TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY

Mail
PO Box 5310
Stateline, NV 89449-5310

Location
128 Market Street
Stateline, NV 89449

Contact
Phone: 775-588-4547
Fax: 775-588-4527
www.trpa.gov

Errata
Revisions to the Draft January 22, 2025, Governing Board minutes, as shown in track changes in the attached document

TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
GOVERNING BOARD

TRPA/Zoom January 22, 2025

Meeting Minutes

I. CALL TO ORDER AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

Chair Ms. Williamson called the meeting to order at 10:29 a.m.

Members present: Ms. Aldean, Mr. Aguilar, Mr. Bass, Ms. Conrad-Saydah, Ms. Faustinos, Ms. Gustafson, Ms. Hays, Mr. Hoenigman, Mr. Kieckhefer, Ms. Laine, Ms. Leumer, Mr. Rice, Mr. Settelmeyer, Ms. Williamson

Members absent: Ms. Hill

II. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

III. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Ms. Regan stated that there were no changes to the agenda.
Ms. Williamson deemed the agenda approved as posted.

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Ms. Aldean moved approval of the December 18, 2024 minutes as presented.
Motion carried-voice vote.

V. TRPA CONSENT CALENDAR

1. December Financials
2. Fiscal Year 2024 Audited Financial Statements
3. Amendments to the TRPA Rules of Procedure regarding public meeting procedures (Article 2) and public records request fee policies (Article 15)
4. Resolution in Recognition of National Radon Action Month
5. APC Membership appointment for the Carson City lay member Kevin Hill

Ms. Laine said the Operations and Governance Committee recommended approval of items one, two, and three. With regards to item number three, the committee is recommending approval of the amendments to the TRPA Rules of Procedure, Article 2, regarding public meeting procedures. Regarding the public records request fee policies, we recommended that this be returned to staff for further review and to come back at a reasonable time that works for them.

DRAFT

Board Comments & Questions

None.

Ms. Williamson said items four and five were not heard at any committee.

Board Comments & Questions

None.

Public Comments

Alan Miller, civil engineer from South Lake Tahoe said I submitted substantial written comments on this item, but they haven't been posted on the meeting agenda website. There was no acknowledgment or discussion of the issues raised, which were significant. The Operations and Governance Committee decided not to take up any discussion. I also requested that this item be removed from the consent calendar, because it is a matter of public interest. The item involves changing the rules on how public meetings will be conducted. And now you are going to approve the current program which is to place the public comment period at the end of the meeting, inconveniencing the public.

In California, the public comment period must be placed at the beginning of the meeting. And TRPA under the Compact must follow the most stringent laws regarding public meetings. You're playing fast and loose with your discretion in attempting to confuse matters with the law between the states and TRPA's Compact. It's straight forward, just put the public comment period at the beginning. When the public came forward in 2019, concerns of the cell towers that were being approved, including the faux pine macro towers that shed. TRPA got tired of hearing the comments and moved the public comment to the end to discourage participation. It's easy to place the public comment period at the beginning of the meeting, as was done prior to 2020. The decision to change this without legal justification was disappointing, and a disservice to the public.

Motion:

Mr. Hoenigman made a motion to approve the consent calendar.

Ayes: Ms. Aldean, Mr. Aguilar, Mr. Bass, Ms. Conrad-Saydah, Ms. Faustinos, Ms. Gustafson, Mr. Hoenigman, Mr. Kieckhefer, Ms. Laine, Ms. Leumer, Mr. Rice, Mr. Settelmeyer, Ms. Williamson

Absent: Ms. Hill
Motion carried.

VI. PUBLIC HEARINGS

Proposed Amendments to the Homewood Mountain Resort Ski Area Master Plan and the Proposed New Homewood Gondola, 5145 West Lake Boulevard, Homewood, California, Placer County Assessor's Parcel Number 097-060-044, et. al, TRPA File Numbers CEPP2014-0636-02 and CEPP2014-0636-03

DRAFT

Mr. Hoenigman recused himself from this agenda item.
Ex parte communication:

Ms. Gustafson said I met with both the applicant as well as Keep Homewood Public along with dozens of local citizens in the community.

Mr. Hoenigman said I have as well. I will be recusing myself from this item after the presentation.

Ms. Conrad-Saydah said I have also met with advocates from both sides.

Ms. Laine said I have met with applicants, residents, and Keep Homewood Public.

Mr. Bass said as well for me.

Mr. Aguilar said I didn't meet with the applicant or any other party. However, in my previous employment as council, I represented an individual who had a commercial transaction with Discovery Land Company. I'm no longer employed by that individual.

Mr. Settelmeyer said I've had communications with both sides.

Ms. Aldean said I met with Keep Homewood Public and received an email from the applicants requesting that I contact them with any questions.

Ms. Hays said I've also met with both parties.

Ms. Conrad-Saydah clarified that she received emails from the applicant asking that I contact them if I'd like to meet. So, I only met with Keep Homewood Public.

Mr. Aguilar said I did receive emails from both sides, and thanked them for their email but didn't engage in any discussion.

Ms. Faustinos said the same for me, just emails.

Ms. Williamson said we received many written comments on this topic and I've read them all.

Ms. Regan made a brief introduction before turning it over to TRPA staff Mr. Nielsen and Mr. Porter, JMA Ventures to make the presentation.

The West Shore of Lake Tahoe is a beloved and treasured place. I just want to put on the record our appreciation for all of those who've engaged on the Homewood Master Plan and Amendment. I want to thank everyone here today and online for taking the time to participate in this important hearing. I did get some questions about the location of the meeting, and I just wanted to thank those from the North Shore for coming to the South Shore. It's hard to predict in the winter what the driving conditions will be like. And when we do have remote meetings, sometimes technology fails. Since we have hundreds of people online, we knew we could trust our system.

We appreciate the respectful dialogue throughout this process, and I feel confident that we will again continue that tradition today. What has stood out is the shared love for the lake and the West Shore and our collective desire to see revitalization and environmental improvements become a reality,

DRAFT

including advancements in fire safety. With the LA fires burning today, it's still very much top of mind for all of us. The package before you is an amendment to the master plan that the Governing Board approved in 2011 with less development than was originally proposed. The gondola permit is also being revised to accommodate a new site plan.

Our staff has been dedicated to public transparency from the outset of the application submittal back in May, and we've dedicated substantial resources to a thorough review and public vetting process. We've received and reviewed over 1,500 comments, and public access has been a key focus of the input received to date. TRPA staff worked with the applicant and stakeholders to thoughtfully incorporate much of that feedback while striking a balance with what is within TRPA's regulatory authority when it comes to setting products, prices, or experiences offered by a private business on private land.

The proposed master plan amendment before you today reflects this careful balance in our opinion. At your board meeting in July at Granlibakken, you'll recall the outdoor sign saying, "Get it in writing." I'm pleased that the package that we're bringing before you today does just that. I want to be clear that TRPA stands firmly behind the integrity of its permitting process and we're ready to enforce the provisions in the master plan amendments to ensure final agreements made throughout the process are upheld and continued.

Mr. Nielsen said TRPA's definition of a master plan is a large-scale, broad overview of an area and its developability. It is not a specific development permit. 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. If the board chooses to approve the master plan today, development permits will come later for the different phases. For example, the gondola permit is before you today as the first phase. Subsequent permits are required so we can look at the specific details of the plan, such as the water quality improvement plan, measuring the height of buildings to ensure compliance, land coverage calculations, and mitigation fees, all of which will be addressed as these permits come forward.

The goals and objectives in the master plan drive the vision and layout of the development plan. This includes a mix of land uses like residential, commercial, and tourist facilities. One important goal of the plan is to restore Homewood as a key gathering center for Lake Tahoe's West Shore and to maintain the heritage of a ski resort that can be enjoyed equally by local residents and visitors. This statement is critical not only to TRPA's Regional Plan recreation policy but also to the community on the West Shore. There is also the second policy goal of the Homewood Master Plan which has been guided by three specific objectives based on extensive community input: a) Consistency with the scale and character of Homewood; b) Enhance the lifestyle and property values of West Shore residents; and c) Generation of sufficient revenues to support the proposed environmental and fire safety improvements and ensure the continued viability of the ski operations.

Regarding the amendment to the master plan, in 2011, this board approved the Homewood Master Plan as part of a community enhancement program (CEP). The program no longer exists, but it was designed to incentivize projects that would bring environmental improvements. Some projects were permitted, some were not, but it provided incentives for developers and property owners to finance projects that went beyond the standard mitigation requirements. This concept of "above and beyond" environmental improvements is central to the CEP.

For instance, the Waldorf Astoria project, which was approved by the board in April, is part of the CEP program. It offers improvements such as treating water quality to the 50-year, one-hour storm level,

DRAFT

which exceeds the baseline requirement of treating the 20-year, one-hour storm. Additionally, there will be scenic improvements along Highway 89 and additional land coverage.

The Advisory Planning Commission (APC) recommended approval with three changes, which have been incorporated into the public access plan. These changes include defining key terms, particularly the term "anyone," and revisiting monitoring and enforcement provisions.
(presentation continued)

Ryan Porter, JMA Ventures, a partner in the Homewood Mountain Resort (HMR) development. I'm here to represent HMR and share our request for revisions to the already approved 2011 Homewood Master Plan. This plan was originally approved in 2011 to address declining ski visitation. Unfortunately, since then, skier visitation at Homewood has declined by an additional 60 percent. It is now crucial to implement this master plan, and the revisions we are proposing will facilitate this process. To deliver a project of this scale and complexity, it's important that we get it right. After a review, we identified key areas within the land plan that needed adjustment, including:
Improving the flow of the village core experience for both residents and visitors alike, supporting operational requirements and requests, updating plans to comply with the latest agency and code requirements, integrating updated engineering needs, and addressing changes in the real estate market.

We've taken several steps to address these areas, including relocating the gondola terminal and realigning the gondola path, adding a gondola cart barn for operational needs, and reducing the total residential unit density by 45 percent. We also reduced the building mass and scale while enlarging significant view corridors and slightly refining the building architecture. Importantly, we have not revised access to recreation for the general public in any way or changed representations from the existing approvals.

Community Outreach and Process: Over the past 18 months, we've conducted extensive community outreach to inform people of the proposed changes, gather feedback, and improve our plan. We've held over 50 community meetings and presentations, reaching thousands of residents, community groups, and business owners. We've also made presentations available on our website, held on-site tours, and engaged in meetings to ensure everyone, including those unfamiliar with the history of Homewood, understood the proposed changes.

One notable site tour was held this summer to ensure board members had context for the development and understood the gondola positioning changes.

At the recent Advisory Planning Commission (APC) meeting, we received unanimous approval for the project amendment. However, we were asked to clarify definitions and solidify our commitment to maintaining public recreational opportunities.

Public Access and Local Discount Program: Throughout the community meetings, we've discussed how to best meet requests from neighbors and patrons within an ever-changing ski industry. Even though our master plan amendment doesn't change the public access language or reduce any recreational obligations, we recognize the need to implement a practical operations plan. This includes offering key local discount packages to ensure the resort thrives. Homewood has always been open to the public, as shown with our Smile campaign. Our goal is to ensure skiing, and all resort activities are available to anyone, including locals, first responders, teachers, and others in key demographics. This also means

DRAFT

all ski lifts, restrooms, lockers, rental areas, and other key skier services are available for all to use in and around the community gathering center and beyond.

We've created a detailed local's discount package to ensure that these important community members are not left behind. We also want to promote opportunities for students, employees, volunteer ski patrol, and other organizations vital to the success of the community and beyond the basin. Although skiing can be inaccessible to some, our aim is to create development that benefits both locals and visitors alike.

Ensuring Compliance and Accountability: We have worked to clarify enforcement and monitoring language to provide TRPA with oversight, including annual reporting, operational consistency, and financial penalties for noncompliance. We've also further defined who can purchase ski products and packages, which is anyone., That includesing second homeowners, third homeowners, visitors, and anyone else who meets the criteria. We've added detailed definitions to our discount program to provide clarity and included language outlining our commitment to complying with the spirit of the public access plan.

Community Benefits:
The approval of this master plan amendment would allow HMR to implement several critical community investments, including Fire Department Funding: The development will directly fund fire department initiatives required for Homewood's full buildout, benefiting all residents in the community. This includes funding for a renovated or new fire station, firefighting equipment, and new staff hires. Water Storage Tanks: The master plan includes constructing two new water storage tanks to support firefighting efforts. Shelter in Place: HMR will serve as a shelter or area of refuge during a crisis. Search and Rescue Resources: HMR will continue to serve as a resource center for training and search-and-rescue missions, similar to the successful one performed this summer. The recent devastation in LA has highlighted the importance of supporting fire services, and we stand behind our commitment to these initiatives. However, without development at HMR, none of these resources will come to fruition.

Switching over to the physical plan, these changes will help realize Homewood at its full final buildout.

Homewood consists of three main development locations: The North Base, adjacent to Highway 89, where the main lodge is located today; the South Base residential enclave, located near Tahoe Ski Bowl Way; the Mid Mountain, located at the top of the new gondola terminal at the old Madden chairlift location.

Here you can see an overlay of the 2011 approved master plan (in red) and the proposed master plan revision (in beige). The similarities in building positioning are clear, while improvements have been made by separating the contiguous village structures. Pulling the gondola down closer to the core of the village will improve skier access from both the day skier parking garage and from shuttle and bus transit options, ensuring a safer and more enjoyable experience.

The proposed master plan revision maintains all the key elements from the 2011 plan, including:
A bed base across the North Base with 71 total residences, in addition to a 73-unit boutique hotel.
The same mix of skier service offerings and commercial spaces, including food and beverage, ticketing, retail shops, restrooms, lockers, ski rental spaces, and a large day skier parking facility.

DRAFT

Public Access: All areas highlighted in orange on the screen are accessible to all members of the community, not just skiers. This includes residents and visitors alike. We envision this thoughtfully reimagined space becoming a community gathering center.

Here's the South Base, with an overlay of the two plans and proposed slight revisions to layouts. The South Base is separated by a pedestrian bridge spanning across the Homewood Creek (denoted in the blue hash line). A key benefit of the South Base development will be to restore and improve the stream environment zone (SEZ). Additionally, the approved master plan noted that maintenance facilities should be moved further away from the lake and up to the mid-mountain area. It also called for all day skier parking to be shifted to the North Base to ease traffic. We are implementing both of these changes with no deviations.

Lastly, here you can see the approved mid-mountain lodge on the left and the proposed revision layout on the right. All key elements, including the community pool, facility maintenance building, gondola, and lodge, are consistent with the original approvals. The only difference is the request to include a cabin storage structure, which will improve skier experience and extend the life of the gondola cabins.

Going beyond two-dimensional plan comparisons, our team has analyzed the rendered views to ensure conformance with the approved scenic evaluation. On the left is the approved 2011 master plan from Highway 89 to Fawn Street. On the right are our revised renderings, which highlight consistency with scale, character, and architectural elements. We believe this represents a noticeable improvement.

Here's a view from Highway 89 into the village core. You can see how our revised layouts have split the contiguous north building structures, creating a wonderful corridor view both up the mountain for people along the roadway and down to the lake from the ski run above. This added view corridor better integrates the development into the scale and character of the community. Lastly, here's a view along Highway 89 where you can see residential units at lot seven and eight. No drastic changes have been made.

The comparisons and renderings you've seen sum up the bulk of the proposed revisions to the master plan amendment. That said, Homewood was originally approved due in major part to the environmental and traffic benefits and reductions that would come with sustained and thoughtful development. It's important to highlight where we remain consistent with and/or improve upon those aspects.

Homewood was approved as a Community Enhancement Project (CEP), and the proposed master plan revision makes no changes to meeting all of our obligations within these CEP objectives. In fact, with a master plan requirement to restore 500,000 square feet of land coverage, Homewood Mountain Resort (HMR) has already exceeded that obligation and restored over 600,000 square feet of land.

