for the public is ensuring that access remains intact. Throughout my 42-year career in public service, defining "public access" has never been a challenge, until now. This discussion has highlighted how complex the issue has become. I've heard concerns from community members about how we determine pricing, as there's a fear that high prices could restrict public access, effectively becoming a barrier. What type of penalties does TRPA currently have in place? I believe there's a penalty of \$5,000 per day, but do we have the flexibility to change or amend that? It's crucial to instill confidence in the public that the penalties we discuss are meaningful and can be enforced effectively. What options do we have to strengthen our approach?

Mr. St. Michel said we might have some flexibility in drafting language to specify what constitutes a daily violation. This could help make the penalties more meaningful. Currently, we're in a position where we'd need to bring a formal complaint, but we also have the option to seek injunctive relief if necessary. In terms of enhancing our enforcement measures, we could consider including conditions in the permit that go beyond what our existing code allows. However, doing so may require a code amendment to ensure everything aligns properly.

Ms. Gustafson said the \$5,000 penalty can indeed be cumulative and assessed daily. This means if there's a lack of public access throughout an entire ski season, the total penalties could add up significantly, potentially amounting to thousands of dollars by the end of the season if violations continue unabated. This cumulative approach emphasizes the seriousness of maintaining public access and serves as a strong incentive for compliance.

Mr. St. Michel said that's something we should confirm.

Ms. Gustafson said if it's 5,000 for the season, then that's not much. If it's 5,000 daily, then, that's very significant to the applicant.

Regarding other enforcement you talked about injunctive. I'm more familiar with County protocol, Certificates of Occupancy can be withheld. We can do other things to find meaningful impact to the applicant.

Mr. St. Michel said this is the kind of feedback we're looking for. You're saying enforcement is a key piece. Penalties, injunctions, and the opportunity to revoke an approval or permit are important. But that's something we need to look further into.

Ms. Gustafson said the operation of the ski area is different from other things we do. We have a Master Plan for ski areas. I don't know what we've done regarding other violations or if we've had any. But we need to address the public's concerns. The ultimate goal, as they believe, is to eliminate their use of the mountain, and I want to find meaningful ways to prevent that from ever happening, both

REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE

September 25, 2024

from this applicant and any future owner or operator of the mountain. That's also our fear as we watch changing dynamics in and around the basin. Ownership changes, and people change. We need to ensure we have that covered.

Mr. Nielsen said a key aspect of identifying a violation is recognizing it when you see it. How do you define the violation? How do you measure it? How do you disclose it? And how do you monitor it over time? If we find ourselves recommending a monetary penalty, we need to clearly communicate to the Board the rationale behind that recommendation, specifically, what line has been crossed. This is our challenge to clearly and understandably define what the violation is and what it looks like.

Ms. Gustafson said I agree with independent monitoring. Unfortunately, we're in a position of such distrust. We need to find a monitoring mechanism that is independent and more frequent than an annual audited report. A year is a long time for those who are distrustful. I wish we weren't in this situation with this level of distress, but we must address it head-on. Throughout the community enhancement plan, it discusses equality of access, which I think is a good starting point for our numbers. Equal is equal. While pricing may not be equal, access should be. Determining pricing is challenging for government compared to the private sector, and I know there will be different opinions on that at this table. However, given that we have the largest number of downhill ski areas in North America, we have ample data points to establish reasonable pricing. So, looking at independent monitoring and equal access is crucial.

Ms. Regan said public access and enforceability are key. The Compact gives TRPA the authority for penalties of \$5,000 per day per violation. How do we define that? We don't have law enforcement powers, and we issue different kinds of permits than local governments do, so it is a bit different. However, we can go to court, when necessary, especially with large projects and Master Plans. We must think long-term, as nothing is static. Additional permits may arise, which could present opportunities to resolve issues that weren't discovered initially. We want to approach this thoughtfully and with our eyes wide open, aiming to be as objective as possible rather than subjective in how enforcement will proceed going forward.

Ms. Gustafson said staff asked for feedback on public access. For instance, Northstar, where there are private facilities that certain members can use while others cannot. There are locker rooms at Palisades that only certain members have access to. This model is familiar to me at ski areas, and I don't think public access should extend to all the private investments on the mountain. However, there needs to be a reasonable amount of public access. Again, I emphasize the need to define what is reasonable and how to demonstrate it, recognizing that private investment can include private clubs and access points. To make the kind of investment needed, developers must encourage people to purchase units at very high prices. What I've experienced skiing at that mountain, and having my kids ski there, doesn't include all those amenities. Unless I'm willing to pay significantly more, I don't believe I should have access to their new investments beyond the lifts. I'm not quite clear on what you're asking for in this context, but we can define it further as we gather public comments.

Mr. Nielsen said to get specific with this application, we need to talk about access to what. For example, consider what is proposed today. There are skier services throughout the area, mostly at the North base, with some at the top of the Gondola and a small amount at the South base. These skier services such as where you can warm up or grab a hot dog are currently divided into two areas: One for homeowners' associations and one for the general public. The proposed division is about two-thirds one-third split.

REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE

September 25, 2024

Ms. Gustafson said as I reflect on the new private investment, I see how it changes the dynamic. As long as I have access to the mountain and a place to warm up, do I have the right to demand access to a more significant private investment? That's a challenge I see. I think about having more lift capacity at an equal level, not necessarily all the amenities.

Mr. Nielsen said there is no division on who can access the lifts at this point, which is not on the table. All lifts are open to everyone including homeowners and the public.

Ms. Leumer said I appreciate the comments that have been made and agree with most of them. I believe we're asking the right questions. The lifts are my top priority. There are other aspects that I haven't thought about as much but the equitable access to the lifts and the mountain is definitely top of mind. It's helpful to have the numbers to think about the maximum number of people we'd see on the mountain. What does that translate to if we're seeing one-third or two-thirds? Is there the capacity to serve that many people if it's divided like that? I also appreciate the need for capitalism, profit, and justifying investments, so there's a balance to consider. Regarding ticket pricing, this might be a longer conversation down the road. I was thinking about having higher prices for those coming in from outside the basin. My only concern is about a friend who runs an outdoors club at a public school in San Francisco with low-income kids who have never seen snow. I'd love them to visit a resort like Homewood and not just Heavenly or Northstar. If they're paying extra because they're coming from out of town, that might make it harder for them to access these experiences. We should be mindful of lower-income individuals coming in from outside the basin as well.

Mr. Kieckhefer said the applicants could build what was approved in 2011 and amended in 2014.

Mr. Nielsen said that's correct.

Mr. Kieckhefer asked if it was correct that all of this discussion about how TRPA controls access is new to the conversation and was not included in the original discussions.

Mr. Nielsen said that's correct.

Mr. Kieckhefer asked where the 200 acres of Forest Service land is located on the mountain.

Mr. Nielsen said it is above the Quail Phase. Looking at the mountain, it's to the upper left, steep bowl above the lake. It's under a special use permit from the Forest Service.

Mr. Kieckhefer said some of the questions that we're getting to is that we've never had to define public access for private property. Some of the problems that we may run into are based on that nature that we're wading into territory that we wouldn't traditionally weigh into. All of the correspondence I've been getting from community members indicates they're asking for a hard reset and starting the process over. I don't think that's feasible, as they could just build what they're entitled to right now, which would likely be a less accessible Gondola with worse sight lines. I'm curious to hear about the specific concerns raised during public comments and whether they can be addressed by some of the issues we're discussing. If we want to promote equal access, and equal means anyone can buy a \$700 lift ticket, is that really equal access?

Mr. Settelmeyer said my question is along the same lines as Mr. Kieckhefer's. I was looking at Homewood Mountains Meadow, LLC, which has 747.45 private acres, and Homewood Village Resort,

REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE

September 25, 2024

which has 89.52 acres. Then you say they'll have 200 acres in the Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit through a permit or a lease?

Mr. Nielsen said it's a special use permit.

Mr. Settelmeyer asked staff to provide that information about the special use permit conditions to the board members.

Mr. Nielsen said the first permit allows for the operation of the lift on that part of the mountain. The second permit is for some backcountry operations, where snowcats take people into the backcountry.

Mr. Settelmeyer assumed they're not going to use any of the California deer hunt zone that's directly next to them, more of the Tahoe City Public Utility District.

Mr. Nielsen said not that I'm aware of.

Ms. Aldean said it would be helpful to know the conditions of the permit with the Forest Service. Public lands are generally accessible to anyone, but you need to be able to reach those lands in order to use them. I presume there is no public access easement to this acreage.

Mr. Nielsen said not that I'm aware of.

Ms. Aldean said public lands are accessible to everyone. However, if you don't have a means of accessing them, you may end up trespassing over private property to get there. I'm wondering if any consideration was given to access that area from Homewood when the lease was originally established by the Forest Service. I'm hoping we can move past this impasse. It might be beneficial to have a standing committee consisting of an HOA representative, a developer or operator, and a member of the Homewood community. This committee could meet regularly to review operations, air any concerns, and facilitate communication between Homewood and the public. This way, concerns can be addressed in a more cooperative manner moving forward.

Ms. Gustafson said to clarify that the Community Enhancement Program project (CEP) provided enhancements to some commodities that they were able to build. This came with public access statements and community enhancements, so I just wanted to ensure you were clear on that regarding the CEP project.

Ms. Aldean said if we can define the areas that have historically been open to the public, what if the developers were to impose a public access easement? This could be recorded as an encumbrance on the property. I'm not sure if that's something they would consider, but I think it's worth suggesting. The areas that have historically been accessible to the general public should continue to be accessible. This recorded easement would be enforceable against the property.

Mr. Settelmeyer asked staff to reach out to some of the other ski resorts. While they are completely on public land, the Gondola does not operate during adverse wind conditions due to safety issues. There are parameters in their leases regarding operating times and rights to restrict public access.

I'm curious about the specifics of public access at these resorts. For instance, can a person start at the base of Heavenly and walk up the mountain to go skiing, or is there a prohibition that requires them to have a ticket?

REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE

September 25, 2024

Ms. Astromoff, on behalf of Keep Homewood Public. She resides in Santa Cruz County, and my multi-generational family cabin is in Chamberlands. We want continued public access to Homewood Mountain while unlocking the redevelopment promised in the 2011 Master Plan. In the spirit of reasonable compromise with the developers, we have said that members could join us on this public hill, provided non-members receive the same privileges as members. We still hold hope for that outcome.

As recently as a couple of weeks ago, we met with the developers' representatives and have had multiple conversations over the past 18 months, specifically regarding the public access definition you just saw. However, this definition contains multiple loopholes that would enable the developers to privatize immediately after receiving their approvals. This definition has not materially changed since we first reviewed it months ago. We no longer believe that the developers are negotiating in good faith, either with us or with TRPA. We are here today to ask for a hard reset. TRPA must use its existing land use planning authority to reject this application outright. Please send the developers back to square one.

Make it clear that Homewood is a public recreational mountain, and that TRPA will use all its powers to ensure it remains that way. In support of this request, you received a letter from our attorneys at Shute Mihaly, & Weinberger outlining the legal bases for keeping Homewood public. You will hear evidence that the developers intend to privatize after receiving approvals and why we believe they are not negotiating in good faith. You'll also hear how they are actively disrespecting our community and other communities where they operate. Additionally, the application and staff report do not adequately protect public access, as staff have mentioned.

Most importantly, you'll hear how much we all love Homewood Mountain. I learned to ski there along with other family members. We want not only our own children and grandchildren but everyone's children and grandchildren to learn to love this special place as much as we do. That deep love for the place from everyone who lives in or visits is the foundation of all successful environmental protection work. Please reject this flawed application and deny all future efforts to privatize it.

IV. UPCOMING TOPICS

Mr. Hester said potentially scheduled for November is the Tahoe Valley Area Plan and the Tourist Core Area Plan Amendments from the City of South Lake Tahoe and Amendments from Douglas County.

Ms. Regan said because we're already at the noticing requirements deadline for next month's Regional Planning Committee, you will see a notice for possible action on the Homewood item. It doesn't mean that there will be any action taken. But just in case we here from the public and there is some action to be taken, we didn't want to miss that noticing opportunity. Staff is not clear when the Governing Board will be acting on this.

V. COMMITTEE MEMBER COMMENTS

None.

VI. PUBLIC INTEREST COMMENTS

Doug Estill lives in Tahoe, and my grandkids would be fourth-generation skiers at Homewood. He urged a hard reset of the Homewood project. TRPA requires the developers to submit evidence of fire

REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE

September 25, 2024

department pre-approval for the project. This has never been completed and is missing from the application. Earlier this year, at a meeting at the West Shore Café, the developers told the community that they were close to an agreement but were not willing to fund items in the 2014 Evacuation Life Safety Plan. To this day, there is no agreement in place. You are the linchpin in determining whether this becomes a community enhancement project or a community destruction project.

Candice Wilmuth is a full-time resident of the West Shore who urged a hard reset of the Homewood project. TRPA must reject the application as it is incomplete. The application only refers to user classes as residents and visitors. The developers previously stated they would sell both on-site and off-site memberships. If on-site members are considered "residents" and off-site members or guests are labeled "visitors," then the developers could fill the ski hill without admitting anyone from the general public. For the application to be complete, it must include a robust definition of public access, with enforceable specifics. She provided a written copy Keep Homewood Public's recommended definition of "general public." [recommended definition of general public](#). Please reject this flawed incomplete application.

Barbara Millslagle is a full-time resident on the West Shore, and my husband and I are season pass holders at Homewood. We're concerned about where we will have to drive to ski this year. I also serve on the Northern California golf course rating committee, which has made me aware of the privatization of Cordevalle Golf Course in Santa Clara County. She urged a hard reset of the Homewood project. I am concerned that Discovery and JMA are excluding the public, as they have done with their other properties. Discovery only develops hyper-exclusive resorts, allowing public access only when legally required, and they often manage to undermine those protections. Cordevalle Golf Course opened in 1996 with a use permit restriction guaranteeing 60 percent of rounds for the public. After opening, Discovery began to restrict public access. When complaints arose, Santa Clara County caved, reducing public access to just occasional charity tournaments. Today, the general public has no access to Cordevalle, which is now promoted as members-only. We cannot let this happen to Homewood.

Kathleen Annice said it seems to me that recreational land is protected by TRPA's recreational land regulations and environmental policies as a condition of the Community Enhancement Program. The Homewood Mountain Resort Ski Area Master Plan required the filing of a recreational deed to preserve the recreational zoning of the ski area in perpetuity. This filing was supposed to occur prior to any groundbreaking, but it was not completed. I urge TRPA to reject this application as it currently stands. It does not uphold the codes and ordinances that ensure fair public access to recreational land. This application would displace thousands of skiers and their vehicles to already highly impacted areas, a significant impact that is only briefly mentioned in a single sentence of the Transportation Impact Report, specifically on page 1163, which discusses predicted day skiers being replaced by Homewood Resort residents, their members, and guests.

While the developers purchased recreational land and spent four years developing a Master Plan in adherence to TRPA regulations that ensured public access, they are now attempting to revise and insert language that will reduce public access and enjoyment of recreational land in favor of exclusive residential development. The loss of Homewood Resort as a public area should have been reviewed in the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) as a potential alternative, yet no mitigation measures have been identified. This area represents the recreational carrying capacity for the entire West Shore, extending from the Green Forest Gate at Emerald Bay through Tahoe City and to the North Shore. As the application currently stands, a multimillion-dollar developer should not be allowed to sidestep regulations that are in the best interest of Tahoe.

REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE

September 25, 2024

Ted Peterson and family own a couple of cabins at the base of the ski hill. I want to address the Community Enhancement Program (CEP) designation. I've attended all the meetings from 2008 to 2011, and even went to Sacramento when the Friends of the West Shore and JMA were challenged in court in 2014. During those meetings, Chapman often stated, "If I can't have this project, I have to close the mountain." This was not a hollow threat; he genuinely believed that the success of this project depended on community support. The community showed up, embraced it, and public access was always part of that vision. I think it's crucial to take his request seriously: if we can't have public access as part of the project, then he should go back to square one. We can't allow him to slide this forward and take the CEP benefits without the commitments that were initially made. I understand the business side of things and recognize the desire for maximum flexibility in the project. However, with that flexibility comes the responsibility to maintain order in our community.

The same folks who supported this project are now saying, "We don't want to close it, but if that's what it takes, then so be it." We need to keep the word "community" at the forefront of our discussions. Enhancements are not happening as promised. Moreover, the ongoing construction impacts our neighborhood significantly. We already have trucks coming down the road every day. If the project is completed and then privatized, it would mean we endure the construction period only to be left without public access afterward.

Randy Boteler homeowner on the West Shore. I urge a hard reset of the Homewood project. TRPA must reject this application outright because it does not guarantee public access. Public access was the foundation of the Master Plan as a community enhancement project. If the developers are allowed to privatize after building the resort, they will reap all the benefits of being a community enhancement project without delivering any of the obligations. What's the point of a community enhancement project that doesn't actually enhance the community, especially if the community is not allowed to use it? The developers have insisted that they need the CEPs to make the project viable. The TRPA Governing Board conferred community enhancement project status on the Homewood project when the Master Plan was approved. In return, the developers have an obligation to guarantee public access throughout the life of the project in order to earn and retain those community enhancement project benefits. However, the developers have not guaranteed public access in their application, thereby violating the Master Plan agreement under which the CEPs were awarded.

Dan Copenhagen said our family has a home just south of Homewood in Rubicon Bay, and I've been hiking and skiing at Homewood Mountain for about 56 years. I urge you to reject the application outright, as it does not guarantee public access. The developers are clearly not acting in good faith and intend to privatize Homewood. A specific example of this is that JMA and the developers [Securities and Exchange Commission \(SEC\)](#) offering "recreational memberships" to the Homewood Club for a minimum of \$200,000 each. This marks the first step toward selling equity memberships for a private club. So, when the developer says, "Anyone can ski at Homewood," what they really mean is anyone with a significant amount of money. This does not represent the general public. They cannot take a Community Enhancement Project, which is inherently 100 percent public, and turn it into a private venture.

Gail Pigatto is a full-time resident of Tahoe Pines on the West Shore. Homewood Mountain is incredibly important to us; it's where we meet her children's classmates and friends every weekend, ski with our neighbors and family, and spend our entire winter season. I urge a hard reset of the Homewood project. TRPA must reject the application outright, as it is no longer a community enhancement project. The developers are not acting in good faith. This March, the managing partner

REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE

September 25, 2024

of Homewood Investor, Mohari Hospitality, stated at a real estate conference that they are involved in privatizing Homewood. He said, we are involved in a project in Tahoe, where we are privatizing a ski mountain with Discovery Land Company. Think of it as a mini version of the Yellowstone Club. While he later called it a "misstatement" and apologized, he did not explicitly deny the intention to privatize. This has fostered distrust in our community. We believe that the developers still intend to privatize Homewood.

Teresa McNamara has been a full-time resident of Homewood for over 30 years. We purchased our home for its proximity to the ski area. My family has held season passes at Homewood for over 35 years. Our children and grandchildren have all learned to ski there. I urge a hard reset of the Homewood project. I ask TRPA to reject the application as presented because it does not guarantee public access to skiing and hiking. The developers are not operating in good faith; in fact, they are running Homewood Mountain Resort into the ground to discourage public use, claiming they cannot profit from an open ski area.

Since the approval of the Master Plan in 2011, the developers have had 13 years to upgrade the resort's infrastructure and facilities, yet they have chosen to do nothing. Despite having the most financially favorable climate for development in the last decade, they have opted for inaction. The 2011 Master Plan promised a mid-mountain lodge with food services and restroom facilities, yet we are left with an oversized tent serving cold sandwiches and a pit toilet. The base lodge is old and rundown, and the Ellis chair, installed in 1977, breaks down almost every year. Its usable lifespan ended in 2017, yet there has been no effort to upgrade either. It seems clear that the owners of Homewood Resort intend to let it deteriorate in order to justify a shift to private development. While it is their business to operate as they choose, they cannot take the original Master Plan and community enhancement project we all agreed upon and turn it into a private resort. Please do the right thing by listening to the community and adhering to the 2011 Master Plan guidelines and the community enhancement plan.

Kevin Foster is a resident of Homewood and has been skiing at Homewood since 1975. I am requesting a hard reset of the project due to serious concerns about Discovery and JMA potentially excluding the public from access to the mountain. I agree with previous speakers regarding the poor management of the resort over the last decade. The latest public access definition presented by TRPA staff came from the developers and has not changed significantly over time, despite our efforts to work with them on a solution that benefits everyone. This proposal contains multiple loopholes that could allow the developers to privatize the area, which is concerning given Discovery's history of exploiting similar loopholes in their other projects.

I supported the 2011 approvals because they included public benefits, and I urge you to stand up for the residents of Tahoe who will be affected by this development, rather than prioritizing the financial interests of the developers. Please communicate to the developers that we are tired of their bad faith attempts at defining public access. If they truly have nothing to hide, they should agree to enforceable criteria that guarantee ongoing public access. Approval must include legally binding measures to ensure this access is maintained.

Victoria Gustafson urged a hard reset on the project. The developers clearly intend to take the resort private. When asked what prevents the developers from privatizing in the future. Both JMA and Discovery answered, "nothing." Moonshine Inc. in 2022 asked what assurance the community has that the future of Homeland won't become completely private. Art Chapman, JMA, replied, "No assurance at all. We're going into this new model because the old model didn't work." A Discovery

REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE

September 25, 2024

representative also said as much in the meeting with Homewood in March 2024. Clearly, the developers think they can privatize based on current approvals. I've been skiing at Homewood for 25 years. I live in Tahoe and have worked for them for 10 years in the past. It's a great mountain. I was part of the original creation of the Master Plan, and we worked together. We had lots of concessions, and now they're just not being honest.

Karen Flynn next door neighbor of Homewood for over 50 years. Four generations of our family have learned to ski at Homewood. I hope that Homewood will continue to be open to the public so future generations will thrive there like the current ones, not only for our family but for all the members of the community. Back in 2011, when the Master Plan was approved, our family recognized that change was coming. Fast forward to today, I'm concerned about the project narrative and comparison that includes the South base remaining consistent with the approved Master Plan, scale, use, and layout, with a reduction and enlargement of total residential units and slight repositioning of buildings. This repositioning is said to provide a better buffer between existing neighbors and the new housing.

However, that's not true for this existing neighbor. Renderings now show a 5,000 square foot structure positioned 100 to 120 feet from the back of our property line, and our house is set back on our parcel. This is very close. There is no buffer. If built, this would adversely and permanently alter the character of the home and the experiences of those who live in it forever. I understand that phase 2 is to occur in the future, and I'm putting this on the radar now, as I fear that I may be told later this has already been approved in the amendment. I encourage the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency not to approve the amendment change from the Master Plan that would reposition a structure further north behind the Flynn house, lot 77. I support keeping Homewood open to the public for the community to continue to enjoy and for their families to thrive there. I want to thank you for providing this opportunity to speak up and for your support.

Rob May is a long-time resident of the West Shore. I've been skiing at Homewood and Tahoe Ski Bowl for 60 years. I urge a hard reset of the Homewood project. TRPA must reject the application outright because the developers clearly intend to pursue a private resort. They sell Homewood as an exclusive private resort. Here's how Discovery described the project on their website: "Mountain on one side, Lake on the other. Homewood Mountain, and the lake is nestled on the west shore of Lake Tahoe. A quiet, secluded community that is more than just a destination; it's a state of mind." He provided a document from the website of [Discovery Land Company](#) that talks about their development of private residential communities and resorts with a world-renowned portfolio.