Additionally, we'll complete stream environment zone (SEZ) restorations both at the North and South bases.

Although required to design water treatment facilities for 20-year storm events, we are designing for a 50-year storm event.

DRAFT

Lastly, we will undertake substantial forest fuel reduction efforts to increase forest health and reduce wildfire risk across our acreage, a project that began this year with the completion of the first 42 acres.

Homewood Mountain Resort has been an environmental steward for the past 18 years since its purchase by JMA Ventures. Homewood has prioritized critical watershed research and improvement efforts up the mountain, using those efforts to inform restoration initiatives across the region. These efforts have resulted in several awards for exemplary and forward-thinking environmental sustainability, including TRPA's Best in Basin Award (2010) and the National Ski Area Association Golden Eagle Award (2013). On the left are photos from restoration performed in previous years, and on the right are current photos of the forest fuels reduction work carried out this summer.
The alternative transportation programs identified within the approved 2011 master plan are still key components of the amendment today. We have maintained key elements of the land plan, including: Shuttle drop-off locations; public bus transit stop in front of the North Base Day Skier parking lot, and other methods of getting folks around the resort. We will continue to explore opportunities to combine efforts with our neighbors in Emerald Bay and beyond to maximize efficiency and synergy where feasible.

The master plan amendment results in a reduced trip generation of 17 percent over a winter day and 21 percent over a summer day in comparison to the 2011 plan. We will continue to prioritize traffic reduction strategies throughout the development, with enforcement mechanisms monitored by the agencies and during subsequent permitting efforts.

Overall, we're extremely excited about the progress our team has made with the master plan progression. We believe the changes made to building layouts, massing, scale, and character have all been positive, and we've received great feedback from the community. We are confident that the revisions to pull the gondola down to the village core is a huge improvement. We continue to maintain a conformance approach to the approved master plan.

Mr. St. Michel said before we begin public comment, I just want to point out that when these board materials were published a week ago, since then, we've received a few more public comments from the group, and we've made some minor clarifications and minor revisions to the community access plan. We've provided these revisions to you this morning. These are very small changes, but I just want to make sure we point that out before we proceed. Copies of these are in the back of the room and online.

Public Comments

Kathy Astromoff representing 3,000 local residents and visitors who want to keep Homewood public. In 2022, JMA informed TRPA of their club concept, where community members could purchase memberships. In this plan, locals could only ski multiple times each month, and only on non-holidays or weekdays. There was no way for second homeowners or short-term tourists to ski. TRPA correctly responded: that's not public.

In today's Community Access Plan, local residents would get more access, but second homeowners and short-term tourists still can't ski. This is not public. It contravenes the master plan, which says Homewood is to be enjoyed equally by both local residents and visitors. Why is this happening? Because, despite claims that Homewood would always be public, JMA still hopes to create an exclusive private skiing experience for members at the expense of visitors.

DRAFT

How do we know this? Because JMA's partner is Discovery Land Company, who runs exactly zero resorts where the public gets what members get. Public access to their Cordevalle Golf Resort was reduced from 60 percent public grounds to a handful of charity tournaments. That's not public.
To be clear, we want a project. We're okay sharing the mountain with members if that funds a gondola we can enjoy. We're okay with 70-foot tall condos if selling them keeps Homewood open. We're even okay with 10 years of construction, noise, dirt, and traffic, but only if visitors, local residents, and members are guaranteed public recreational access. That is public.

Please ask JMA how many members can be on the hill, and how many non-members can be on the hill at any one time? Who gets to ski on blackout days? What pass pricing do you think is reasonable? Please keep asking until you get good answers, and if you don't get them, please send this application back to JMA to do better. Or at least include the changes we asked for in the draft motions before you. This is a once-in-a-generation decision. Doing it right is way more important than doing it quickly.

Ellie Waller said I believe Placer County has a history of not addressing blight, especially when it comes to condemning buildings and ensuring that demolitions are done expediently. The Tahoe Inn is a public nuisance and a wildlife hazard. Public health and safety should be the priority here. As the Governing Board, you have the authority to change the 2028 demolition deadline. In my opinion, it should be moved up to May 2025, before any gondola or other improvements are approved or started. The Tahoe Inn is part of the Homewood Project, where tourist accommodation units are being transferred for conversion into residential units. It should be condemned and demolished now. The old Henrikson building didn't come down without public complaints. The Sandy Beach Campground is still sitting empty, being used as dirt parking for boats and the public. The site at 6731 Alpine View Estates wasn't torn down until we started seeing issues with vagrancy and bears. These are serious problems. The Tahoe Inn needs to be demolished immediately. The good news is that Cal Neva is in progress, although Washoe County is dealing with a similar problem with the Biltmore, now Boulder Bay could be the next site in need of attention. I'm sure Cal Neva would like to see the Tahoe Inn demolished as well.

Kevin Steele said I've been a ski resort employee since 1992, it's not an easy job. Sometimes, second homeowners refer to us as "lowlife locals," and more recently, I've been called "Tahoma High Class" by one of the organizers of the opposition. I'm the Food and Beverage Manager at Homewood Mountain Resort. I'm also a father, and I need this job. This development is a good thing for the community, and I've known since the early 1990s that Homewood needs these improvements. I'm a passionate and hardworking professional in the ski industry, and I work with a team of people who care deeply about this resort. We all want to keep our jobs. I want to feed my kids, ski, and serve food and beverage to the many people who come here to enjoy the incredible experience Homewood has to offer.

This development is a huge opportunity. I've worked for JMA and Discovery, and they are good people who want to do this the right way. They've treated me incredibly well as an employee. I came to this job because of the development and the chance to build my career. I truly believe they want to do the right thing, and I think this master plan and development will reunite the community. We can all celebrate this together, it's a victory. We've entertained prospective investors for many years, and now we finally have people here who are ready to make this happen. It's important to me, to my family, and to all the employees who are without jobs right now. This is the cultural center of the West Shore, and it's crucial that you do the right thing today and approve this development.

Lisa Small, West Shore resident for about 10 years before recently relocating to Carson City, Nevada. I moved because I found the resources on the West Shore lacking for raising my family. I'm here today

DRAFT

in support of Homewood, and I want to emphatically support the Homewood employees who are here with me today. They work incredibly hard and depend on this resort for their livelihoods.

Lisa Small on behalf of Rhonda Stratton, Tahoma homeowner for the last 25 years who couldn't attend today's meeting. "Dear TRPA, I'm a supporter of Homewood Mountain Resort and enthusiastically back their proposed amendment to the approved master plan, including replacing the Madden ski lift with a new gondola. The 2011 approved master plan outlines critical investments in ski infrastructure, environmental improvements, wildfire risk reduction, and the amenities and services our community lacks. These investments are vital to protecting both our community and Lake Tahoe. Homewood has demonstrated its commitment to addressing community concerns and assuring continued public access to the mountain."

Lisa Small on behalf of Monica. "As we begin the new year, I'm writing to voice my support for Homewood Mountain Resort's amendment to the master plan. This proposed amendment conforms with TRPA, state, and county requirements. TRPA staff has done a thorough job working through the details with HMR to ensure that this is the case." I'll skip to the bottom part here: "Business climate change is a factor we'll address when it arises in the future. It has already been stated by TRPA staff that any changes not covered by the master plan amendment, such as moving toward privatization, will require the resubmission of plans and new rounds of reviews and approvals. Homewood Investors are aware of and have agreed to these conditions. Now, the decision to approve the amendment is in your hands. I urge you to vote to move the project forward as recommended by both TRPA staff and the Advisory Planning Commission."

David Powell said I'm aware that Homewood Mountain Resort (HMR) listened to public concerns regarding public access and made changes to the operations plan portion of the master plan amendment presented to the Advisory Planning Commission (APC) in December. I also know that some still felt there were ambiguities, but I'm confident that the meetings between HMR and TRPA staff after the APC meeting have fully resolved the public access issue in the community access plan, which is now part of the amendments to the master plan.

I therefore strongly encourage the board to approve the proposed amendments to the master plan so that HMR can move forward in creating a first-class area. I want HMR to improve the facilities to match the exceptional setting of their mountain while also building a profitable business that ensures the resort can continue operating for everyone over the coming decades. I've been involved with decision-making for the West Shore for the last 35 years. I was a member of the Citizens Advisory Committee for revising the West Shore General Plan that was published in 1998. I've also been on the Homewood HOA board for 25 years, serving as president for 10 of those years. I'm familiar with the difficulty of getting things done in Homewood.

Generally, there are those who don't want any changes or additions. For example, there were opinions in the 1998 master plan that opposed any new commercial activity in Homewood. There were also people who opposed completing the bike path through Homewood, referring to it as the "Homewood Hole." Recently, I've also heard a lot of opposition to the extent of the HMR additions, but I am in favor of change and improvements at HMR. I want a first-class ski area at this beautiful site. I hope the amendment is passed today so HMR can begin work on the gondola and the rest of the master plan.

Fredrick Crosby has lived in Tahoe for several years, and I think this is an exciting proposal. There are a lot of great things about it, including the idea of having a key gathering center for the West Shore community. However, I am concerned about Discovery Land Company and their business model, which

we need to address. As has been mentioned, they don't have a single public facility across 32 other locations on their website. The public cannot access any of them.

How can you buy property for anywhere between $3 million to $50 million and get access to everything, except the exclusive areas? Their model promises exclusivity. And I think there's a comment from Mike Millman, the CEO, who himself said in an interview that the private club model is designed to “weed out” people. If you're a "bad guy,” you’ll know it and you won’t bother buying property or going through the membership process, as you won't be approved. In that same interview, he mentioned that their locations are frequented by captains of industry, athletes, actors, and sports team owners. They can relax and be themselves in a place where no one needs anything from them because everyone is at the top of their industry.

This is why we’re concerned about the language in the proposal. There’s a precedent for this exclusivity, and it contradicts the idea of equal access. If they say that the public and visitors will be on equal footing, where is that equality? Will we truly have access, or is it just a promise?
There’s a history of companies backtracking on original commitments once they get through certain stages. I urge you to be very careful with the language in this agreement, so that we can move forward with what we all want, but with proper protection for the community.

Candace Wilmuth, board member of Keep Homewood Public. My boyfriend and I are full-time residents of the West Shore, taxpayers, Homewood pass holders, and, of course, Homewood lovers. TRPA Governing Board, thank you for your time and for spending that time protecting Lake Tahoe. Today, I would like to submit my name to the record as a full supporter of Keep Homewood Public's position regarding the extremely problematic and incomplete amendment application from Homewood Mountain Resort. As I was coordinating our RSVPs this weekend, I had a number of supporters tell me they could not attend in person for various reasons.

So, I started making a list of those who wanted to show their support, even though they couldn’t be here live. About 200 of those folks are here today, both in person and on Zoom. The remaining 750 supporters are here in spirit, and they want to make sure their voices are heard. I would like to submit this list of 750 supporters to the record. These people are not publicly commenting, but they want to make it clear that if this application is not fixed if the issues with it, or the omissions, are not resolved. They urge TRPA to send this back for further work by TRPA staff and Homewood Mountain Resort. Please do not approve this today with all of these problematic issues involved.

Kathy Bean said my family and I have owned property on Sacramento Avenue in Homewood for the last 60 years. My husband and I moved here permanently 10 years ago once we retired. We are members of Keep Homewood Public. My comments right now are specific to the fire protection aspect and the public access piece. It is critical that TRPA feels confident that Homewood Mountain Resort, Discovery, JMA, and any other relevant agencies stand behind their commitment to public access and their commitment to protecting us from fire. The recent fires in the area have only emphasized how critically important this issue is.

Nick Desomber is a full-time West Shore resident since 2003. As we can all see, a lot of changes are coming our way. I’m in full support of many things, but I have concerns when it feels like there’s backhandedness or confusion being created making things unclear for people. People have the right to a job, a home, and security. This is all rooted in the community, not just the people who work there but the community they are a part of as well. It should not be just a select few who are privileged enough to privatize everything. I’m not saying we shouldn’t go ahead with this project, but we all

agree that there needs to be more clarity about public access. What is it really going to mean? We need to know the actual numbers of how many tickets will be available, and at what cost? Isn't that what public access is? It shouldn't just be a token gesture for a select few. I'm sure the people working there want to be able to ski with their friends and have their families enjoy the resort too. We all want to make a living, and we all want progress, but I feel like things are moving too quickly without enough definition. We need more clarity to say, "Yes, this is the right decision." This isn't a small decision, and I understand that a lot of work has been put into it. But I think we still need more information. Homewood is our home, and everyone here loves it, who doesn't? We all want to see the right thing happen for this place. The biggest thing is getting that definition and clarity. We need real numbers and clear answers about what this is going to look like moving forward.

Chief Lindgren on behalf of the Lake Tahoe Regional Fire Chiefs Association, which includes all the agencies in and around the basin. I am also the chairman of that group and the chairman of the Multi-Agency Coordination (MAC), the governing body that oversees the Tahoe Fire and Fuels team. I just wanted to provide a quick update on some of the efforts we're doing in the basin to address fire concerns. We've done a lot of great work collaboratively with all the agencies working together communicating, getting grants, and coordinating our efforts. But we still have a lot of work to do, and we don't want to sugarcoat that.

We have significant challenges, especially with fuel reduction in the basin. We also have evacuation issues and concerns, as many of you know. I want to highlight a couple of our main priorities with the Tahoe Fire and Fuels team. The number one priority is reducing the fuels along evacuation routes to make it safe for people to evacuate. Given the limited evacuation routes we have in the basin, we know that in the event of a massive evacuation, like during the Caldor Fire, people could be stuck in their cars. We want to ensure that doesn't turn into a situation like the Campfire or the fire in Hawaii, where people are in danger.

Our second priority is creating fuel breaks on the Forest Service land around our communities. As you all know, our communities border Forest Service land. A lot of that land is not well-maintained, and it's not a healthy forest. We need to create that barrier. This project is important, but we also need to ensure we're able to protect the community as a whole.

The fire marshal from North Tahoe will speak a little later and provide more specifics, but I wanted to share the good work we're doing with the Tahoe Fire and Fuels team. We're fully aware of the fire risks, and we are committed to addressing them, because anything that happens in the basin affects all of us.

Ben Neikirk, Assistant Ski Patrol Director at Homewood and has lived in Tahoe for eight years and working at Homewood for six. Fortunately, I'm still employed by the resort, but unfortunately, I've watched the ski patrol team, which I consider my family, disappear due to obstructionist actions from our opposition. Some of our team members, with years of medical expertise, snow science experience, and technical rescue skills, have had to relocate to other resorts or even return to their hometowns, as their livelihoods have been taken away.

This loss extends beyond just ski patrol. Homewood has seen departures of ski instructors, line cooks, mechanics, ticket scanners, and essentially all of the hardworking individuals who make this resort run smoothly. Right now, Homewood feels eerily quiet. We want to get back to hearing the sounds of chairlifts in motion, the music played by lift operators, the energy of skiers enjoying powder turns, and the buzz of people out on Quail Face. But those sounds have all vanished. More broadly, there's an

DRAFT

emptiness on the West Shore that reflects the loss of our vibrant community. This resort is in desperate need of investment, and our partners are ready to provide the necessary capital to restore Homewood to its rightful place as the jewel of the West Shore. I urge you to do the right thing and move this proposal forward for our employees, our community, and for the future of Homewood.

Kurt Streit, and I've been proud to call this community home for 14 years now. For the past eight years, I've worked at Homewood, where I've been fortunate to build my career while living in one of the most beautiful places in the country. I'm here today to express my full support for this project because Homewood needs this development. We're working with aging infrastructure, limited employee housing, and a lack of essential on-mountain utilities that impact everything from snowmaking to food and beverage operations. These aren't minor inconveniences. They're real, pressing issues that threaten the long-term sustainability of Homewood and, by extension, the West Shore community.