Susan Holm is a full-time resident of Homewood. Homewood Resort is the heart of the West Shore and supports many businesses. It's a beloved tradition for many community members whose families have learned to ski there and made countless memories. Our community is firmly behind the Master Plan with the appropriate public access language added. If the TRPA allows this development to go through without that agreed-upon public language, it will effectively pluck the heart out of our community and hand it wrapped in a bow to an elite group of wealthy individuals who will have it as their personal winter playground. There will be no turning back if the privatization of the resort harms the businesses and community, as we all believe it would. This elite group would have no reason to leave the resort since all their needs will be met on-site. The clientele that Discovery caters to high-profile celebrities from sports, film, and business that desire the exclusivity and privacy that their other developments provide, and this one would be no exception.

The businesses along the West Shore cannot survive on a few summer months; they will either shut down altogether or close in winter, turning the West Shore into a ghost town. This will depress the

REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE

September 25, 2024

community, affecting both full-time residents and those with second homes. Winter skiers will eventually choose to rent homes closer to Palisades or other public ski resorts, rather than adding an hour or more to get to a public ski resort from Homewood. Ski rental owners will suffer, and so will the full-time residents who live there and ski in winter. They will have no choice but to drive to another ski resort. In fact, traffic on Highway 89 will increase because the community will have to drive to Tahoe City for nearly all of their needs. Please consider very carefully the lack of transparency being exhibited by JMA and Discovery. A decision to trust their public statements without requiring them to put it in writing will give them the loopholes they need to turn the resort private. I'm asking for a hard reset, and I believe you should reject this application outright.

Dick Holm full-time resident of Homewood. As a retired developer, I understand the requirement of complying with the development conditions. A key condition for the approval of Homewood's Master Plan in 2011 was that the ski mountain would remain public. In fact, keeping the ski hill public, along with several other amenities, was considered a community enhancement project and was a key reason that JMA received approval in 2011. Now, 13 years later, the ski resort has been allowed to dilapidate while JMA claims that the resort loses money and must go private to survive. The project has turned from a community enhancement project into an exclusive real estate development with a ski mountain as a hook for buyers. It is a real estate development with a ski mountain attached. This does not align with the original Master Plan, nor are these the minor changes they claim allow them to stick with it. The TRPA should reject this application outright. The developer should be required to reapply with a proposal for a private, exclusive real estate development. If they really want to build, they need to go through the process from the beginning and do a reset.

Additionally, in 2011, there was no affordable housing issue, but now there's an affordable housing requirement in 2024. If you do a hard reset, they must go back and include the affordable housing requirement.

Nancy Martin homeowner in Tahoe Pines for the past 60 years. I've been a season pass holder at Homewood since the early sixties when it first opened, and I've taught my children, grandchildren, and friends to ski there. I also worked at Homewood for about seven years as a ski instructor in the early seventies. Homewood is an integral part of our community, not only for us but for the businesses that serve it. I'm concerned that JMA and Discovery intend to exclude the public from Homewood. In a November 18, 2022, letter to the TRPA, JMA stated, "We are planning a new legacy club concept where community members could purchase for their families that would permit their parents, children, and grandchildren the opportunity to ski at Homewood during their lifetime." This indicates that the developers still want to privatize. Please reject the application.

Dan Martin said thank you all for having us here today and listening to our concerns. I'll keep my comments brief since my wife covered all the salient points. We own a home in Tahoe Pines and ski at Homewood. We took our kids there, and we look forward to taking our grandkids. The most important thing to me is having the assurance that Homewood can remain public. Public access should coexist with any private club arrangements on the mountain. However, I don't believe that membership agreements equate to public access. These memberships are very expensive, and most of the public likely wouldn't be able to afford the \$200,000 to \$300,000 price tag. Please take these points into consideration as you review our concerns.

Eric Beckenhauer said my family has owned a home near Homewood for 35 years and is where I learned to ski. Many of my most treasured memories in Tahoe were made on that mountain, and I hope future generations can say the same. However, I fear they won't if the developers' plans to

REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE

September 25, 2024

privatize move forward. If you look around our community, you won't see a place dominated by multimillion-dollar mansions. Sure, there are some, but you'll find a much more diverse community. In my neighborhood, there are nurses, tradespeople, firefighters, sheriffs, and retirees, people who likely have no hope of joining an exclusive enclave for the ultra-rich. It doesn't fit with the community feel that so many of us love about the West Shore.

I'm not opposed to development at Homewood; I supported the 2011 Master Plan and look forward to improvements at the resort. However, when developers sought community support back in 2011, there was no indication that public access would be removed. The Master Plan emphasized public engagement and was approved as a community enhancement project. In exchange for those promises, developers received valuable benefits, including building variances. Now, it seems plans have changed, and there's a strong desire to privatize. While vague claims have been made about preserving some form of public access, there aren't any enforceable specifics, certainly nothing in writing. This lack of clarity is concerning. It feels like they're trying to slip through the amendment process without clear terms for public access, potentially giving them the freedom to privatize later. I urge you to reject the application as it stands unless there are enforceable specifics in place to ensure public access remains protected.

Hannah Glass is a longtime skier and homeowner in Homewood, I want to echo what many have already expressed. I want my family and our neighbors to continue enjoying access to the mountain where my child learned to ski. Unfortunately, I believe the developers are not negotiating in good faith. Their actions have shown disregard for our community, especially in their failure to adequately secure public access. The language they've presented today regarding public access is flawed and filled with loopholes. I'm concerned that if this project moves forward with such inadequate public access language, the developers will exploit these weaknesses, ultimately limiting community use of the mountain. I urge you to reject this application outright. If we allow the project to progress now, it will only become more difficult to amend the flawed language later. Each step forward gives developers a signal that they can continue with their privatization goals. We need to take a stand now to protect our community and ensure our access to Homewood remains intact.

Christopher Tuck lives in the West Shore community. The issue at Homewood extends far beyond just one location. The entire 30-mile stretch along the West Shore from Sunnyside to Tahoe Pines, Homewood, Tahoma, Rubicon, and Meeks Bay is interconnected. What happens at Homewood impacts all of us. We need to clarify what "public access" truly means for Homewood and our community as a whole. It feels like public access is being undermined. Other ski resorts have already put their season passes on sale, while Homewood hasn't even offered that option yet. As someone who was supposed to be employed there, I still don't have answers, and many of us are left in the dark. If Homewood becomes a private resort, it raises questions about what makes that mountain private when it sits right off a main highway and is adjacent to public lands like the lake. It feels contradictory. I purchased my home in Tahoe seven years ago, motivated by the promise of community access outlined in the 2011 plan. Now, I worry that my family and others won't have the same opportunities to enjoy this beautiful area. I want to ensure future generations can have those experiences, just like I did. I urge you all to consider what public access means and what steps you can take to protect it. Whether that means canceling the current plans, imposing stricter conditions, or whatever it takes, we need your help. The community feels slighted right now, and it's not just about Homewood; it's about the entire West Shore. Please, let's work together to ensure our community's voice is heard and that our access to this beloved mountain is preserved.

Andy Buckley is a Homewood employee and an industry expert with 40 years of experience across

REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE

September 25, 2024

various ski resorts. My career has taken me from the French Alps to Vail, Colorado, Northstar, Deer Valley, and beyond. Throughout my journey, I've learned what drives resorts and the challenges they face. Ski resorts are capital-intensive, requiring constant maintenance and upgrades to thrive. The traditional model relies on strong visitor volume, but many small resorts, including Homewood, are struggling to maintain that visitation. This isn't just about ticket prices; the financial realities of running a ski resort are complex and challenging. Some resorts are closing, while others are barely surviving.