The unfortunate reality is that some want to see this project fail. Many of the loudest voices in opposition are part-time residents who don't ski at Homewood and don't rely on it for their livelihoods. Yet they seek to dictate the future of a place that many of us depend on.

Homewood is the largest employer on the West Shore, and for the people in this room my coworkers, my neighbors, and my friends this isn't just about a ski resort. It's about jobs, stability, and the ability to continue living and working in the place we love. Over the past two years, Homewood employees have been treated like second-class citizens. Our voices have been drowned out in a conversation about our own future. But today, I'm here to set the record straight. The opposition does not represent me as a homeowner. They do not represent my coworkers, and they do not represent the majority of the community. I urge you to do what's right, not just for a select few, but for the entire community. Approve this amendment, secure Homewood's future, and ensure the people who live and work here can continue to call this place home.

Shawn Copenhagen, and I learned to ski on the Mighty Might at the age of two at Homewood. I would like to address my concern regarding the developer's care for the community. The Ellis chair was installed in 1977, 48 years ago. The Madden chair was installed in 1982, five years after the Ellis chair. However, the Ellis chair is not scheduled to be replaced until 2030. A few years ago, the Ellis chair broke down and stranded many skiers on the chair for two hours or more. I had some close friends who were stuck on the chair. For them, it was cold, it was scary, and people were belayed off chair by chair, person by person.

While the gondola will be a wonderful addition, visible and snazzy at the front of the mountain, it is mind-boggling that the oldest chair on the mountain, which gives access to great skiing in a visually hidden part of Homewood, will not be replaced sooner. This, to me, illustrates that the developers do not have the community and public's best interest in mind when the oldest chair on the mountain will not be replaced until it is well over 50 years old. I'm also concerned as a second homeowner that unless excessive costs are addressed, I will be unable to enjoy the hill that I have loved and cherished all my life. I support Keep Homewood Public's position and ask that all of their highlighted points are resolved before the board approves changes to the master plan. I do want to see Homewood developed. I want to see it improved, but not at the expense of the public.

Don Yuhas, director at Homewood. I'd like to start by discussing the state of our industry. In 2007, the Apollo Group bought Vail Enterprises out of bankruptcy and eventually became a publicly traded company, launching the Epic Pass with 42 resorts. In 2009, KSL Partners formed Alterra and launched

DRAFT

the ICON in 2017. Altera now controls 19 resorts and 14 heli-ski lodges. These two conglomerates control 23 percent of the resorts in the country and 60 percent of skier visitation.

In order to reward stakeholders and investors, they must sell millions of passes, and they do. Together, they will sell over two and a half million passes from small resort towns in the Tahoe Basin, and small resort towns and Tahoe Basin communities could be completely overwhelmed. Try driving from Truckee to Tahoe City on a busy weekend. I worked in Northstar for 23 years and experienced their culture firsthand. Suffice to say, employees were treated with disdain, as evidenced by the recent strike and guest experience nightmare over Christmas week in Park City, a culture of fear and reprisals.

I share this experience to give the board and community an industry perspective and to express how grateful I am to be part of Homewood. I love working for an organization and people who genuinely care about each other. We are a culture of inclusion and support for each other in the community. We are aligned with great partners who want to develop this area and do the right thing. Like many small resorts, we cannot compete with the aforementioned.
Please, this decision is very binary. Approve, and the water rises for everyone. Deny or delay, and hundreds lose their jobs and livelihoods. The resort becomes an economic and environmental blight, and the West Shore in Tahoe City continues to die. Please do the right thing.

Joey Marzelli, is a second homeowner in Tahoma. I want to talk about the local businesses and the local economy and what's happening. I'm a true believer that we should keep Homewood public, but I'm also a true believer that we should approve these plans so these people can get their jobs back.
I grew up in a small lake mountain town in New England. We serviced the second-home community and the tourists, and we had two seasons to make our money summer and winter. If it was a bad summer or winter, we felt it as a family.

As a small business, we made our money through the locals, the second-home community, and the tourists. We didn't make money from the people at the private yacht clubs, the big homes, and the private country clubs. They didn't contribute much. Why? Because they had these big homes they'd visit maybe once a year. I couldn't care less if we give them a private lodge where they can eat caviar and talk about their wonderful lives. But Homewood is a huge piece of our community, it's the heart of the West Shore.

I saved up for years to finally buy a cabin in 2019 next to Homewood. I worked as hard as I could to make that dream happen. The only reason we're in Reno now is because we have children and don't have as many resources to be there primarily, but we're there all the time. I see the small businesses struggling, like Dog and Bear, and so many others that are really suffering right now because we've taken away their economy, tourism, renters, everything—by taking away the Homewood community.
I stand behind these people in saying, let's keep it public. We can find a fair balance of keeping it public and having private sectors of the resort that make sense. Let's get these people their jobs back and support the local community and local businesses.

Andy Chapman, Chief Operating Executive and President of Travel North Tahoe Nevada. But today, I'm here as a 32-year local who has raised our children here in the basin, all of whom skied at Homewood as little kids. Today I stand in strong support of the TRPA approval of the Homewood Mountain Master Resort Plan Amendment. This project represents a significant opportunity, balancing responsible development with the protection of Tahoe's environment while delivering enhanced community character and substantial economic benefits to the Tahoe region.

DRAFT

As outlined in the packet, your TRPA staff has recommended the Governing Board approve this plan. This recommendation signifies careful consideration and thorough evaluation of the project's potential impacts and community benefits.

The Homewood Master Plan reflects an understanding and appreciation of our community's values. The central goal is to restore Homewood as a key gathering center for Lake Tahoe's West Shore while maintaining its heritage as a ski resort enjoyed by both locals and visitors. This aligns perfectly with the community input, which emphasized maintaining the resort's scale and character, improving the quality of life for West Shore residents, and ensuring the resort's ski operations are financially viable. Homewood Mountain Resort has long been considered West Shore's local ski hill. This plan ensures that tradition continues while providing the necessary updates to enhance the experience for all.
By supporting this project, you are not only investing in the future of Homewood but also in the economic vitality of our entire region.

In conclusion, the TRPA approval of the Homewood Mountain Resort Master Plan Amendment represents a balanced approach that supports economic growth, protects our sensitive environment, and enhances the quality of life for residents and visitors.
I urge you to support this important project.

Jeff Porter, guest services manager at Homewood. You've heard a lot from the development team and from Keep Homewood Public, and I want to introduce a third group, mountain people and employees. I feel uniquely qualified to speak on the public support for the project. I interact weekly with thousands of guests and 300 employees each day during the ski season. Over the last three years, I've had numerous discussions with them. It's important to note that a very large group overwhelmingly supports a membership-public model with public access. I've sat in that office, and they often ask, "Jeff, what's happening right now?" I've had those discussions with them. Of course, they'd like to win the lottery and just buy it and make it employee-owned, but that's not going to happen. We feel this investment group is a good plan. There is a small opposition group, Keep Homewood Public. I think there's a feeling that the skiers, guests, and employees I'm talking about are farther apart from KHP than they actually are.

A very large group agrees with KHP on many points about public access, upgrading infrastructure, and responsible development. However, the group I interact with differs from KHP in believing that approval for the project should be based on what's actually being presented, stated, and backed up in writing, not just on a feeling of mistrust. If you agree with the opposition group's angle, you would have to believe that the developers are misleading everyone, maybe even outright lying about public access. I don't believe you can base your vote on that. We have to be guided by the facts, and the facts are in writing. Homewood will be public. Day tickets to ski on the mountain will be available to anyone equally. TRPA staff have even stated in the last meeting that, to go private in the future, developers would have to come back with a new plan and get TRPA approval.
So, please approve this project. I can call my employees and tell them we're going to be open next year. I can call the thousands of guests who ask me. You can go ahead and start renting your second home, getting your Airbnb's, and visiting the restaurants.

Nancy Martin said my family has been second homeowners in Homewood for over 60 years. I worked for many years at Homewood Mountain as a ski instructor, as well as taking on summer jobs in the community. I am speaking for my entire family, who spends our summers and winters living and playing in the Homewood community. We've had season passes all those years. We know every run on the mountain, spend time in the lodge, and have taught multiple generations to ski there. As the

developers pursue this new model of a private-public resort, it's critical that they designate and define public access to skier services, such as specific allocations for restrooms, shuttles from north and south bases, lockers, and hotel reservations. This needs to be in the master plan so that the public has a comfortable skiing experience in this private-public model. We look forward to continuing to ski at Homewood with this new development.

Dan McNamara said I'm astonished that people can be so arrogant as to come into a close-knit community and completely disrupt everything. Residents and visitors have been enjoying the ski area for 64 years, spanning generations of family members. They should be ashamed of themselves. Art Chapman has shown himself to be very deceptive and dishonest. It was learned that he didn't even disclose to his investor, Discovery Land Company, that the community is dissatisfied with the resort going private. When Ed Divita of Discovery came out to see the project, it was reportedly the first time he found out about the community's opposition. Chapman was so distrusted and inept at public relations that Divita had to take over handling the public. All statements from the group are deceptive, manipulative, and not transparent.

We bought our house near the resort in 1993 so our young kids could learn to ski there. Since we can't afford a membership in the private club, with blackout days being the only times our kids can get off work and our grandkids will be out of school, we won't be able to get together as a family and ski at the mountain where our kids grew up skiing and where we all love. That is lost forever. Everyone was behind the original master plan, but HMR did nothing to improve the area for 13 years. When people drive from beautiful Emerald Bay to Tahoe City, they would have seen architecture so inviting that they would want to stop in. With the currently proposed style, it will be an abomination, and people will wonder how something so out of place could ever have been approved. I encourage the commissioners to again watch the JMA video for the original plan, which shows Tahoe Tavern-style buildings with green roofs and rocks. Then, compare that to the brutalist architecture style proposed, which resembles a stark government housing project.

David Paulson, Base Operations Director at Homewood Mountain Resort. For the last 10 years, among a handful of other departments, my oversight has included buildings and grounds. We've heard about the people and community side of this decision today, and yes, we all have fear and concern for our fellow employees and what might become of our community if Homewood does not open again and this plan is not moved forward. But I'd like to talk about another aspect of the need for your approval: the condition of the resort as a whole. You've heard it from others, but in my 48 years as a Tahoma Park resident and in the ski industry as an operations director, I've worked at four major resorts and witnessed their internal and external conditions.

By far, Homewood Mountain Resort is in the least favorable condition of all of them, and that's being kind. Anyone who has been an employee or guest at our resort can attest to that. There is truly no tread left on the tires that is Homewood Mountain Resort. We are in dire need of a capital infusion to bring this resort up to the standard that the community deserves, and our partners are ready to do that. Those of you who have been to our ageing resort, picture that in your mind. Now, picture the artist renderings you've seen of the new Homewood Resort. Imagine walking through that thoughtfully laid out, carefully designed, and crafted community center that welcomes all. Imagine the possibilities of enjoying all the amenities we will soon have to offer, both summer and winter. Homewood can once again be the economic center of the West Shore, the desired employer of choice for 300 to 400 employees, and the driver that leads to successful businesses we stand shoulder to shoulder with, like Dockside, Obexer's, West Shore Sports, and Dog and Bear.

DRAFT

Ted Peterson is representing my eight grandchildren, and soon to be number nine. One of the primary points I realized today when Giuseppe was speaking is something that's being missed right now, and that's the retail component of the project. There's not enough density in Homewood to support the 25,000 square feet of retail, and I don't see any studies coming forward on the commercial side that address this issue. It's really critical because if that space is built and remains vacant, it doesn't do anybody any good. Ed Divita represented that the average stay for a Discovery member is 27 days a year. That population won't support the retail needs. If you look at the convenience market, we have Dockside, former Obexer's Sunnyside Market, and West Shore Market. It's not a match for us.

The second issue for me is the construction timeline. The construction timeline talks about a 10-year period. That's fatiguing. It's too long. When you go out to 10 years, it's not a deadline. They can't build this project at this scale. I have 40 years of experience in the shopping center business in places like Danville, San Jose, San Diego, and Orange County. The restrictions up here make it difficult to build this project in that timeline. Our cabin is at the base of the scale, and we've had it for 75 years. My brother and I own it now. My wife and I bought a cabin two doors away in 2016 because of the master plan. What we've gone through on lot three has been unimaginable, and we can't live there in the summertime. It's a knockout for us.

Rosaline Walker, second homeowner in Skyland, not Homewood, since 1964. I started skiing at Homewood when I was 18, and one thing I've learned is that nothing is forever in my 88 years. I was also a realtor for 45 years until I retired. I agree with everyone here, but there's one thing I haven't heard or read: I don't see any permanence. What if the current owners sell in a year? Is there anything in the contract that ensures the rules will follow? What happens if the next owner decides to make it non-public? I'd like to see something in the contract that makes this permanent, if you agree with the people who live around here and support it.

David Wall said back when JMA bought Homewood, about a year afterwards, they started their meetings for development. Art Chapman would consistently say that the numbers don't work and Homewood doesn't make money. I would always put my hand up and say, "Art, you just bought the area. Didn't you look at the financials? It should be making money. You should have bought it with it making money." But from that point on, Art consistently did not put any money into the resort. As we've heard, members of Homewood Mountain Resort have said it's old and decrepit. That's because no money has been invested in it. As a result, skiers have been going elsewhere. Another issue is that they jacked prices up to unrealistic levels two years ago. Homewood became the most expensive place to ski in Northern California. That's ridiculous. It's part of their plan to reduce attendance so they can say, "It's not viable." But you have to put money in, and you have to run a ski area.

So, I'm coming here with a different proposition for you. The issue is Discovery, and their business plan. You have a developer, JMA, and money from Mohari Hospitality. Let's get Discovery out of the picture. Let the two entities who know what they're doing go forward, get Discovery out, and create a nice development.

Steve Pascucci, homeowner on the West Shore, and I've been snowboarding at Homewood since 2003. This is a really exciting proposal, but I think it requires better definitions to live up to the master plan. Unfortunately, because of the company's history over the last 11 years, it's harder for the Homewood group to gain the trust of the public. They can rebuild that trust in two ways. First, better define public access. They said they couldn't do it, but anything with a little time can be better defined. For example, the "first-come, first-served" language is too vague, and it can be improved. Secondly, ensure that public access doesn't dwindle over time, as it has at other properties they've managed.

JANUARY 22, 2025
Governing Board

Ann Dentel, a year-round resident in Tahoma, and I'm the IT manager at Homewood Mountain Resort. It's important to me, and to many in this community, that we continue to have viable access to Homewood Mountain Resort. However, access is not the only thing at stake, and there are voices in our community that have been continuously unheard throughout this entire process. I, like many people on the West Shore, rely on Homewood for my livelihood. Having a healthy, vibrant West Shore economy means people like me can continue to live here and thrive.

Homewood Resort employs around 300 people in a typical season, but this season, there are currently only 34 employees. The combined population of Tahoma and Homewood is around 1,700 people. When you remove 300 jobs from that community, it has a significant impact. When you remove the people skiing, staying in local lodging, eating at local restaurants, and so on, you lose even more jobs. We need good-quality jobs with a pay scale not just for entry-level seasonal workers but also for salaried positions. A family could live here on the West Shore, not in South Lake or Reno.
As we speak, we're losing valuable employees who want to raise families and continue to contribute to this community. They can't, and they're leaving because of the uncertainty.

The failure of this project would cause a terrible toll on the local community and economy, not just in the short term, but for years to come. I myself would be forced to leave and work in my area of expertise, IT. There's nothing locally that could match my current salary or job responsibilities.
The Homewood operators are in business to make a profit. I can't see how their bottom line won't always prioritize money over our community. But I believe there is a path forward where they can make their profit, and this community can benefit too. I have no problem letting some millionaires pay for a revitalized resort.

Jenn Sheridan, has lived in the Tahoe Basin for 14 years and have worked in the marketing department at Homewood for the past six years. Some people have talked about the big corporate PR team Homewood recently hired. It's actually just been me. In my time at Homewood, I've had the pleasure of organizing tons of events that bring people to the basin, bring the community together, and contribute to a vibrant scene on the West Shore. On the other hand, I've also seen plenty of days with fewer than 50 skiers on the mountain despite our best marketing efforts. A less glamorous part of my job is reading and responding to reviews and social media comments, and there are recurring themes that paint a picture about why more people don't want to visit Homewood.

A three-star review on Yelp reads: "The prices are just okay. The drive to get here sucks, and the parking lot is small and filled with potholes. The whole building is outdated and cramped. I felt like the bathrooms probably aren't even up to code. Had a great view from the top." Another three-star review says: "The lifts are old, trails are short. It's great for the price, but I'd recommend other Tahoe resorts." A two-star review says: "Except for the beautiful views of Lake Tahoe, this place is a dump. I would gladly pay more for a decent lodge, bathroom, restaurant, and lifts. I was very disappointed." If Homewood is to be a viable business, it's time for change. In order to address these complaints and hundreds more just like them, we need to upgrade our aging infrastructure. No marketing tagline or community events can fix that. This project is an opportunity to improve the skier experience for locals, visitors, beginners, and longtime skiers. Without this project, the resort is unlikely to survive. And if Homewood closes, we lose more than a resort. We lose the community.

Employees like me lose our jobs and may be forced to leave the community. Our neighboring local businesses lose some of their customer stream. And residents and visitors lose a great place to gather and recreate. It's clear, despite some negative reviews online, that we have a really passionate and

involved community that loves Homewood. I understand and even initially shared in their mistrust. The lack of information and uncertainty were frustrating. However, the leadership at Homewood has made great strides in owning their missteps and has worked hard in committing to remaining open to the public.

Dan Engel, the Supervisor of Lift Maintenance at Homewood Mountain Resort. I'm here to read a letter on behalf of Michael Reitzel, CEO and President of the National Ski Area Association (NSAA) and the former president of Ski California. “Dear Governing Board, The California Ski Industry Association represents 36 ski resorts across California and Nevada, including Homewood Mountain Resort. On behalf of Ski California, I am writing to express strong support for Homewood's Master Plan Amendment and gondola permit. These critical projects will enable Homewood to address challenges unique to its location and ensure its long-term viability in an increasingly competitive and climate-challenged industry.

The ski industry is at the forefront of experiencing the impacts of climate change, particularly in California, where warming trends and reduced snowpack are felt earlier and more acutely than in many other regions. These impacts are magnified at resorts like Homewood, which has one of the lowest base elevations of any ski area in California. Without significant upgrades, Homewood risks becoming unable to offer the consistent, high-quality experience that visitors demand. Indeed, the delay in implementing these projects has already cost Homewood and its guests the 2024-2025 season.” The letter goes on to talk about modern infrastructure and enhanced skier services which are becoming a necessity for resorts. This isn’t just something that would be nice to have; it's now expected of us in 2025. He goes onto highlight geographical and competitive challenges. Homewood is the farthest resort from any major metropolitan area, and we haven’t been allowed to spend any money to do things right by our community and our resort.

Teresa McNamara, a full-time homeowner, resident, and pass holder at Homewood for over 30 years. I’ve been a part of the community since 2006 when the owners of Homewood began their quest for the development of the ski area. Through the four years of community forums that led to the completion and approval of the 2011 Master Plan and Community Enhancement Plan (CEP), and for the 14 years since that approval, we have been waiting for development to begin. We, the people who own homes, live in, and visit the Tahoe Basin, rely on the TRPA Governing Board, which has jurisdiction over our communities and environment, to ensure that the laws, codes, restrictions, plans, and guidelines put in place to protect the environment and our individual communities are equally applied to and enforced on every permit and project application proposed in the Tahoe Basin.

We expect the agencies to represent and protect all of us, not just the wishes or development projects of one landowner. Homewood’s development received entitlements and allowances within the codes because of the CEP and the approved master plan promises. If these promises are not adhered to, those entitlements and allowances should be revoked. I appreciate the addition of the Homewood Community Access Plan to the master plan amendment, and I request there be additional language stating that all Homewood Mountain Resort skiing products and packages will be available for purchase by any and all persons at a price similar to that of other similarly sized local ski areas, along with the availability of a no-blackout-date season pass. The master plan and the words it contains will serve as the foundation for future governing agencies and their representatives when making decisions regarding permit approvals and adherence. The proposed amendment to the 2011 master plan must not be vague; everything must be very clear.

DRAFT

JANUARY 22, 2025
Governing Board

Tony Karwowski, president, and CEO of the North Lake Tahoe Community Alliance. Infrastructure dilapidation is a chronic issue in North Lake Tahoe. We're suffering the consequences of decades without significant reinvestment in our infrastructure. Our businesses, local quality of life, and guest experience are suffering because of it. The biggest barriers to redevelopment are difficult regulations and private lawsuits brought on by a network of sophisticated organizations well-endowed through anonymous donors with undisclosed interests. They meet behind closed doors in a vacuum, making impactful decisions without input from the community. It's imperative these organizations better understand their impacts and engage the business community directly going forward.

Healthy businesses create jobs, pay taxes, and support our schools, workforce housing, transportation, human impact mitigation projects, and so much more. Make no mistake, we're at a tipping point. Infrastructure will continue to decay. Visitors will primarily stay in short term rentals (STRs), and our boarded-up buildings will continue to grow in numbers. Businesses like Homewood will shut down. Ultimately, infrastructure decline leads to our destination being perceived as a low-value destination, resulting in fewer overnight stays. Overnight visitors have a lower environmental impact, provide a higher yield for businesses, and create more tourism taxes and assessment revenues for reinvestment into our community.

Low-value destinations attract more day visitors, who have greater impacts on our environment and infrastructure but contribute far less to our businesses and community. I encourage grassroots and environmental organizations to have conversations with the business community. The NTCA is happy to organize community forums to openly exchange ideas around investment opportunities that will set us on a course for a balanced economy and environmental preservation for generations to come. Don't let this opportunity go by. The cost of doing nothing is far too great.

Suzanne Wilkins, lives on the West Shore and is a consulting planner with over 30 years of experience in the Tahoe area. I believe an approach to help address some of the community's distrust regarding these new amendments, which I'm encouraged by, could be the creation of a community oversight committee. This committee could be comprised of Homewood Mountain Resort senior management, HOA representatives, business representatives, KHP representatives, the public at large, the fire department, and Tahoe City PUD, which provides water. It could act as an advisory committee to Placer County and TRPA for approval of permits, giving the committee a chance to review the permit applications as they come in and ensure they remain in compliance with the master plan and the proposed community enhancements. Additionally, the committee could review the annual report that's to be submitted to TRPA, and this oversight should be made a condition of approval for both the master plan and the gondola permit.

Maurice Storch, homeowner on Alpine Avenue in Tahoe Pines since 2011. I've purchased season passes at Homewood pretty much every year they've been open. We bought this home with the intention of raising our kids here and having access to the mountain. I was in full support of the redevelopment plan in 2011, which included community access. I would like to see that community access enshrined in whatever approvals are made. If Homewood doesn't plan to go back on their word, then let's set stiff fines for non-compliance, $100,000, $200,000, $500,000 a day. A fine of $5,000 or $2,500 a day isn't going to cut it. There should be strong penalties to ensure compliance. If this is done, and the public is included, Homewood will have my support.

Blake Herrschaft, full-time resident of Tahoe City and a skier and snowboarder at Homewood. I'm also speaking on behalf of my wife, a teacher at Tahoe Lake Elementary. I had the privilege of serving as chair of a local planning board in Ocean Beach, California, where public access is a constant topic due

to the California Coastal Act and Associated Commission. I want to thank everyone here today for your passion for this amazing local asset. None of us want to be here today, and we shouldn't be.

Land use planning is all about clear language, and we're here today, spending thousands of hours, because TRPA, the public, and Homewood failed to get clear language on public access in the 2011 plan. The last thing any of us want is to have to come back because we failed again. Specifically, I want to address the language "but not limited to" in the operational constraints section. It states that these discounted ski products may be subject to advanced reservations based on operational constraints, which can mean, but not be limited to, things like severe labor shortages or staffing limitations. This is an open door for Homewood to do whatever they want in the future regarding a reservation system, potentially offering as low as one reservation per day.
I strongly encourage you to get that language clear today, so we don't have to go through all these meetings again in five years. I also want to say that the idea proposed by Ms. Wilkins, of an oversight committee is a great idea and would be a significant improvement. Thanks to everyone, especially the workers at Homewood.

Samir Tuma commented on the extremely high cost of doing nothing, including the negative impacts on the environment, the social fabric, and the financial health of our community. Look around the north and west shores of Lake Tahoe, what do you see? Between the stunning Tahoe Rim Trail and the cobalt blue of our treasured lake, we face a decaying-built environment that negatively impacts not only our lake but also erodes the social fabric and economic health of our community. Over the past decades, despite various attempts to revitalize North Lake Tahoe, efforts involving tens of millions of dollars and countless hours of community planning. These projects have all failed to materialize. Not a single major lodging project has been completed, and only one significant workforce project has been built during this time.

To fill the void, many homes in our community have been converted into short term rentals, further reducing the housing stock for locals and driving community members out. Meanwhile, along the main corridors of our town centers and throughout the West Shore, there are too many vacant, boarded-up buildings, empty lots, and chain-link fences. Projects that were started have stalled and remain in limbo, littering our community.

While there are numerous factors that have contributed to this, one thing all these stalled projects have in common is litigation. Instead of working in good faith to find compromises, small groups of watchdogs have resorted to delay tactics through lawsuits. This strategy stifles progress, escalates costs, and ultimately leads to further community decay. Back in 2011, Homewood had a very different business plan. However, after years of delays and increased costs, that plan had to be altered. Yes, there will be significant community access, but additional delays will only make things more difficult and may ultimately lead to a permanent closure. I urge the Governing Board to move the project forward, and I ask community members to refrain from suing. Instead, let's work together for the betterment of our community.

Seth Howard, a field representative with the Northern California Carpenters Union and represents several counties in the basin. JMA Ventures has a letter of intent to hire local contractors for this project. There are many people in this area who depend on these jobs to support their families. I was recently contacted by a subcontractor who is looking to hire 20 drywallers and 20 metal stud framers locally. This is a great opportunity for job creation in the region, and I support the project.

DRAFT

JANUARY 22, 2025
Governing Board

Rick Woodward, West Shore Homewood resident. Like many others, I have a deep passion for Homewood. I also bring over 35 years of professional experience in handling approval processes like those currently taking place on the West Shore. From that experience, I can tell you that Discovery Land and the development group are as high quality as any I've encountered in my professional career. They are committed to bringing jobs, a sense of community, and high-quality development to the West Shore, which is desperately needed. Change can be hard for many people, and I understand that. However, I believe the TRPA board should carefully consider the compelling arguments for a public-private model and approve the master plan amendment without being bogged down by hypothetical situations. For the sake of the West Shore community, let's move this forward.

Steve Becker, homeowner on the West Shore and Chamberlains for 36 years said I've spoken to quite a few neighbors and they all have similar interest in having the measures approved to get the mountain developed. I don't want to stand in the way of that progress but need to do it with some reasonable terms and conditions. The loopholes that Keep Homewood Public would like to close are reasonable. I recommend that the Governing Board not approve the conditions as they state now but to meet with the two parties and resolve those differences. The one that is the most troublesome to me is the mountains insistence that only full-time residents would enjoy certain privileges and benefits and not homeowners. That's a means to intentionally exclude a group. The vast majority of my friends and neighbors are second homeowners. It only gives Homewood Mountain Resort more of a feel of a private resort as they would wish. I support what's moving forward if those loopholes can be resolved.

Mike Gardner, expressed support for the original master plan as a community enhancement project. However, as many others have stated, the key issue is public access. Unfortunately, after conducting research and reviewing Discovery Land Company's business practices, I provided an example. If they were to offer $1 million for a park, what would stop them from reducing it to just $1 per year, claiming they're still providing funding? Without codifying the terms and statements in the master plan, this project shouldn't proceed. If the TRPA board doesn't force Discovery Land Company and the Keep Homewood Public teams to agree on specific language, then TRPA must step in to ensure it's a conditional use permit for this community enhancement project.

I don't know anyone who doesn't want this project to move forward, but it must come with guaranteed, enforceable public access for all. I want to ski there; it's in my backyard, and I want to see people I've known for years, back at work. But if we don't close these loopholes, Discovery Land Company could change things down the line. The terms must be enforceable. This can be achieved by making it a conditional use permit with firm, clear numbers. Please, be very careful with this and don't approve it as currently submitted. Get the language in writing and agreed upon by the public.

Adam Wilson, COO of the North Town Community Alliance and a former employee of Homewood in the early 2000s. Today, I'm commenting on behalf of the North Tahoe Chamber of Commerce, a division of NTCA. One of our roles is advocating for small businesses and helping them thrive.
This opportunity exists with the proposed changes to the Homewood Mountain Resort Master Plan. Recently, we conducted several days of business walks, including on the West Shore. Many small businesses expressed concern about the closing of Homewood and its impact on the vibrancy and financial health of the region.

Homewood is a vital business for the West Shore and the surrounding area. We understand the concerns about public access but believe Homewood has gone above and beyond to assure the public that access will remain available, as documented in their Home and Community Access Plan. With your

approval, Homewood has committed to several skier service upgrades, which can begin as soon as permits are granted and work is scheduled to reopen the resort next season.

This project aligns with our strategic focus on economic health, community vitality, and environmental stewardship. The project will enhance the economy by adding lodging and attracting visitors, something the West Shore needs, especially since much of the traditional lodging is no longer in operation. It will also boost community vitality, providing over five miles of new hiking and biking trails, enhanced public amenities, and contributions to maintaining regional trails.

Amy Ross said thank you for your careful review and regulatory work. I urge you to use your powers to protect Lake Tahoe and the community we all love. Building multi-million-dollar condominiums overlooking the lake may be an obvious way to make money, but that was not the original intent. The 2011 permit allowed a limited number of real estate structures in exchange for upgrades to the ski area and public benefits for the West Shore and the greater Tahoe Basin.

The developer's current plans for a private club seem to benefit only an exclusive group, rather than the wider community. I fear this could lead to community exclusion and displacement. Public access must be just that, public, with no restrictions. Access to the ski hill should be available to all, as originally envisioned. Condominium owners can buy a beautiful view, but they shouldn't control the mountain. That was the deal in 2011, and it must remain the same now.

Maryann Ernst, homeowner on Sacramento Avenue, off Tahoe Ski Bowl Way. I'm a secondary homeowner, and I worked hard to buy that house to create lasting memories with my two young boys, particularly skiing at Homewood, right across the street. However, with the recent amendments, I'm still excluded as a secondary homeowner. Many other secondary homeowners feel the same, as they've spoken today. We keep the community alive in both winter and summer, and we should be recognized for that. We should also have the opportunity to ski at Homewood.

Additionally, I want to emphasize the importance of fire safety. Homewood needs to comply with fire regulations, especially given the challenges surrounding insurance and the growing risks after the recent fires. Finally, I want to address the issue of blackout dates. As secondary homeowners, we deserve equal access without restrictions, especially on the dates when many of us can visit with our families. These homes are family investments, and we bought them for a reason. This should be taken into account in the plan.

Trevor Larkins owner of West Shore Sports since 2015, though we've managed the shop since 2008. We're located between the North and South Lodges of Homewood Mountain Resort. In the summer, we operate as a bike, kayak, and paddleboard rental shop, and in the winter, we switch to offering ski, snowboard, cross-country, and snowshoe rentals. I want to speak briefly about the trust within the community and the direct impacts Homewood's decisions have had on our business. Over the past few years, we've seen a 35 percent decrease in revenue, largely due to Homewood's decision to increase their day-use lift ticket prices, which ultimately led to the resort's closure this year.