The hybrid model proposed by Ed Davita and the Homewood partners aims to balance community access with the necessary revenue stream to keep the resort updated and vibrant. The amendments being discussed are common-sense solutions designed to improve operations for visitors and ensure ongoing access for the community. I've spoken with members of Keep Homewood Public, and I honor their commitment to the community. Many support the development, recognizing that the resort cannot function as just a local amenity without the necessary economic foundation. This development is crucial for the continued employment of over 200 staff members who live in our community, pay mortgages, and have families. These employees are passionate about Homewood, and they deserve the opportunity to work in a thriving environment. I urge you to consider my perspective and the points made by my colleagues, and to approve the amendments to the Master Plan. Let's ensure that Homewood can continue to serve both the community and its visitors for generations to come.

Chris Hoffmann said I'm here today to offer a unique perspective as both an employee of Homewood and a lifelong local. I grew up on the west shore and am now a homeowner. I studied ski business and resort management at Sierra Nevada College. Over the last ten years, I've built my career at Homewood, and today I serve as the mountain operations manager. From my very first day as an intern, Homewood has invested in my development. This commitment to employee growth is a sentiment shared by many of my colleagues. Homewood is not just a job; it's a community that genuinely cares for its staff. Imagine a perfect powder day at Homewood. You arrive early and join others waiting for the first chair. You hit the slopes and find untouched snow and by lunchtime, you wonder where everyone is. From the perspective of the resort, we're doing everything we can to prepare for those days, yet we often find ourselves asking, "Where is everyone?" The answer lies in the competition from larger resorts. Vail's Epic Pass and Alterra's Ikon Pass dominate the market, capturing around 60 percent of visitors. Meanwhile, smaller resorts like Homewood are striving to stay afloat. By investing in infrastructure and ensuring community access, we can create a sustainable future for Homewood. We're committed to being a public resort and enhancing the experience for both locals and visitors. I urge you to approve these plans.

Alex is an employee of Homewood. Alongside my colleagues, we're looking forward to providing the best experience for everyone this winter. I want to recognize the work that Keep Homewood Public has done to protect access, but I also believe we need to approach this situation differently. Homewood is a special place that deserves to be open, and we must hold corporate entities accountable in a time when trust in big businesses is low. As a long-time operator at Homewood, I urge you to support the project moving forward. I've been part of the Homewood family for eight years, and it's why I've chosen to stay in Tahoe. However, the reality is that our mountain is struggling, and the Discovery Land Company is currently the only operator willing to put forward a plan to address this. If circumstances were different, this development would have already been completed. While some may view this as a compromise, any access to Homewood is better than driving past another abandoned ski resort. Delaying this project impacts my ability to plan and serve our community, creating uncertainty for this winter. As we consider the necessary approvals, please remember that your neighbors, like me and my team, are the ones affected while we wait. Please support this project.

REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE

September 25, 2024

Doug Fagel has been a member of the Homewood team for eight years and has lived in Tahoe for 24 years. His role now as the Director of Outdoor Pursuits at Homewood allows me to connect with both the Homewood staff and the Discovery Land Company, and it's my goal to bridge our vision with the community's needs. We're at a pivotal moment, entering a new phase with Discovery Land Company. This project has the potential to integrate our operations with the community, creating opportunities for more people in the snow sports industry. We see many in our community struggling to find sustainable, well-paying careers in this seasonal industry, and we need to address that. As I drove up here, I thought about the controlled burns happening in our area, which are crucial for accountability and stewardship of the land. However, I'm concerned that what began as a controlled effort could turn into a wildfire, jeopardizing our mountain and, ultimately, our jobs. If the mountain were too close, it would not only impact on our livelihoods but also deprive the community of a place to ski. Right now, Homewood is open and accessible, and we need to keep it that way. I urge everyone to support the revisions to the Master Plan so we can ensure the continued success of Homewood and the community it serves.

Stewart Smith is a full-time resident of Tahoma. Regarding the necessity of the Community Enhancement Project (CEP) revisions to be economically necessary. It's clear that anyone seeking a better deal is because they've had a better agreement down the road. Whether we're talking about a legally binding contract or community enhancement plan. If changes are approved, I'm concerned about the traffic implications. The current plan compresses traffic from two parking lots into a single structure, presumably with entrances and exits on Highway 89. Is that accurate? I don't foresee a traffic circle, or a traffic light being implemented, which raises questions about how we'll manage traffic flow. With winter driving conditions, the potential for accidents is high, especially if inexperienced drivers are navigating our roads. There's no center lane for turns, which could easily lead to traffic blockages. Will there be a full-time tow truck on standby to clear the highway quickly, or will we be left to manage accidents ourselves? While I don't support the current plan as it stands, I recognize that change can sometimes be necessary. Still, I share the sentiment of "Keep Homewood Public" and believe a full reset would be preferable, even if that may not be feasible.

Don Bean has a home in Homewood and a part of this community for 56 years. I moved here full-time about 10 years ago. I urge you to reset the Homewood project and reject the application because it no longer enhances our community. Last week, they put in a power pole on our street. It took several days, and it was a complete mess. Meanwhile, a neighboring area received underground power, which was invisible and didn't disrupt the neighborhood. Why couldn't they allocate more funds to do the same on our street? To me, that kind of oversight does not represent community enhancement. Please do not approve this project as it stands.

Judy May requested a hard reset on the Homewood project. My husband and I have been full-time residents for the last eight years. TRPA's mission is to preserve, restore, and enhance the unique environment of the Lake Tahoe region while improving local communities. However, the proposal from Discovery Land Company does the opposite by closing off access to our treasured environment, alienating local communities, and prioritizing club members who won't contribute to the community. I echo the sentiments of those who spoke before me from Keep Homewood Public. I urge you to deny this application outright.

Jane Catterson said I've been in Homewood since I was nine, and I'm now 68. I learned how to ski there, and my son did too. What I've heard today about defining public access sounds like it might require a committee to enforce daily violations, which doesn't sit right with me. We have a project that's supposed to enhance our community, yet we're discussing the potential privatization of a

REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE

September 25, 2024

mountain in a small town. This is our home, and we want public access. As a community member, I wonder why a developer would want to alienate the very people they should be engaging with. Let's keep Homewood public. I urge you to deny this application.

Lynne Hurst said JMA when you owned Alpine and I had dinner with Warren Miller who said if you could connect Homewood to Alpine and Squaw Valley (Palisades Tahoe), you'd create an unbeatable terrain. Now we have that lift from Alpine to Squaw but imagine if we had a lift from the top of Homewood to Alpine. I've skied at Homewood for most of my life, and my daughter has too. I have treasured Christmas pictures at the top of that hill. Homewood is the most beautiful place to ski. Please don't take that away from us on the West Shore. I live in Tahoe Park, and we want a solution that works for everyone. The developer needs to make money, but we also want public access. Let's figure out a definition that allows for both. Homewood is too special to limit access to only a few.

Shari Francesconi has owned property in Tahoe since 2005 and started skiing at the age of three. My kids began skiing at Homewood and have grandkids coming up now. I urge TRPA to ensure that everything is documented in writing, specifically about local access. Make it permanent, for eternity. When JMA is filling out their paperwork, please insist that the term "eternity" is included. It seems essential, given the history we have with these developments. We need to protect access for future generations.

I'm here to address some concerns regarding the Homewood project. I want to point out that past practices indicate that agreements can change unexpectedly, so we need to be vigilant about commitments made by developers. One of the early presentations mentioned a commitment to public access, but they also indicated limitations based on traffic and lift ticket sales. This inconsistency raises concerns about how truly accessible the area will be to the public.

Regarding quality, the structures recently built on Sacramento Avenue do not match the architectural standards presented in their proposals. There's a clear disconnect between what was promised and what has been delivered. They also claimed that the parking structure would not be visible from the lake, which seems questionable. If they can't deliver on that promise, we need to hold them accountable. Additionally, when they say they don't know how many visitors are being brought in, that feels deceptive. They must have accurate numbers, and it's important to acknowledge that adding amenities will likely increase the number of visitors. Finally, there have been ongoing plans for construction at Rainbow Ridge, despite previous limitations set by TRPA. We need to ensure that the commitments made are put in writing and followed through.

Peter Kappelhof expressed the concerns of our family regarding the disturbing changes to the previously approved Master Plan for Homewood Mountain Resort. Our family has long supported the project approved in 2011. We are in favor of a revitalized Homewood as a community asset, but not as a private club with token public access. JMA and Discovery claims it will provide public access, but it appears to be resisting the inclusion of written measurable requirements in its application. It is clear that JMA and Discovery has been disingenuous with its vague promises of public access to the resort. The current application contains no mention or commitment to public access, indicating that they have misled the public and negotiated with community stakeholders in bad faith.

Discovery has a history of developing only private resorts, and in at least one case, has promised public access only to renege once the project was approved. The community has been disrespected by this membership model and the unenforceable promises of public access proposed. This is a betrayal

REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE

September 25, 2024

of the very community that JMA relied on to receive approval for its Master Plan in 2011. The 2011 Master Plan stated that a central goal is to restore Homewood as a key gathering center for Lake Tahoe's west shore, maintaining the heritage of a ski resort that can be enjoyed equally by local residents and visitors. They are now proposing to drastically change the physical character of the resort as represented in the 2011 Master Plan. The approved Master Plan was conceived as an Alpine village community in the architectural style of classical Tahoe. This is now proposed to be replaced by jarring mountain modern buildings that are completely out of character with the surrounding community. This change violates the Master Plan, which promised certain architectural features, including gable and hip roof shapes, dormer configurations, and the use of exposed timber and natural materials, designed to express the Tahoe design theme. TRPA and Placer County should be embarrassed by the approval of the Lot 3 Fawn Street residences, now under construction, which do not adhere to these aspects of the approved Master Plan. We urge you to deny the revised Homewood application.

Blake Herrschaft is a full-time resident and homeowner in Tahoe City. I'm an architectural engineer and former chair of a regional planning board. I have family that has learned to ski at Homewood. It serves as a key recreation area for residents from Tahoe City to Meeks Bay, especially for those who can only enjoy winter sports on weekends when other mega resorts are nearly inaccessible. From Monday to Friday, locals and parents who cannot afford \$25,000 per year for ski teams, rely on Homewood. It is the centerpiece of our local community. Tahoe can be an inspiration to others, particularly in creating an equitable community with equal access to local recreation. The applicant, Ed Davita, knows nothing about equity. He resides in a \$10.3 million house in an equestrian community and takes a private jet to go skiing. He is featured in the book Billionaire Wilderness: The Ultra Rich and the Remaking of the American West. Furthermore, there is not a single publicly accessible mountain in Discovery's entire portfolio. The evidence shows that public access is already diminishing. Last year, season passes went on sale on August 10, and they are not on sale this year. I urge the TRPA to investigate what is happening with public access. True public access would mean being open seven days a week to all passholders at a reasonable price that local teachers and firefighters can afford. Please reject this project.

Carolyn Selig owns a house on Upper Snowbird Loop in Homewood, and my two sons ski on the Homewood ski team. We agree that there should be development on the mountain, and we support the 2011 Master Plan. We, along with the staff and the team that spoke today, would like to see the mountain open this winter. As a CPA and business owner, I want to emphasize that the financial aspect needs to work for the investors, and we agree with that. However, the definition of "public access" must also be clear. Currently, there is no definition that includes daily usage or how many lift tickets would be accessible.

Residents of the West Shore, and anyone else who is not an owner of a \$200,000 membership, need to be considered. We understand that the mountain must be viable, but there are community-focused mountains like Diamond Peak that are also successful. They have invested in lifts that operate reliably and do not require frequent closures. We love Homewood and appreciate the team that works there. Our main goal is to establish a clear and enforceable definition of public access. I know that a vague and complicated definition would be incredibly difficult to enforce on an ongoing basis. The definition needs to be specific, measurable, and documented so that everyone understands it. For instance, Cordevalle is a prime example of the business model run by Discovery Land, similar to Yellowstone. We do not want that kind of development in our backyard. I have submitted numerous letters to TRPA with this same information.

REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE

September 25, 2024

Chris Heasman said 2.5 years ago, Discovery Land Company began developing in and around my community in the Scottish Highlands. I could speak at length about the problems we've faced since DLC arrived: the total lack of transparency, widespread environmental destruction, and repeated instances of unauthorized construction.

In Scotland, public access to land is codified in law, known as the right to roam. While DLC has promised to respect the letter and spirit of that law, the reality is they have taken every opportunity to abuse it. They have confined access to so-called core paths across their estate, misappropriated concepts such as curtilage, and hired security teams to remove people from land that they have the legal right to use and enjoy. This issue is not isolated; similar situations have arisen in places like Barbuda, Portugal, and the Bahamas, where the circumstances are often much worse. DLC resorts pride themselves on exclusivity and privacy, catering to their ultra-wealthy clients, which is fundamental to their business model. This means that, despite what DLC's publicists or community engagement officials may claim, you are not their neighbors, partners, or friends, you are in their way. Other communities facing DLC developments are warning that this company cannot be taken at its word and cannot be trusted to prioritize the needs of residents and locals over profit.

Deanna Boyette said I have a home in Rubicon Bay and have skied at Homewood for over 50 years. It is imperative that Homewood remains publicly accessible. Clearly, that is not the intent of the current applicant. I'm asking for a hard reset: please reject this application. Homewood is a public recreational mountain, and TRPA has the authority to ensure it stays that way. A community enhancement project cannot exclude the community, and this proposal is currently exclusive. Please adhere to the 2011 plan and ensure that any amendments include clear definitions of public access in writing. I concur with Carolyn Selig's comments.

David Murray lives in Tahoma and Homewood has been an integral part of my family's life for decades. We consider Homewood our home mountain, and it holds significant emotional value for us. My son has been skiing at Homewood since he was just 18 months old, and now at 10, he has been on the Homewood ski team since he was seven. Losing this public recreational opportunity is something we are fighting hard to prevent. There is an increasingly apparent underlying agenda to privatize Homewood Mountain and limit public access once approvals are secured. This aligns with the business model of Discovery Land Company, which has a troubling history of environmental and community harm. They demonstrate a clear trend of prioritizing profit over environmental stewardship, often operating under the radar and disregarding regulations, believing they can navigate around necessary scrutiny.

For instance, in their Barbuda project, Discovery removed mangroves that protect internationally recognized wetlands, leaving the local ecosystem more vulnerable to storms and extreme weather. This development restricted local access to essential natural resources, adversely impacting fishing, farming, and cultural activities. Similarly, the proposed Lewis Road Project threatens one of Long Island's largest aquifers, with plans for luxury homes and a golf course facing resistance due to groundwater contamination, despite promises to mitigate runoff. Their Los Cabos project in Mexico also faced complaints for unauthorized alterations to critical watercourses during construction, raising serious concerns about local water systems. Most recently, the exclusive Yellowstone Club faced backlash for destroying federally protected swallow nests by using pressure washers during nesting season, demonstrating a blatant disregard for environmental stewardship.

These cases reveal a disturbing pattern of environmental negligence and community opposition. The application and staff report for this meeting are disturbingly vague regarding public access, raising significant red flags about the developer's true long-term intentions. This is not the business model we

REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE

September 25, 2024

need or want in our basin. I urge TRPA to reject this application.

Stephanie Foucek said I am a resident of Tahoma and a long-time passholder and skier at Homewood, along with my family. I fully supported the Master Plan as presented in 2011 especially due to its focus on community enhancement and access. I agree with everything that has been said about the importance of Homewood remaining a community-based and open public space for recreation for all. I request that you ensure true and full public access continues at Homewood Mountain Resort.