There's something to be said about charging more while providing less than other resorts. This could explain why our visitor count is down by 60 percent. Day-use ticket buyers are now going elsewhere for better value, and in turn, they're not visiting our local businesses. As a result, I've had to let go of two full-time employees, reduce employee hours, and significantly cut back on our ability to sustain our winter business.

DRAFT

At the moment, there's no security for West Shore Sports. If Homewood privatizes or reduces skier capacity, we could face even more challenges. This situation needs to be addressed, as we're already suffering from these decisions. Unfortunately, we can no longer trust the developers' promises about public access, the storyline has changed too many times. As a business, we supported the 2011 master plan, which supported both visitors and locals. A clearer, more responsible plan would not only help our business and the West Shore but would also bring the community closer together. West Shore Sports cannot continue to operate sustainably in the winter or be a reliable employer without a more defined and responsible master plan from Homewood Mountain Resort, one that clearly outlines who can access the resort and when.

Kyle Overacker, general manager at the Hampton Inn in Truckee. I want to reinforce that everyone here loves Homewood and the Tahoe area. I'm speaking in support of the approval of the amendments to the Homewood Mountain Resort Master Plan. As a hotel operator in this region, I've seen firsthand the impact this project could have on the local economy. Whether it's full-time residents, second homeowners, visitors, or workers, everyone has different goals, but in order to support the long-term economic health of this area, including for workers and full-time residents, we need growth and revitalization.

Carolyn Selig purchased a home Snowbird Loop in Homewood in 2019. We are season pass holders at Homewood, and our two sons, Henry and Teddy, are on the ski team. We love Homewood Mountain, the team, the staff, and the coaches, who feel like an extended family. We want nothing more than for this development to move forward. However, we do have one significant caveat. We would respectfully request that the TRPA ask Homewood Mountain Resort (HMR) for additional refinements to the definition of public access. The definition must be quantifiable and measurable in order to be enforceable. Specific metrics should be included in the definition. I have a career background as a CPA where I work to enforce regulatory laws and guidance to protect the investing public. I know firsthand that for public access to be enforceable by the TRPA, it must be measurable, quantifiable, and documented in writing.

At the Advisory Planning Commission (APC) meeting last month, one committee member asked how a loophole might exist. I want to clearly state for the record that HMR is creating two classes of access: Class A: HMR residents and hotel guests who purchase for millions of dollars. Class B: Everyone else, including the general public. By using the terminology "first come, first serve," HMR could exclude the public over time, offering season passes first to HMR residents and hotel guests. We, the public, deserve to have it in writing the number of tickets allocated to us, either as a specific number based on lift capacity or as a percentage. At the APC meeting, Connor from HMR mentioned a lift capacity of 4,000 skiers in one day at Homewood. This seems like a simple calculation for HMR to determine lift capacity and allocate a percentage of tickets to Class B, the general public. Based on recent census data, there are 8,607 homes on the West Shore, of which 6,000 are second homes.

Ann Nichols, North Tahoe Preservation Alliance said Homewood Resort must agree to raise the blighted Tahoe Inn now. Waiting until 2028 is a slap in the face to the community. It feels like waiting for Hell or Tahoe to freeze over. They want us to wait until they complete the gondola, remove the Madden chairlift, make ski terrain and snowmaking improvements, build north-based food and beverage services, construct the North Base Gondola, pay TRPA impact fees, and construct a beginner ski area. Meanwhile, we're back in line for creating a hardware store. This is unacceptable. These should be conditions of the permit.

DRAFT

Also, I requested that Cindy Gustafson be recused because her husband made more than $10,000 in 2022, according to her FPPC Form 700, with Placer County. They're claiming it's fine, but I think there is a conflict here. While she is a good person, there's too much cronyism in this situation.

Elena Kuslys, visitor to the West Shore and currently have a ski lease in Homewood, along with fellow Swiss expats. I also have relatives who have owned property in Homewood for generations. Firstly, I see the pain that being excluded from the resort causes to families deeply rooted in the area. My aunt has hiked that mountain while pregnant with all three of her children, and I see the impact that had on my cousins. I cannot fathom how missing out on these opportunities will affect future generations. Personally, we have been following and discussing this project with our Swiss friends, and I know none of us would accept such a loss to our own community and children in our mountains.
Secondly, I am shocked and saddened to see how a corporation managed for the community is now turning people against each other. I don't mean to discount the terror of losing your livelihood, but instead of pushing for a sustainable development that truly benefits everyone, you're blaming each other. You are the people of Homewood. It is in your power to ask the developers to do better. Don't accept being strong-armed by a corporation that doesn't operate in the interest of you and your families.

Nancy Gimbert, 40-year resident of the West Shore supports the Homewood Master Plan. Unfortunately, due to unexpected circumstances, I had to move away from my beloved West Shore. However, I still consider myself a local. Fortunately, I work for an amazing company, Homewood Mountain Resort and have been employed there for a very long time. I believe I am the only employee who has worked for all five owners of Homewood.

Back when Keep Homewood Public began their talk about Homewood going private, I had many friends approach me regarding this subject. Being the optimist that I am, I told them they didn't need to worry about Homewood going private. The resort would always remain public. We just wanted to start the master plan, a plan that was originally started in the 1980s, a plan that would improve the West Shore, increase property values, and keep the economy alive. I fully support Homewood and the master plan and look forward to finally starting this project.

Mike Peterson said my family's cabin has been here for 75 years, directly across from the seven modern boxes in the swamp, on Lot 3, which was committed to be "mountain rustic" in the 2011 master plan. We are 100 percent in support of the clarification and commitments proposed by Keep Homewood Public, which we want added to the proposed amendment. They've done an excellent job listening, coalescing, and communicating the expectations of the community. We understand business and tax revenues but also understand that California is one of the most regulated states. When a business files for a community enhancement project, granting exceptions to support the community, but then changes their mind and wants to go private ten years later, it's their property, and it's their right. But they need to submit a new plan for a private project like everyone else.

Since our cabin sits at the base of this project, I have huge concerns beyond just the access to the hill. I'm glad Ryan Porter pointed out Homewood Mountain Resorts fire commitments, which have been outstanding since 2022. This alone should stop any amendment discussions. How can anyone in good conscience allow these discussions to move forward without fire commitments being satisfied? The truss has been broken too many times already. This is a glaring example. Safety is the community's number one priority, and HMR hasn't met their commitments. If you want us to believe that a community enhancement project won't go private, put it in writing or submit a new plan.

We are huge supporters of Homewood, but most of all, we want a neighbor we can trust. The entire Tahoe Basin is watching this vote. It sets a precedent that could change the complexion of Tahoe forever.

Brian Scott said my family has been second homeowners in Tahoma since 1972. I want to echo the sentiments of Mr. Peterson, Mr. Baker, Mr. Gardner, Mrs. Ross, and Selig. I agree with their comments. My biggest concern is that the entire issue is public access, and it involves Discovery Land Group. The reason people don't trust them is they have a history of being untrustworthy in all of their projects. They verbally guarantee public access, then over time, they restrict and restrict until it disappears. If this project goes forward with this company, I fear for businesses like Westside Sports, Firesign Cafe, Dog and Bear, and the Homa Market. These businesses have been supported by my family for 52 years. I'm voting for Keep Homewood Public, and I support defining exactly what public access means, especially for second homeowners, who are vital to the business community there.

Renee Koijane 24-year full-time resident of the West Shore. My husband and I are business owners here. From 2009 to 2011, I worked directly with JMA, Art Chapman, and David Tierman to help get the 2011 master plan approved. I helped get the community involved and fine-tuned the plan. I was there from the beginning, and I saw early on how JMA pivoted their ideas. They made multi-million-dollar investments in the High and Dry Marina and West Shore Cafe but did not put money into infrastructure.

Now that Discovery Land is part of the plan, there's a playbook here that we need to codify and shore up. We can't afford to go backwards. We also need to 100 percent mitigate fire danger. This is as landmark a moment as the TRPA's decision in 1969 to prevent the Emerald Bay Highway 89 project from going through. This decision is pivotal, and if we don't close these loopholes, we will never trust the community input process again.

Debbie Walker said d my family and I have skied at Homewood since 1965. In 1972, we built our family cabin in Homewood, and we've frequently used it ever since. I'm a retired public agency director, responsible for many park and facility master plans over the years. I just want to say how important it is to get this right, and I know you're being flooded with comments today. I support the project, but I'm concerned that guaranteed public access needs to be more carefully defined with specific accountability to assure equal access year-round, without blackout dates. I'm hopeful your board will require that additional written public use language, both clarifying and guaranteeing current and future owners will adhere to the same standards.

Scott Rundle, Lake Arrowhead, California. We're a private lake that has been overrun by mergers, acquisitions, and outside investors pushing short term rentals. So, our problem is a little different from what you're facing. They sued us, they won, and now we've lost our private lake. But I don't see this as a public-private issue; Homewood seems like a wonderful place. I've never been there, but it sounds great, and it has a lot of great homeowners, which you need to keep that character. Discovery is a big mergers-and-acquisitions company, and they won't be upfront with you. They won't commit to things, and there's a reason they haven't followed through on all their required commitments.

Why can't the TRPA make this a private deal for the private citizens who own up there, except for the short term rentals that get access for free, while the billionaires pay lots of money? Allow it for the private homeowners and second homeowners to keep your values high, and if you decide to sell, that value will go up as well. If you're going to deal with all these rich investors coming in, you should get something in return, like increased value and access to the resort, as long as it exists. Be careful with

the wording; don't let any of it slip by like people have said. Get everything in writing, make it solid, and ensure that your homes become more valuable through this process. It sounds like you may have to endure 10 years of construction, which will be messy.

Marjorie Khosrovi, second homeowner in the Homewood-Tahoma area, and I've been here since 1980. I'm speaking up for clear language that explicitly protects second homeowners, especially regarding blackout days. We need to ensure that the language is clear and protects all homeowners, not dividing people into different categories of homeowners and visitors. We cannot let this opportunity slip by. We have an obligation to be explicit and protective of this very special place.

Andrew Bowdle, I've been skiing at Homewood (formerly the Tahoe Ski Bowl) since the 1970-71 season. I've been a Placer County property taxpayer and, at times, a business taxpayer for the last 35 years. I have two points. First, I don't understand how the developers were allowed to change the architectural standards of the master plan to the so-called "mountain modern" design of the Fawn Street houses. The key issue here isn't necessarily the architectural standards, which are a matter of personal taste, but rather that the developers seem to have been able to change the standards at will, apparently defying the master plan.

Second, I don't understand how the developers can say they are going to "restore Homewood as the heart of the West Shore" and yet, at the same time, have chosen to close the ski area during this season, with the possibility that it may remain closed indefinitely in the future. These statements and actions are completely inconsistent and impossible to reconcile. This leads me to question their true intentions. The local consensus is that the developers plan to close the ski area for two or three years, expecting us all to lose interest and get used to skiing elsewhere. After that, the opposition to privatizing Homewood will likely disappear. This seems plausible, especially since the developers have closed the ski area with no clear reason. I urge the TRPA board members to fulfill their obligations to the public good of the people of California and Nevada.

Jeff Brown, longtime Placer County resident and business owner. I urge you to support the application of Homewood's Master Plan as written. The economy of the West Shore, and the basin more broadly, depends on this form of redevelopment to create employment and sustainable wages for our residents. Without it, we risk a flight of full-time residents to Truckee, Reno, or other places farther away. The absence of prosperity in non-lakefront sectors has negatively impacted employment opportunities, as trade and service jobs continue to move to Truckee.

The plan presented is thoughtful in its scale and environmental sensitivity. We cannot be held hostage by sentimentality or cling to a financially unsustainable model that is regressive for our community. We must support responsible growth and evolution, and this project represents perhaps the most significant opportunity to stimulate the local economy in a generation.

David Ruda, attorney in San Francisco, and my family has owned property in Chamberlain since 1961. I learned to ski at Homewood Mountain Resort in 1968, along with my sisters. I have a couple of points. First, I agree with the CPA that spoke earlier, emphasizing the need for quantifiable percentages or numbers of tickets for the general public to ski at the resort in the future. Words like "the public will have the opportunity" to buy ski products are insufficient. We need specific commitments, and these should be backed by penalties for noncompliance, including substantial financial penalties, hundreds of thousands of dollars per day, not just a small fine that would be negligible for large corporations like

DRAFT

Elon Musk. Additionally, the TRPA should include a condition of injunctive relief to shut down operations if the developers fail to comply, as penalties alone will not suffice.

David Lindstedt, second homeowner in Tahoma. I've rented every year in the West Shore since 1995, and I purchased a condo in 2014. I'm a seasoned pass holder and have concerns about the community access plan, specifically regarding the definition of full-time West Shore residents for discounts. Approximately 70 percent of West Shore residents are second homeowners, and I'm a financial planner who works remotely for six months out of the year, paying property taxes in the area. While I may not qualify as a full-time resident, I'm worried that I will be priced out of season day passes, as will many other second homeowners. This will hurt local businesses I frequent, such as Dog and Bear, Colt Burger, and Tahoma Market.

Also, I'm concerned about the SEC filing (Form D) for a Rule 506 ski exemption signed by Todd Chapman in December 2022, which allows Homewood to raise funds from accredited investors with a minimum investment of $200,000. This raises concerns that second homeowners, renters, and visitors will be excluded from purchasing ski products unless they make a large financial investment.
It seems that Homewood has found a way to ensure that the mountain remains relatively private and not widely accessible.

Mary Porteus, and I'm a 40-year resident. I support Keep Homewood Publics' position on precise and enforceable language. I also agree with West Shore Sports, our cherished local sports equipment provider, as well as the Homewood Mountain Resort PR employee who spoke earlier about the neglect leading to a 60 percent reduction in skiers. Unfortunately, the amended master plan does not include a finite timeline or any obligations to improve the infrastructure, except for the gondola, which is merely replacing one of the more dependable chairlifts. This leads me to believe that the gondola is being replaced just for show, to lure in resort ownership sales.

Regarding public access, I agree with KHP that Homewood Ski Resort needs guaranteed and codified public access language. JMA has stated they will submit operational data for public access to the TRPA, but TRPA has no position or protocol for monitoring this. Will the TRPA establish an oversight committee with the authority to impose financial penalties if public access is not honored? This committee should be in place before the TRPA approves the project.

Lastly, regarding pricing, Homewood's decision to price season passes on par with Northstar and Palisades is fiscally irresponsible. Homewood reports 1,260 skiable acres, while Northstar has 3,170, and Palisades has 6,000. To price Homewood's passes the same as those larger resorts shows a lack of financial common sense.

Kathleen Annice said I'd like to read an excerpt from the newsletter that was distributed to the community shortly after JMA took ownership of the mountain in 2006. "In keeping with what Homewood has meant to so many of us over the generations, the design theme is Old Homewood." This could find friction in future architecture and design. As someone with a professional background in architecture, I'm deeply concerned about the omission of references to historic structures, such as the Tahoe Tavern, Hellman-Ehrman Mansion, and other National Park buildings.

In nearly every other instance, clarifying language has been added, detailing the changes being sought after. But here, there is no such follow-up, and it begs the question: why? My concern stems from a single sentence in the EIR that states, "The design and construction of buildings shall be a cohesive

DRAFT

architectural theme that complements the natural landscape and setting of Homewood Mountain Resort. HMR. This amendment application should add to, not omit from, the details of the master plan. By omitting these historic references, the master plan amendments weaken and risks future developments deviating into mountain modern styles, which would only align with the few street structures permitted in error, in violation of the master plan.