Louie Fielding agreed with the points made by the Keep Homewood Public group about ensuring public access. We all want to see the ski area revitalized and improved, consistent with the 2011 plan or through some modifications. I'm not saying that TRPA and Placer County should outright reject the amendment, but they must require further amendments to clarify and specify the public access for the resort. An important point that hasn't been mentioned is that part of Homewood is public land. The Forest Service purchased the Quail Lake parcel, including the Quail Face area, in 2009. This area is integral to the operation of the ski area and has a history of public use.

In California, there is actually a prescriptive easement related to this access, similar to what exists for access to the backcountry around Ellis Peak which has been utilized for years via the ski area. These access points to public lands must be maintained. Some statements from Discovery and JMA are concerning and reflect a level of contempt for the community and the customers who have supported Homewood. Our hearts go out to the employees who have also been left in the dark, facing uncertainty about the resort's future. It's troubling to hear public statements suggesting that part of the reason for privatizing the resort is to operate it with fewer employees. As the demand for recreational opportunities in Tahoe, particularly skiing, continues to rise, eliminating Homewood as a publicly accessible facility will only push more people to fewer and fewer areas. This approach is contrary to the goals of a planning agency. Please hold them accountable by requiring enforceable elements in the plan as defined by the Keep Homewood Public group, to ensure that public access and the essence of a community enhancement project are maintained.

Mary Portius has been a resident of McKinney Drive since 1997. My family has skied at Homewood every season since 1980. I echo what others have said and request a hard reset on the application. I have reviewed the TRPA Community Enhancement Project document written in August 2007. According to this publication, TRPA has both the authority and the responsibility to reject any application that does not align with the desires of the community, improve residents' quality of life, provide public access, and demonstrate clear public benefit and strong public support. JMA and Discovery Land's current application fails to meet any of these criteria. They have not contributed positively to the local community or improved residents' quality of life. The negative impact of their seven condominiums is clear. This issue is no longer just about public access; the project lacks local community support. TRPA has the authority and responsibility to reset this application, as it does not fulfill TRPA criteria. The community has clearly stated that they do not support this project.

Michael Peterson has a family cabin located on Sacramento Avenue, directly across from the Lot 3 construction site. I've presented my thoughts on the Community Enhancement Project multiple times and today I will share the day-in-the-life perspective. Following an email, I sent Monday, which included JMA and Homewood Mountain contacts regarding the construction, I'm uncertain about where we stand on communication and timelines. The construction plan seems to be in constant flux. While a JMA representative was somewhat helpful in accommodating our requests to minimize disruption leading up to my daughter's wedding this past Saturday, the overall experience has been nothing short of a nightmare.

REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE

September 25, 2024

Despite their efforts, the impact of the construction has been overwhelming. After the wedding, we returned home to a blocked driveway and uncollected garbage. We had brought family from all over the country and international to celebrate, and were overshadowed by this construction. We've owned our cabin for 70 years, and it's disheartening to see how this project is affecting our family's experience. For the past three years, we've faced challenges in enjoying our cabin or even renting it out due to ongoing construction. We shouldn't have to navigate this disruption. This project is just the first phase, and if this is how neighbors are treated, I am concerned about the future. The thought of enduring this situation without long-term access to the area is unacceptable.

Jane Hokanson on behalf of her son, Kevin Hokanson. We've been part of the Homewood community since 1964, and Homewood Mountain Resort holds great significance for us. I want to convey the key points my son expressed. First and foremost, we urge you not to move forward with this project or approve the amendments being requested. We do not believe that JMA and DLC are acting in good faith, and we have serious concerns about whether the resort will remain open to the public. My son recently overheard a Discovery Land employee pitching to a potential investor, and they indicated that the resort would eventually go private. These were the exact words he heard.

Additionally, I encourage you to approach the statistics provided by JMA with caution. They reference a decline in ridership from 2011, but we must remember that in 2011, Homewood Mountain Resort merged with Alpine. At that time, they also offered college students season passes for just \$450. Thank you to everyone in the Homewood community who have advocated against this project.

Josh Shelton said first, comparing the Keep Homewood Public organization to the NRA and suggesting that you feel intimidated by our presence is both shameful and offensive. This is a grassroots organization dedicated to protecting one of our community's most valued treasures. I echo many of the sentiments shared here tonight. I overall support any development at Homewood that has been pending since 2011. As a resident of Meeks Bay, and someone who has the privilege of teaching the third generation of skiers here, I understand the importance of this community treasure. It is disheartening to witness the erosion of community and public access. I urge the TRPA to honor the Master Plan and respect the community and its citizens by rejecting this amendment. It is time for a new application altogether.

Gavin Feiger, League to Save Lake Tahoe said we sent a letter on June 26th to TRPA regarding three key requests for analysis to determine consistency with the Master Plan. The first request is related to transportation impacts. We asked for a comprehensive analysis to estimate the proposal's winter impacts, including visitor demographics, especially if visitors are redirected to other ski resorts. Additionally, in the summer, details about food and beverage services and the maximum number and size of events were not clarified, making it difficult to analyze transportation impacts effectively. We would like to see this included in an updated transportation analysis.

The second point concerns sediment calculations. We noted discrepancies in the documents, and we request more detail on how these calculations were conducted.

Lastly, we would like to discuss enforcement. We would appreciate seeing permit conditions or development agreements that codify many of the commitments outlined in the Community Enhancement Project. Ensuring enforcement, especially when relying on third parties, is crucial. This presents a great opportunity for TRPA to explore how third-party enforcement can be effectively managed.

Frederick Crosby has a home on Tahoe Ski Bowl Way and my kids learned to ski by at Homewood. I

REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE

September 25, 2024

appreciate everyone's perspective today. We all want change, and we all want to see the place developed. However, we must recognize the complexities we currently face in defining equal access and what constitutes the general public. When we hear promises of public access, it often feels like a quagmire, and there's no straightforward way to settle these issues without a clear and reliable framework. We've heard how Discovery has previously treated communities, making promises of public access that have gone unfulfilled. New concerns, particularly around environmental commitments, have also arisen. This organization has a track record that leans towards hyper-privatization, and it's hard to believe that a single analysis will change this trend.

We cannot accept a path that compromises the needs of the community for the benefit of a few. For those who feel we should move forward quickly, please remember that this is not just about the next year or two; it's about the future for many people involved. We need to ensure that any agreements reached are fair and equitable, especially considering that the community will likely be the minority in any tri-party arrangement. With a proposed capacity of 5,000 a day, we must question how this will impact our community and access. The real power we have now is to advocate for a hard reset of this process. We need to revisit this application thoroughly to ensure it meets the needs of our community. Rushing through this could lead to failures that would resonate for years, potentially signaling to others that it's acceptable to overlook the needs of our environment and community. I urge a hard reset. We are not working with partners acting in good faith; history has shown this.

Deanne Bostrom echoed the sentiments expressed by the Keep Homewood Public members who spoke earlier tonight. I am asking that the current proposal be denied. If Discovery Land Company wishes to proceed, I urge them to resubmit an honest proposal that includes updated environmental impact assessments. The original environmental surveys were conducted during the initial proposal phase, and given the significant changes since then, it's essential that these assessments be repeated to reflect the new designs and concepts. Additionally, I request that public access be clearly outlined in writing as a required component of any new proposal. I also question the involvement of those who are approving this project, particularly regarding their personal and financial stakes in it.

Amy Kacher said I have a house on the West Shore. During the earlier discussion, the developer's spokesperson mentioned wanting to respond to some concerns at the end. I would like to know if they would be willing to sign a clear agreement stating that Homewood will remain a public ski area, similar to other regular ski resorts. This agreement should include specific details to prevent backtracking, as we've seen with previous projects like the golf course. Second, I'd like to understand how TRPA approved the construction of those modern buildings that were never supposed to be built, given the original vision of a mountain vibe. I've had to navigate numerous hurdles just to build a small rock wall in front of my house, so it's confusing to see these larger projects move forward without similar scrutiny. Additionally, how are you ensuring that the developers adhere to fire evacuation plans? I'm questioning the processes behind the scenes, and I'm considering filing a Freedom of Information Act request for emails, as this situation doesn't seem right.