These structures are contrary to the design vision established in the West Shore General Area Plan and the 2011 master plan, as reaffirmed by the Tahoe Basin Design Review Committee in 2023, when they reviewed a copycat ski lodge design from Park City, proposed by Olson Kundig. The TBDRC guidelines emphasize that preserving the old Tahoe building style is not a matter of nostalgia, but of maintaining a design framework essential to preserving Lake Tahoe's legacy. I urge the board to extend the review process to ensure the MPA fully upholds the commitments made to the community and protects its integrity.

Christian Searing, Director of Finance for Homewood Mountain Resort. I'm here to read a couple of letters of support for the Homewood project from those who can't be here today. The first is from a Tahoe City homeowner, Mr. Dennis, "Dear TRPA, I am a friend of Homewood Mountain Resort, and I support their current amendment to approve the master plan and the replacement of the Madden Ski Lift with the new gondola. The Homewood Ski Area Master Plan, approved in 2011, includes vital investments to protect our community. There are significant environmental benefits that will occur if the project moves forward, including, without limitation: Significant wildfire prevention work throughout the forested areas of Homewood. Infrastructure improvements for the water and fire districts servicing the west shore. Extensive vegetation work along the resort's old access roads that will significantly reduce sediment runoff into Lake Tahoe.

Homewood desperately needs new and updated infrastructure to remain safe and viable. Reasonable members of the community understand that such significant investment can only be made by allowing this project to move forward. The gondola, purchased more than two years ago, is still sitting in a warehouse in Reno. Keep Homewood Public has insisted that TRPA not permit the installation. This delay to gain leverage over the master plan not only costs money but has deprived the broader community of the use of this gondola for several seasons. We deserve the support of our community and a bright future for everyone. Please approve the amendment and the Homewood Mountain Resort Gondola permit so we can all ski next season. Homewood will be an even better place for current and future generations."

I won't have time to finish the remainder of the letters.

Sandy Rundano, Human Resources Manager for Homewood Mountain Resort. I'm here to share the human side of what this approval represents, not just for our ski resort, but for the community and the people who make it run. Over the last year, we've experienced an unprecedented time of uncertainty. While we've remained hopeful, the impact on our staff has been significant. We've lost several incredibly talented and dedicated employees. Watching them leave has created a significant ripple effect of doubt and concern among those of us who remain. Every day, employees come into my office burdened with anxiety, asking questions I can't answer, like: "Should I leave? Should I stay? What's going to happen to us?" These are people who have dedicated their lives to this special place, and their stress is palpable.

The uncertainty is quite literally paralyzing. We've reached a critical point where our ability to open next year hangs in the balance, dependent on clarity and stability. This isn't just about business; it's

about livelihoods, the community, and the lifeblood of the West Shore economy. The current state of limbo is taking an emotional toll on all of us, and it feels unnecessary to prolong this anguish. I urge you to consider the human impact of your decision. Approving this plan isn't just about brick and mortar; it's about breathing life back into our community and securing the future of those who call this resort home.

Chris Hoffman, for the next 24 hours, I'm the Mountain Operations Director at Homewood Mountain Resort. On September 25th, in this very room, I listened to the Keep Homewood Public group make demands that I found unreasonable. They said Homewood must start from scratch on the development simply because they don't trust us. One leader even said, "It's okay if Homewood closes, because we will be okay." I'm sure that he and many other retired second homeowners will be fine. But I want to make it clear: Myself, along with hundreds of employees just like me, will not be okay. We're the people who live, work, and contribute to the community every day. The demands of Keep Homewood Public were not just unreasonable, they felt aggressive. To be honest, I feel like I'm being bullied out of the very community I grew up in.

Because of the uncertainty caused by KHP and their demands, I've been forced to look for work elsewhere. After 30 years of living in Tahoe, I now have to leave my home, my family, and my friends to find a stable job somewhere else. KHP claims to represent the community, but they do not represent me. They do not represent the broader Tahoe community. Homewood recently circulated a petition to support the development, and to date, over 2,400 people have signed it, which I will submit today for the record. This clearly shows that there's overwhelming support for the project. Not only that, but it's needed for the future of the West Shore.

I urge you to consider the fragile economy of the West Shore. It's small, isolated, and unique. Unlike South Lake Tahoe, it lacks the infrastructure and sustainability that other parts of the basin enjoy. Without Homewood and the proposed development to ensure its economic viability, the West Shore will become a ghost town. If Homewood continues to operate the way it has in the past, it will close for good.

I ask you to approve this project. Please don't let the demands of a small, fearful group prevent a private business from operating efficiently on private property. This project is essential for the future of Homewood and the entire community.

Stephanie Sword has worked at Homewood for almost 10 years and has lived in Tahoma for 30 plus years. I would like to introduce Luz Navarez and Guadalupe Soto, they have worked at Homewood for 19 years and nine years and both live on the West Shore. Lupe says "This is my house. My heart is broken by all this uncertainty and waiting. I worry all the time about if I will lose my job. I must leave my work and my work family that I love. This is my life. I do not know if I can find another job in my neighborhood because I feel older. If something happens to my job, I will be devastated. Homewood has always treated me and Luz so well, and we feel part of a family here. I do not know if I could find another company so good. TRPA, help me please and support Homewood."

Luz says "I'm very sad about this possibility of losing my job, and I'm also sad to see the people I work with so worried about their jobs too. I'm very thankful for this job because it offers good insurance, good benefits, and steady work. I can help my family and send my son to school. Homewood has always been a very good place to work. And they're very good to me. Losing this job would be devastating to my life. I take the bus to and from work. And to find another job that I love with all the same great benefits would be very difficult. TRPA, please help me."

DRAFT

Dave Eisenberg, general contractor on the West Shore in my 41st year as a long time Tahoma resident. Correction on the skier reduction, 60 percent. We're currently sitting at 100 percent skier reduction since the ski area did not open up this year. I believe that was a business decision and nothing else. It didn't have anything to do with Keep Homewood Public or pressure to get codification of a guarantee for permanent public access. Homewood had been operating the last number of years while negotiations were going on. The infrastructure is the same. Everything's checked out. Homewood could have operated this year. So, don't lay that at the feet of Keep Homewood Public. Everyone here clearly is speaking in favor of the development. We all want to see Homewood move forward and become new. The point has always been ensuring public access. I love to see this progress, but this is the same as a glossy brochure. We need to have it codified. It has to be legal. It can't just be printed on a piece of paper. Permanency is a huge issue. Outside development coming into an area should add to the community and not take away from a community. If we lose Homewood, and I'm seeing here that they want to work with us, we need to see this codified. When the lawyers say it's codified, that's when I'm going to believe it. We can all talk to each other forever.

Mike Ricker lives in Tahoe with my family. I'm here today to express my support for Homewood Mountain Resort and the Associated Master Plan Amendment. I believe that thoughtful, sustainable investment in our community is necessary to keep Tahoe a place. That my neighbors can live, work, and raise their families. Well, it seems that many of the opponents of the project do not live or work here, the local families that call our region home need a vibrant community that's more than just a recreation paradise. We need an economy that is fueled by thoughtful planning and measured growth. We need opportunities to work and support our families through investments in our community, both public and private. We can't be so opposed to development that our community continues to age, our infrastructure decays, and full-time folks are forced to work or live outside of our region. It's very important to me that we protect our natural resources in the Tahoe Basin. And I believe the amendment we saw today will accomplish this through reduction in density, improved view corridors. And smaller building massing than the 2011 plan. Forty-five ski resorts have closed across the US in the past 20 years.

Many could not adapt to a changing market. In 2012, a season pass at Homewood was $949. Essentially the same price it is today, more than a dozen years later. As costs have increased significantly. In order for Homewood and other independent resorts to survive. The model for a sustainable ski resort needs to evolve. Blocking this project will almost certainly ensure that Homewood stays closed. Please approve the Homewood Mountain Resort Master Plan Revision. And the gondola project permit. Which are overwhelmingly supported by the local community.

Collin Casper and I've worked at Homewood Mountain Resort and been a part of this community since 2016. I first came to Homewood in 2007, though, as a summer intern program to learn about ski resort operations. I've always wanted to run ski resorts, not knowing how challenging it actually is to run an independent resort. A decade later, I had an opportunity to join the team as a part-time analyst and am now JMA Ventures as Chief Financial Officer. I have lived on the West Shore since 2016.

And I'm currently a Truckee resident. I used to visit the West Shore for almost 40 years coming up first with my parents to ski. The West Shore in particular, homeowners played a pivotal role in my love for Tahoe, the outdoors, and skiing. And Homewood has made a clear commitment to the TRPA to always keep Homewood accessible to the public. I want to ensure that others will be able to have the same opportunity that I had here at Homewood. Much like many others in support of the master plan, I've been at Homewood through good winters and bad. As a finance person, that means how do we

navigate volatile cash flow? Our business has significantly been impacted by lower skier visitation, increasing costs of insurance and labor. I've logged countless hours trying to figure out just how are we going to make payroll, not once, but time and again. How are we going to pay our vendors? Who are our neighbors and our friends? During COVID, I took a significant pay cut to make sure that my colleagues would be able to retain their jobs.

Today, I ask for the support of the master plan so we can help ensure that my colleagues will be able to continue to make their livelihood here at Homewood, learn new skills, and expand their careers. For over 250 people each year. I'm asking for your support today and approval of both the gondola, a desperately needed infrastructure improvement, and the minor amendments to the prior approved master plan. The gondola will provide community benefit to all skiers and snowboarders.
And the revisions to the master plan will allow economic sustainability to the ski resort as well as maintain jobs in the community.

Connor McCarthy, Resort Services Director at Homewood Mountain Resort. I have worked at the mountain and been a part of this community for over 15 years now. I've been there through all the ups and downs over the years. I've been there for the days we've had thousands of skiers on the mountain and I've been there for the days we've had 15. Over the past 15 years, visitation has dropped by over 60 percent. Operating a ski resort is an incredibly costly operation. The amount of revenue we bring in in a day does not even begin to cover the cost of utilities, insurance, workers comp, labor, etc. I, like everyone else in this room, also love to ski at a resort with no lift lines, but it's not a sustainable business model. We lose money every single year. Recently, Keep Homewood Public sent an email to their distribution list encouraging folks to email Homewood and TRPA expressing their concern over this project. We received 180 of those emails. Sixty-three percent of these emailers have not skied at Homewood within the past 17 years including some of their most vocal members and likely some of the folks on Candace's list. If the Keep Homewood Public Organization is so passionate about this project, why are the majority of them not showing up to support the mountain? The Epic and the Icon Pass have drastically changed the ski industry. Smaller resorts like Homewood have been left behind and are being forced to look at different business models.

The proposed model allows the business to stay open. It provides the dollars needed to upgrade our amenities and chairlifts, which everyone will have access to. This project and the people in this room have been publicly scrutinized over the past two years. The language is there. Everyone can ski, but nobody can ski if we're not open. We cannot open without a sustainable business model.

Randy Butler homeowner in Tahoma. With all due respect to Homewood Mountain Resort, the ill-conceived and poorly designed community access plan still has no commitments or capacity for the over 6,000 second homeowners on the West Shore. We bought our Tahoma home for many reasons. The natural beauty of Lake Tahoe, outdoor recreation, including hiking, biking, and snow skiing. The friendly community along the West Shore made us feel so much at home. I've skied Homewood Mountain many times over the past several years, and it's always a great experience. Being only two miles away is a big plus. But now there's a serious problem at Homewood.

The developers have deliberately crafted a vague and non-specific community access plan. But it doesn't offer access for second homeowners, nor a commitment to sell them a minimum number of season passes and day tickets. Second homeowners at Tahoe pay property taxes like every other property owner at Lake Tahoe, but we're being discriminated against by the Homewood developers who are not including us in the very community we are part of. Seventy percent of the approximately 8,600 homeowners on the west shore are second homeowners. Homewood says they'll sell full-price

DRAFT

ski products for purchase by anyone, including visitors from the general public. What they don't tell you is that there's no defined commitment to sell any defined products. And the key here is defined. It's also not a commitment to allocate some of the mountain's capacity. That's not flexibility, it's an exclusion.

Scott Helley said I don't work for Homewood and I am not part of Keep Homewood Public. This year, with the resort closed, my friends, my family, and many others are feeling the economic strain. Restaurants, shops, and local services are struggling without the visitors that Homewood Mountain Resort typically brings. Approving this master plan amendment and gondola permit is crucial to getting our economy back on track. HMR has addressed concerns raised by Keep Homewood Public about public access and affordability. Their updated community access plan lays out specific enforceable commitments that TRPA has the authority to enforce with daily financial penalties, including fines or even shutting the resort down. That's real accountability. They've met with KHP leaders in groups and one-on-one meetings and working meetings with the TRPA staff, as well as holding community meetings. This shows their commitment to not just their business, but the entire community we are all part of. It rubs me wrong, with the divisiveness that KHP is promoting. They have posted on Facebook that their real goal is to convince HMR's investors they won't make money and should sell. They posted the KHP's goal, is to convince Homewood Mountain Resort of this. If KHP's concerns are addressed, what's the real agenda here? Divisive comments like this don't help.

They further separate the community and create instability. I'd like to submit a screenshot of this comment for the record. HMR has addressed language in the 2011 master plan amendment to hold themselves accountable and to address the concerns of KHP, but it seems like it's never good enough for them. It's time to mend these wounds, support HMR's master plan amendment, and the proposed gondola, and move forward. I urge you to approve this amendment and the gondola permit.

Katherine Stempien, Local architectural designer, and homeowner in Tahoe. I support the development with public access for all that is sustainable and inclusive. I'm here to speak on behalf of Building Smart. The American Institute of Architects has set an ambitious goal to make all buildings carbon neutral by 2030, which is a critical step in combating climate change and reducing the built environment's carbon footprint.

As of now, the construction industry is responsible for approximately 40 percent of global carbon emissions. LEED certification, as outlined in the master plan, is the lowest of the four levels. Just following the building code that California set meets that minimum certification. And I don't think that's enough.

By aiming for LEED Platinum or Gold certification, we can significantly reduce the environmental impact, supporting the broader effort toward a carbon-neutral environment. Please clarify the language to include the requirement for LEED Platinum or Gold and report out to the public the development's carbon footprint.

Jason Kohler said my wife and I were both born and raised in South Lake Tahoe. While we now reside in Truckee, we maintain a deep connection to the Tahoe Basin and its communities. I support the Homewood Redevelopment and the associated master plan. This project represents an important opportunity to enhance the local community while aligning with the region's sustainability and environmental goals.

DRAFT

Thoughtful redevelopment like this can provide much-needed updates to aging infrastructure, improve local economic vitality, and maintain the scenic integrity that makes Lake Tahoe so special.
As someone who understands the balance required between growth and conservation in the Tahoe Basin, I believe this plan reflects a responsible approach. Please support Homewood's master plan amendment with a vote to approve it. I appreciate the board's work in ensuring thoughtful stewardship of our shared home.

Kirsten Lant, North Lake Tahoe resident for 22 years, and I have the privilege of raising my family here. I work for a variety of hospitality companies. I'm a pass holder at Palisades Tahoe, but I love sneaking over to Homewood for untracked POW lines, gorgeous views, and lack of lift lines, even on a holiday weekend.

It is important to me that public access remain as one of those day ticket purchasers. Today, I'm here to speak in favor of the proposed amendment to the 2011 master plan for Homewood. This amendment is not a drastic departure from what was previously approved. In fact, it's a simple update focused on the placement of a new gondola facility and realigning. Importantly, they are not changing any material element of the original plan, such as community access to the ski area, the hiking opportunities, or adding significant traffic-generating development.

In fact, they are reducing the overall housing units from, I think they said over 200 to under 130. And I think that's something that will help preserve the essence of this beautiful area and not make it the next South Lake Tahoe. One of the primary concerns that was raised is the idea that Homewood would privatize the ski experience. And I too thought that when I heard about Discovery Land coming in. They have addressed this concern directly, providing a written commitment to TRPA and the community that they will continue to sell annual passes and tickets to the public.