Suzanne Hughes said I ditto what so many have stated this evening, and the official Keep Homewood Public statement.

Sherry Holland said I'm a homeowner at Sugar Pine Lakeside in Tahoma, where I purchased my property about four years ago. One of the main reasons I chose this location was the beautiful Homewood Mountain Resort, which is just about two miles away. I wholeheartedly echo the sentiments expressed by my neighbors and the Keep Homewood Public community.

REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE

September 25, 2024

Lisa Berghout said we've owned our place since 2008. I do want to express our excitement about the 2011 Master Plan and seeing it implemented. But it's been disheartening to watch the ski resort stagnate over the years. I echo the sentiment that there seem to be so many rules and regulations. A plan approved in 2011 truly needs to be reconsidered to fit our current context. What makes Homewood so special is its inclusive, casual vibe; we're not an exclusive community, and that's a significant part of our charm. We want to see improvements, but it's crucial that we codify public access, which must include ensuring affordable pricing. Transforming our community into something exclusive would be a loss not just for us, but for all of Tahoe.

David Powell said I've skied at Homewood for about 55 years and have owned a cabin just off the north side for around 50 years. It's important to me that Homewood continues to thrive as a premier ski area for my family. I understand the business model challenges facing this ski area, and I know that changes are necessary for its survival. I'm open to a partial membership model, but I strongly agree with the committee's earlier call for a public access discussion. It's essential that we clearly define what public access means moving forward. I know that a Master Plan won't cover every detail, but there are many variations and combinations that can be explored. For instance, Homewood could offer different membership levels, options with or without parking, the ability to bring guests, and distinctions between weekdays and weekends. This flexibility could accommodate different owners, such as those with short term rentals or winter leases, all at varying price points. It's also crucial to address non-member access to the mountain, possibly in relation to lift capacity, with adjustments as conditions change. While I'm not sure how much detail needs to be included in the Master Plan, I believe that a slight modification of the current wording, which confirms a commitment to public access, is essential. What I don't support is shutting down the entire process and starting over. That would threaten the ski area's future. Let's find a way to work together to ensure Homewood can adapt and thrive for years to come.

Heather Peterson said I've owned my family cabin on Sacramento Avenue for many years. Other family members and friends have cabins nearby. We live directly across from Lot 3, and we've been dealing with the construction for 3.5 years. The lack of respect for our environment, the basin, the lake, the wildlife, is truly disturbing. It breaks my heart to hear a mother bear and her cubs rummaging through unsecured dumpsters filled with hazardous materials. My neighbor has been picking up trash left by workers every week, which attracts wildlife to our homes. Our properties are filthy, and our yards are marked with flags and spray paint from the construction.

We've embraced the phrase, "The mountains are calling, and I must go," but I'm compelled to ask: why are you all making these decisions if not to protect our mountain? As a neighborhood, we've regularly requested that green tarps be put up around the construction site, but it feels like we're living in a neglected area. We are just yards away from the jewel of the Sierras, and we need to see that respect reflected in how this project is managed. I'm asking for a hard reset. As a homeowner directly impacted by this construction, please consider what the next ten years will look like if this level of disregard for the community and the environment continues.

Robert Millslagle, Director of the Meeks Bay Fire Department. Fire safety is on everyone's mind here in the West Shore. To date North Tahoe Fire doesn't have a development agreement in place with Discovery. Although there was a last-minute commitment from them in December 2020 to establish an agreement, we're now approaching October 2024 without any resolution. Discovery has expressed that they do not agree with the evacuation and life safety report that requires them to provide essential fire-fighting resources, including a Type 1 fire engine and a brush fire unit, among other things. Given these ongoing concerns, I urge you to deny the current proposal from JMA and

REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE

September 25, 2024

Discovery. We need to prioritize the safety and well-being of our community.

Michelle Dike lives on Sequoia Avenue and echoed everyone's thoughts and requests for Discovery to reset and resubmit their proposal. It's crucial that we ensure Homewood remains a public space. Earlier, one of the speakers posed some important questions, and I think it would be beneficial to bring the representatives back to address those directly. It would help reassure the community if they could commit to signing an agreement that guarantees public access. I support having Discovery come back with a plan that includes clear and robust language to protect Homewood as a public area.

Rachel Hitchcock said I've been skiing and snowboarding at Homewood for over 40 years. I learned to ski there, worked as an instructor, taught my son to ski, and have been a passholder for nearly 30 years. I'm grateful for the staff at Homewood and their commitment to the area. I want to ensure continued public recreational access to Homewood Mountain. While I support the redevelopment in the 2011 Master Plan, I'm concerned that passes still aren't on sale, which is unusual for this time of year. The statement that they can't sell passes until the application is approved feels like a threat. I believe the developers intend to privatize after receiving approval. The current language around public access is vague and lacks specifics, there's no clear definition of how many people will have access, when, or where. This application does not provide any safeguards against privatization and lacks enforceable specifics regarding public access. I urge you not to approve any proposals that do not guarantee public access to Homewood for everyone, every day, in all areas of Homewood.

Dan Copenhagen said Homewood can definitely thrive as a public ski hill without going private. There are numerous examples of small ski resorts across the U.S. that operate profitably, including Diamond Peak, which is just a bit larger than Homewood. He submitted a copy of the [Diamond Peak Financials](#) for the past two seasons. You'll see they generated solid profits, \$3.9 million in the 2022-2023 season and \$2.7 million the previous season. They reinvest a portion of these net earnings into capital improvements, demonstrating that it's possible to run a successful ski operation while maintaining public access.

Ed Davita, Discovery Land Company said I appreciate the strong passion for the West Shore and Homewood that resonates within the community. It's clear that this passion is shared by both supporters and those with concerns. I want to express gratitude for our Homewood team and their hard work in planning and operating the facilities to serve the public as we pursue the necessary approvals. We have many supporters on the West Shore, and I'm thankful for each and every one of them.

Regarding future meetings, I'm curious if you would like us to bring in more supporters. So far, we've focused on crafting the application content and presenting it effectively, rather than filling the room with repeated messages. We've been listening to the comments from the Committee, and I must address the misinformation that has circulated, especially from the Keep Homewood Public group. We plan to respond to these inaccuracies, but it's disheartening to see personal attacks and the spread of false information. Such tactics can be damaging and often mislead listeners. Discovery has a strong track record of complying with permits and regulations while providing community and economic benefits at every location. We will present facts to support this. One common point made tonight is the desire for everyone to continue skiing at Homewood. We assure you that our plans include equitable access for all skiers, and we will work with staff to document this satisfactorily. We've put significant effort into our application, including drafting language on public access and enforcement to build confidence, and we've been waiting for staff feedback for weeks.

REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE

September 25, 2024

While there have been requests to restart the application process, we believe that this has been a productive day overall. We're committed to moving the Homewood project forward and look forward to further discussions with the Regional Planning Committee soon. Lastly, I want to emphasize that we have an approved Master Plan, and we are not proposing any changes to it, particularly regarding public access. Thank you all for your time, effort, and focus on this application. Your dedication is greatly appreciated.

VII. ADJOURNMENT

Ms. Aldean moved to adjourn.

Mr. Settlemeyer adjourned the meeting at 6:49 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,



Marja Ambler
Clerk to the Board

The above meeting was recorded in its entirety. Anyone wishing to listen to the recording of the above-mentioned meeting may find it at <https://www.trpa.gov/meeting-materials/>. In addition, written documents submitted at the meeting are available for review. If you require assistance locating this information, please contact the TRPA at (775) 588-4547 or virtualmeetinghelp@trpa.gov.