Furthermore, they're offering discounted passes for local residents, ensuring that the people who make this area so special can continue to enjoy it affordably. Read about the honor roll free ticket program. They've had numerous meetings with local community members, HOAs, and opposition groups to listen to their concerns and come to a compromise. They've revised their architectural plans and things like a more classic mountain style. Please vote to approve this.

Dan Copenhagen said I've been skiing at Homewood for 58 years. I'm here to talk about the big secret today, and that is capacity. There's been a lot of discussion around language that needs to be locked down in the master plan and community access plan. The invisible capacity is a very serious omission. The danger is that Discovery's model is very private, as we've heard, and their intention will be to reduce that capacity. Because of this concern, we commissioned a study from SC Group, who are industry experts on capacity and ski resort planning. I'll submit that for the record, and you also have slides showing the culmination of that survey work. What it told us is that the comfortable carrying capacity is 1,800 skiers at one time at Homewood. This supports the original promised capacity in the master plan of 1,704 PAOTS.

What's unsettling is that we know the developers are intending to reduce that capacity to 1,000, and there is no capacity for second homeowners and visitors. The solution is simple: 1,500. That's the number. We want 1,500 capacity in the form of PAOTS, committed to the general public as defined by visitors, second homeowners, full-time residents, etc. The rest of the capacity can be used by the developers for members, private members, etc. We've discussed this with Homewood Mountain Resort. They won't tell you anything about capacity. Please don't approve without this language in there.

DRAFT

Doug Fagal said I've proudly been part of the Homewood team since 2016. Thank you for your time and recognizing the urgency of approving this project, not just for the future of the business but for the livelihood of our dedicated team members and their families. What does Homewood look like without approvals? We know it all too well: The mountain is closed. The Homewood workforce is decimated to only a fraction of what it should be. And the community is divided, the void being filled with fear and uncertainty. We are in a fight for this community, to rebuild the heart of the west shore and to heal the divisions fueled by misinformation.

We all need to understand that now is always the right time for the community to come together. The project represents so much more than a redevelopment effort. It's a commitment to safeguarding Lake Tahoe's water clarity, reducing wildfire risk through fuel reduction mitigation efforts, and enhancing protection for all the West Shore residents.

It's a commitment to reviving a ski resort with an operational model that will endure so that we can reopen and stay open. It is, most importantly, an investment in people, creating jobs, driving economic vitality, and ensuring Homewood remains the heart of the West Shore for generations to come.
To the Homewood Governing Board members, thank you for supporting the integrity of the approval process. For being consistent and fair in how you govern all businesses in the basin. For helping this project move forward and enabling Homewood to reopen and stay open, not just for the resort, but as a vitality community center. I'm also submitting a letter by Ron Parson, the owner and operator of Granlibakken who is urging immediate approval.

Don Fouts, resident of the West Shore dating back to 1968. In my day job, I too am one of those evil developers. I've brought many projects through the development and application process through the municipal body, city council, and board of supervisors. We as developers must be counted on to comply with the conditions of approval that we sign and agree to. The development agreements we sign must have enforceable mechanisms, and that must hold us accountable. There are no such accountable levers to enforce the public access plan that Homewood Mountain Resort has currently brought forward. The current plan is a move in the right direction, but again, it has zero accountability and enforcement mechanisms.

Given Homewood Mountain Resorts clear desire to privatize their resort and their past lack of transparency, there is no trust in the Homewood Mountain Resort and the public side. As Ronald Reagan said, "Trust but verify." Homewood Mountain Resort's adamant smile will always be public. If that is their policy, why are they so afraid to put it in legally enforceable language? There's no assurance in this current language. Also, the DA was in the North Fire Department. They have agreed to sign, but they've yet to do that, to my understanding. Why is this not a key point in the approval process? The Caldor fire is warming all of our memories, as is the LA fire. That should keep the center straight and forward for all of us, that fire, life, health, and safety must be a high priority.
I am in support of the redevelopment of this project, and I hope it moves forward. But I hope you require Homewood Mountain Resort to fulfill their obligations, so that they agree to enforceable measures.

Karen Flinn said my family has been at 145 Tahoe Ski Bowl Way for over 50 years. We've tried to be good neighbors. When somebody parks in our parking place, we go to Homewood to try and solve the problem, and on and on. I've always appreciated the people who have been boots on the ground, working together with Homewood. At this point, when the plan came out in 2011, we digested that

change was going to happen. We were very happy that the Homewood facility was going to shape up their resort. And at that time, we did not have a footprint plan that extended to the back of our house. The amendment, though it seems like a small change to a lot of people, is very significant for us. I know I'm one person asking Homewood and TRPA to listen to me on this, but this will result in a significant impact to my family of over 50 years. It will wipe out our back views, change the experience of the people who live in the house, and it's very hard to see what is considered a very small change being a significant one to us. It will impact our property value, change our lighting, and add more fire risk. The tree plan is old, and there's no buffer. Please take a look at this and see what you can do.

Gavin Feiger, League to Save Lake Tahoe said we are a key stakeholder in the approval process for the 2011 Master Plan and the 2014 settlement. As with nearly all projects around the basin, we've reviewed the documents submitted for the current proposal to ensure consistency with the 2011/2014 master plan. From our review, we haven't identified any additional environmental impacts and commend improvements made, especially in the stream environmental zone (SEZ) restoration, increased stormwater treatment, forest fuel reduction, and further reductions in vehicles miles traveled (VMT) through the alternative transportation plan.

Of course, monitoring, enforcement, and compliance are essential. One of the TRPA's fundamental roles is creating and enforcing consistent regulations across the region. We're grateful to see that this master plan is consistent with TRPA's goals.

Public engagement, such as the efforts by Keep Homewood Public and others, has been invaluable. The Community Access Plan and the Alternative Transportation Plan are key pieces that truly seem enforceable, and we appreciate that. We only support projects that can be enforced, this one includes specific enforcement measures, such as the ability for TRPA to halt Homewood's operations and financial penalties of up to $5,000 per day per incident.

Additionally, the annual reporting on ski products and the ability for TRPA to step in if Homewood and its partners fail to follow through on their commitments are vital. We appreciate the public's involvement in ensuring Homewood stays true to its promises. We support the environmental improvements at Homewood, and we believe the master plan's scope is appropriate for the area. Mitigation goals and policies are in place to offset the environmental impacts on the lake.

Chuck Murray, resident for about 85 years and built my first place for my parents when I was a college kid. A few years later, I built a place for myself. I support this project, but I need to express some concerns. The initial proposals I saw in 2011 were impressive, but all I've heard since are empty words. I've yet to see a concrete budget, and that's crucial. Without line items or a specific budget for things like a new fire truck, it's hard to trust the developers.

I've been around long enough to remember the first developer for Homewood's chairlift and the promises that were made, yet the mitigation for erosion was never fully followed through, with Madden Creek running thick with mud for years. Trust is critical, and frankly, it's at an all-time low. Developers need more than just words; they need to show us concrete plans and follow through.

Andy Buckley, General Manager, Homewood Resort with 40 years of experience in the ski industry, I've worked in resorts across Europe and the U.S., including Colorado, Idaho, Wyoming, Nevada, and California. I've spent much time with Vail Resorts and have seen how private models, such as private clubs coexisting with public access, can succeed.

This is what I'm advising for Homewood. The decline in visitation is largely due to the consolidation of resorts and the shift toward Epic and Icon passes, which is why we need to rebuild infrastructure to remain competitive. We need to replace the outdated Madden chair lift with a gondola. I believe it's essential to maintain flexibility with our products and pricing to ensure Homewood's financial viability. I ask you to approve the amendments to the plan so we can move forward with the gondola installation this summer.

Brent Armstrong, Division Chief Fire Marshal, North Tahoe Fire Protection District said my focus today is fire life safety. The development agreement plays a crucial role in mitigating risks, especially given the region's vulnerability to catastrophic wildfires. The recent fires in Southern California highlight the urgent need to improve evacuation routes, fire mitigation measures, and resources for emergency responders.

Although discussions about this agreement have been ongoing for over a decade, we still haven't seen concrete action in the form of signed agreements. This development agreement is essential for integrating advanced fire mitigation strategies and ensuring safer evacuation routes. We need to prioritize fire safety in all development decisions, not just in the North Tahoe Fire District, but throughout the entire basin. We need better forest fuel management, hardening structures, and fortifying evacuation routes.

Martin Gibson, a local resident and grew up in Tahoe. My grandfather taught me to ski at Homewood when I was three, and by high school, I was teaching lessons there. I've worked in almost every aspect of the resort, from the ski school to the maintenance crew. I would be devastated if it were no longer open to the public. My family has a house on the West Shore, and I feel I have a right to ski there, just like anyone else. I'm confident the current plan includes sufficient enforcement mechanisms to ensure Homewood stays open to the public. The first-come, first-serve model makes sense. If you're a local or second homeowner, you can get there early, as I was taught. I fully support the plan and encourage you to approve it. Homewood needs this new model to survive.

Joseph Petta, lawyer for Keep Homewood Public said much of my work at Shute, Mihaly, and Weinberger, is agency counsel for agencies like yours and special districts throughout the state. I do want to acknowledge all of the work that your staff has done so far, which has so far shown up in its latest form in the revised community access plan. There's a lot of important stuff in there that I want to give staff credit for, but there are some remaining issues that you've heard about today. One is capacity. Not setting it artificially low. One is ski products and what that really means and whether products will include day passes and other types of products available to the public. And third is making sure pricing is not exorbitant.

I know you don't want those things to upend the public access language that you've gotten into the cap. I know that's not your intention, but the problem is that you can't avoid doing environmental review pursuant to your compact just because you're assuming that these things won't happen. They're absolutely foreseeable. Any one of these factors could tip public access in a negative direction. And we had an outside engineer do a study which we've submitted saying it takes only 30 daily car trips to different resorts among people who typically attend Homewood. To trigger your threshold for environmental review.

That review is not in this application. You're instead basing this approval on a finding of no significant effect. So, you have to take this back and either get further assurances from the developer that they

DRAFT

will not do any of these things we're talking about, or you need to do the review of these foreseeable impacts.

Gary Reid asked if everybody has read this document that's sitting over there? I keep hearing that there is no criteria, there is no basis, there's no pricing. I'm guessing that these gentlemen here have put this together, and I truly believe that maybe people haven't read it. It does not address second homeowners. Second homeowners are usually considered a vacation property. I got it. My family is a second homeowner. I don't expect a discount. I mentioned this to somebody in the hallway. When I go to McDonald's, I'm paying the price for a burger, whether I'm a local, a visitor, or a traveler. I do get that the people who are considered full-time homeowners want to see something. But I believe in this gentleman, and I believe what's on this paper. I'm just a little concerned that everybody hasn't read it because there's very good details in here that address most everything. I don't think you can address every single thing perfectly. But boy, this is one heck of a good start.
I hope you approve this.

Anne Wagner said I guess I'm baffled. It sounds to me as if we're all in the same direction here.
I'm very concerned about our small businesses, our bike shops, our restaurants, and lodging.
I know I want to keep this community vibrant for them. I'm also concerned about the viability of this and how much depth TRPA does in their research to guarantee that this effort over a 10, 15-year period is actually not risky for our community. Discovery can always walk away. The West Shore cannot. It's very important to us that this have legs to be able to accomplish it.

Finally, I want to address the employees of Homewood and all the hard work West Shore employees. At no point does anyone who wants to ski there want to disrupt your jobs. I don't see keeping Homewood public impacting negatively upon any of your jobs. I just want that to be added to the existing plan. You can still have your job there, but your direction and your leadership is holding out on the issue purely in my opinion, now, exclusivity. That is what they're selling. They're selling an exclusive experience.

And the West Shore taxpayers have been paying for this for years for road improvements, drainage improvements, etc. And I think that is inappropriate. I think you're fooling your employees and local sewer businesses to say that you're doing everything you can when all you have to do is make that small tweak.

Victoria Gustafson, 15-year full time West Shore resident. I agree with everything Keep Homewood Public has presented. It's very important to me that public access be cemented in this decision. We need to make sure that it's protected, achievable and affordable. The community wouldn't have approved this in 2011 had we known that it was for the private. I respect private business model. However, this is a community enhancement program. And we need to receive some benefits too for all of the headache we're going to endure. Submit a new project if that's the direction we want to go.

Second, fire funding has to be cemented very clear. Finally, agree with the gentleman who pointed out the operational constraints and the public access seems like a big loophole. Please address it.

Jane Catterson said I grew up in Homewood and live in an HOA on the West Shore since 1964. There’s been quite a bit of change. A lot of it is good and a lot of good stewardship coming out of TRPA. This project was a community enhancement project that seems to not keep the community of the West Shore completely involved and transparent. For that reason, I am against moving forward with the current design of this project. It was brought up that TRPA needs to get their enforcements solidified

DRAFT

before even thinking of approving this project. That really struck me because of the amount of time we've had in public meetings, the amount of dollars spent paying you as TRPA to listen to us for hours on end and overview these plans is just the beginning. And to ask you to enforce skier visits, public access I think out of your bailiwick. I urge you to deny this project until those aspects are in place. And importantly, again, fire.

Carlee, manager at West Shore Sports said we've been deeply affected by Homewood's closure this year, and I do want to take a second to say thank you to the community and Keep Homewood Public for the support that we've received so far. We support development at Homewood, and I don't know a single person who is stuck in their ways or doesn't want change. The community is pro-development. And as has been stated, we just want the loopholes in the contracts closed. This is a pivotal time in our community, and it seems to have turned us versus them, but it is obvious that the community wants development, wants the growth and we're all on the same page. Those who are asking questions are not standing in the way of a thriving West Shore. We are trying to ensure
that we will be thriving long term. And that there is no ability to go back on their word. We want to protect our community, small businesses, and each other. Please take into account the concerns our community has raised today so we can move forward together.

Johana Butler, a full-time resident of Carnelian Bay. I have enjoyed going to Homewood the eight years I've lived here because my wife grew up in Tahoma. Homewood is a very important mountain for everyone to have access. It should be public access, not this private bougie community. Closing the resort is absolutely ridiculous. I see them spewing out all this stuff. Oh, we're here for public access. But in the writing, repeatedly, they have not changed it when they'd had the opportunity.
I feel horrible for the employees that are not having work, but to try to speed this process through and not have the legalities figured out that's very important. We can't go back once you guys approve it. And they're just going to keep lying because I've heard from other people about projects they've done. They want to cater to the very uber-rich and this Tahoe is about the community and allowing all access.

Kathy Greer said my family has owned two cabins on the West Shore since 1960 and have supported all the businesses on the West Shore, including Homewood Ski Area. In regard to JMA caring so much about the local employees, why did they close West Shore Cafe after purchasing it? And they have continued to keep this business closed even though it provides jobs and is a great West Shore restaurant for homeowners and visitors. It appears it will be a part of the Discovery Lands Private Club.

Two, why do they want to block access to second homeowners? This makes no sense. As stated by many others, all homeowners pay property taxes and should have equal access to Homewood. Second homeowners bring in revenue to all the businesses including Homewood Ski Area. I believe that Keep Homewood Public is not asking for anything unreasonable. I support them totally. It would not be that hard for JMA and associates to be specific and reasonable in their master plan to ensure public access to all residents for generations to come.

Tavis Nichols, Homewood skier. It's where I learned to ski and I've skied there for 30 years now. I think one thing that we're sort of glossing over here is just the consequences of privatization if it were to happen would be extremely similar to the resort closing. There would be little need for Homewood to retain hundreds of employees to serve at most a dozen people who would be there at any given time. West Shore businesses would be pretty much wiped out during the winter. I think redevelopment is urgently needed but it is important that there not be a path to privatization left open.

DRAFT

In terms of the impact on the local community. A lot of people are rightfully concerned about jobs and other consequences. I am excited about what's in the master plan, what they want to do on the hill. I just want to make sure that that is public.

Kate Maltais, Kings Beach resident, said as our community continues to evolve, it's essential that we support developers who truly listen to the needs of the public and adapt their plans accordingly. Homewood Mountain Resort is an example of this and has taken community feedback to heart, refining its plans to better service all. As we watch our town struggle to maintain their vitality, it's clear that responsible, thoughtful growth is crucial. Approving projects like HMR will not only help preserve our unique way of life but also ensure that we can continue to thrive as a community. I stand with Tony Karwowski, Samir Tuma, and Jeff Brown in their comments.
Kina Lamblin is in support of Keep Homewood Public, because I've experienced both at Homewood where I've skied for 40 years as a member of the public and also my partner has a family home there for 50 years. But more importantly, I was a homeowner at Sugar Bowl during a big change there which is somewhat similar to what's happening here at Homewood. Where the resort was having a hard time keeping going and they had to restructure and redo things. But they were really good in how they structured the whole community plan and really honored all the public access in that community. Homewood needs to come up with a better plan so that there's public access for everybody.
We don't want a bunch of private, exclusive, gated, high-end, third home, second homes, the residents that we have who are living in Homewood who have worked hard to live there who live and work there need access to Homewood, their employees need access. I urge TRPA to not approve this plan.

Patrick Brady, Homewood resident, echoed what Kathy and others have said. We all want development. We know it's needed. We all support the originals. But I think we'd all like to raise concerns, as we've highlighted the very large loopholes in the Homewood Mountain Resort Community Access Plan.

That would allow the developers to exploit those public commitments and effectively close public access without technically violating anything in the current plan. One specific one I'd like to highlight is extreme pricing. In the current community access proposal, pricing of regular ski products is not defined. We know from reviewing Discovery Land Company's other properties and Homewood Mountain Resorts own financial filings that extreme pricing with buy-ins in the hundreds of thousands of dollars and annual dues in the tens of thousands of dollars is indeed an explicit part of the business plan. And that pricing would essentially foreclose access to the general public outside of the very wealthy.

We should not allow such extreme pricing to so easily circumvent community access commitments and violate the spirit of the master plan approval as a community enhancement project. While I know that HMR developers and TRPA may feel uncomfortable with pricing restrictions and that HMR needs some level of flexibility, we need to ensure that extreme pricing does not obviate all the other public access commitments. I'm not asking for a discount for part-time residents, but I do ask that TRPA please ensure that the community access plan provides adequate and forceful protections to ensure extreme pricing does not foreclose public access.

Julie Gable is a member of the public and has skied at Homewood for over 40 plus years. I am supportive of a development, but I am not supportive of how this is going about. I do not own a home up there, but it doesn't mean that I don't support the workforce or the businesses or the community. Generations of my family have lived and worked there in different ways and means. We continue to volunteer up there and contribute to the community and we love patronizing the businesses. And one

DRAFT

of our favorite shores is the West Shore, but Lake Tahoe overall is an asset that is incredibly not just for the immediate community, but for the region and, it's one of a kind.

I have not heard of one person in opposition of the development, but what I see as the sticking point is the developer and the owners on the business model where you want to privatize. I don't think it's a healthy model. I agree with the speakers, Carly, Kina, Tavis, and others. That it has maybe a short-term gain to get your way and open the resort, but it has medium and maybe even short-term impacts that are going to be negative.

Bob Boldt said I've been an owner in the Tahoe Basin for more than 40 years and a stone's throw from Homewood Ski Resort in Tahoe Pines for the last 15 years plus. Much of what I've heard today is encouraging to me. I like the idea that it sounds to me like we're very close to a deal. There are two significant issues, one is the architecture that's proposed, it's not what was originally proposed. Personally, I don't like it. I don't think it's consistent with Tahoe traditional. The second one is more important because what's happening here is I've seen our community divided.

We've heard today about the so-called locals who are denigrating the so-called second homeowners and then the workers at Homewood. It was very disappointing to hear them because they seem to consider second homeowners as a necessary nuisance to them. I think that's a mistake. Seventy percent of the owners are second homeowners, we pay much more than 70 percent of property taxes. And without that money, there would be no sewers and no schools or anything. So, I would ask the so-called locals and the so-called workers at the ski resort to keep in mind who's paying the bills here and we deserve an equal treatment to the other homeowners in the area.

Robin Stone said my family has been coming to the West Shore since the late 1800s. We've owned a home on the West Shore since 1963. My family learned to ski at Homewood. The West Shore is a beloved jewel. I believe the privatization of Homewood Mountain is the wrong way to go. I worry when Homewood Mountain Resort uses the word "flexibility." That is definitely a keyword that you don't want to have in any type of contract where the person with whom you're in contract can be flexible. I think the CPA who spoke earlier made very good points. This can be very easily hammered out to reduce flexibility and guarantee community, meaning visitors, locals, second homeowners, and full-time residents access at a reasonable price.

I support Keep Homewood Public. I think it is a very difficult straddle to be selling multi-million-dollar homes to people who want exclusivity and at the same time telling TRPA, we're going to make this public. I would love to see the sales pitch to one of those potential homeowners. And it probably doesn't include locals who've been there since the late 1800s.

Nick Kramer said I own a small lot in Tahoe and have been a California native pretty much my whole life. I run three sustainable reforestation projects across three different countries. I do a lot for the environment. I'd love to be able to have my family enjoy the lot that we have but the IPES score is 15 points short. I bought that lot with the assumption that I'd hopefully be able to get the IPES reassessed because the science that was done on it is so bad. It's unfortunate that 40 years ago, people were given six months to basically contest their IPES scores and oftentimes people didn't understand that it was going to be decades in decades and now indefinitely.

Ms. Williamson asked Mr. Kramer if he had a comment on Homewood.

Nick Kramer said no, I have a comment about the IPES score.

DRAFT

Ms. Williamson said we have a closing public comment period that I would invite you back for and we'd like to hear about it then.

Steven Sinnock said my family has owned a home in Tahoe Pines since 1962. Three generations of our family have skied at Homewood. And hopefully an upcoming fourth generation will be able to do the same. I think it's fair to say that everyone attending today's meeting supports the reopening of the Homewood Mountain Resort. If I was to boil down all the comments to one word, it is “public.” The word public derives from the Latin word publicus, meaning pertaining to the people, state, or community. There are no qualifiers, no exclusions. No special categories, no special exemptions in the definition of public. This is the definition that everyone understood to be perfectly clear and unambiguous when we all supported TRPA's approval of the 2011 Homewood Master Plan. The public access commitments in the master plan also did not include any qualifiers, exclusions, special categories, or special exemptions. Never in my wildest dreams did I think we would have to spend so much time, energy, and money trying to define the word public. I have read the January 16, 2025 Homewood Community Access Plan which attempts to narrowly redefine the word public. I am in 100 percent agreement with and support the recommendations of Keep Homewood Public. I won't repeat any of KHP's recommendations. Rather, I refer you to their website. We are asking that the developer honor the commitments they made to the West Shore community and to the public in order to obtain TRPA's approval.

Matt Sales is a third-generation Homewood skier. My grandfather and father built our current second home on Sans Souci just north of North Mountain Lodge. There's been a lot of people from different sides of this discussion, and it seems like everyone wants development and to improve Homewood. From what I've gathered, the big takeaway is that small ski areas are not a sustainable business. There needs to be a hybrid model. They've partnered with Discovery Land Company, whose business model is based on exclusivity. The figures have already been discussed. The issue I see is that access to the public is limited, and just waking up early and showing up on time isn’t enough with their exclusive business model. Moving forward with the current general plan amendment is a giant leap of faith, putting trust in JMA and Discovery Land Company to do the right thing. It would be easier to incorporate enforceable measures into the plan.

Linda Luke Miller Rich said I’ve grown up on the West Shore and skied Homewood for 59 years. I remember when lift tickets were $7. I’ve heard a lot of opinions from both sides. Most people want redevelopment, but I, like Bob, am not thrilled with the current plans. It’s too big for my taste. It seems like everyone wants the same thing: to improve Homewood and keep it for future generations. I ask that the TRPA deny this plan. There’s ambiguity in the verbiage of the master plan, especially when it comes to public access. I agree with Stephen's definition of what is public. Please, TRPA, say no, and let’s bring this back to the table to redefine the verbiage.

Brian Bensch, full-time homeowner in Tahoe City. I’ve ran a ski school program at Granlibakken since 2018, and was a Homewood employee from 2017 to 2020. There are two things I urge TRPA to consider as they evaluate this proposal. First, regarding the alleged frailty of independent ski areas: In the age of Epic and Icon passes and corporate consolidation, contrary to popular opinion, independent ski businesses have been thriving, especially post-COVID. The NSAA reported that there were 478 active ski areas in 2005 when JMA took over, and last year, there were 486.

Second, I want to comment on Homewood’s business history. As an independent small business owner, I’ve tried to partner with Homewood for several seasons to bring new skiers from Granlibakken to

Homewood, but I was told by multiple members of Homewood leadership that their business objective wasn't to grow skier visits, especially not through more affordable lesson products. I believe the current ownership group is responsible for the history of business losses, and that a different ownership group could operate the mountain sustainably and profitably while being open to the public.

Maya Borhani said TRPA's mission is to "lead the cooperative effort to preserve, restore, and enhance the unique natural and human environment of the Lake Tahoe region, while improving local communities." It's a difficult job to balance development proposals with that mission. I'm 66 and have lived on the North Shore, mostly in Carnelian Bay, all my life. I consider myself a local, even though I don't live here full-time. I agree with the others who have asked for the proposal to be denied. The language of the proposal is vague, and I'd be telling my students to define what they mean if they submitted it in my English class. The flexibility language in the proposal is concerning, it's not a good thing. I also agree with the comments on capacity and pricing. There's no reason why these things can't be spelled out in the proposal. Thank you again to Stephen for his definition of "public." It's not so debatable.

Chris Bennett said I love the plan and have been waiting 14 years to see work begin. However, I believe Discovery Land Company is the fox in the henhouse. While I believe JMA and the owners are acting in good faith, I don't yet trust Discovery Land Company. They are motivated by money and likely sold JMA on their ideas because the numbers at Homewood didn't add up. Worldwide, we're seeing billionaires buying up land for themselves, leaving the rest of us behind in crowded conditions. This development is no different if it goes private. Look at Zuckerberg and Larry Ellison's estates. It's a game, and they're pitting locals, second homeowners, and business owners against each other.

We all want the same thing which is to improve Homewood and ensure access for locals and visitors. Homewood employees, please ask the resort owners to ensure public access. JMA and Discovery, you are smart, write it out, revise it based on feedback. TRPA, do the same. Make sure public access is codified in the community access plan for locals, employees, second homeowners, and visitors.

Niobe Burden said I agree with the numerous previous speakers about tightening up the definition of public access. Obviously, we want development, but we also want to retain public access. The only way we can reach an agreement on this is to define that access clearly with enforceable standards that everyone can agree on. We must make it affordable and accessible to the public.

I am concerned about the continued presence of the Tahoe Inn, which has been an eyesore and blight in our community for far too long. Since the Tourist Accommodation Units (TAUs) were transferred to Homewood Resort 25 years ago, the Tahoe Inn has remained a dilapidated structure that detracts from the natural beauty of our region. It undermines efforts to enhance the local economy and tourism. The ongoing presence of this abandoned property not only affects the community's aesthetic value but also impacts potential development in the area, including the highly anticipated Cal Neva Resort across the street and the proposed Tahoe Biltmore site next door. It is crucial that we present a unified and appealing image to visitors and investors, and the Tahoe Inn stands as a significant obstacle to achieving this goal.

I strongly encourage TRPA to require immediate action to have the Tahoe Inn demolished as part of the first phase of the Homewood development, not at a later date. 25 years is long enough. They are already benefiting from the TAUs.

JANUARY 22, 2025
Governing Board

Macey Peterson, third-generation Homewood resident. I've grown up with Homewood Mountain Resort as my playground and classroom, and I hope it will serve the same purpose for my children, grandchildren, and future generations. I spend summers and falls hiking Quail Lake, fishing in Madden Creek, and zigzagging through manzanita for the ultimate workout. In winter and spring, I ski Rainbow Ridge and my favorite runs at Homewood Mountain Resort. In fact, I learned how to ski at Homewood, and I plan to teach my future children how to ski there too. In the winter of 2022, I was engaged at Homewood and dreamed of getting married at the top of Big Blue, as I had since I was a little girl. Unfortunately, that dream wasn't realized due to delays with the master plan.

Homewood has been the setting for some of my most treasured life moments. Losing public access to Homewood Mountain Resort would be devastating and a significant deviation from the quality of life promised in the 2011 approved master plan. Additionally, the shift from Mountain Rustic to Mountain Modern will completely alter the character of West Shore, which draws both the community and visitors. "Mountain Modern" does not fit with the historic fabric of Homewood and will detract from the natural beauty of the area.

As a businesswoman, I recognize the importance of proper disclosure. Transparency is key to an honest negotiation, and I seek clarity on the public access that will be afforded to our family. The term "public" remains vague. Please clearly define "public" in perpetuity, as specified in my letter for today's meeting. I recently attended the Yellowstone Club while staying in Big Sky and was asked not to wear Yellowstone gear in downtown Big Sky because residents dislike the club due to its noise and traffic. We have an opportunity to do this right and have this project strengthen our community, not divide it. Let's get the details right. Let's keep Homewood public.

Claire Cunningham, full-time resident of North Shore. My family skis at Homewood, and we have five ski resorts within 20 minutes of our home, including some larger, fancier resorts. Despite this, we choose Homewood. I urge the board to help us obtain clear language from the developers on the areas that remain unclear. As is currently written, there is room for the developers to privatize the resort later without penalties or further approval. Our local community supports an improved Homewood Mountain Resort that is accessible to everyone. Discovery is not in the business of keeping resorts public; every Discovery resort is private, and Homewood is already listed on their website as part of their private portfolio. We know that people like Mark Zuckerberg, who might buy a membership, do not want to be around the rest of us.

There are at least two areas in the language that need to be addressed: Community Access: There is no defined pass or ticket type for those who are not full-time West Shore residents, nor is there a committed number of passes available. Many locals who ski at Homewood live outside West Shore. Extreme Pricing: The current plan does not prevent pricing that mirrors private clubs like the Yellowstone Club in Montana. This could prevent regular people from accessing the resort.
This isn't the first time, nor will it be the last, that Discovery attempts to privatize a resort. The TRPA has an opportunity to stand up for the original Homewood Master Plan, which the community supported, and say no to amendments without clear language and guarantees.
In summary, please require the developers to clarify, quantify, and firm up the language in the master plan to ensure Homewood remains public.

Bill Larson said I've been a long-time supporter of Homewood. However, I don't trust an organization like Keep Homewood Public, which openly supports and participates in online bullying. I'm an older member of this community, and when I try to speak with people, it feels like I'm just being criticized online. This kind of behavior does not build community trust. I worked at Homewood as a janitor for

many years but unfortunately lost my job when the current issues began. Luckily, I was able to secure work elsewhere, but I would love the opportunity to return. Homewood means a lot to me, and I hope this project moves forward. My grandmother was concerned about the availability of medical staff in case of an emergency. Recently, she had a minor injury on her skidoo, and medical staff responded quickly. I reassured her that the people I worked with at Homewood are great, and I hope to be back working with them soon.

John Regan said I've been listening to the comments all day, and I don't believe the TRPA can approve the current proposal. The language has been massaged to accommodate privatization, and that was never the original intent. This feels like a bait-and-switch. If they want to privatize, they should start from the beginning, but they can't do it under the current proposal.
Jeffrey Hawkins said my family has a second home near Homewood, where I grew up skiing, and I want my kids, and other family members to experience the same. I support closing the loopholes related to public access, especially exorbitant pricing.

Laura Miller said I've spoken at meetings regarding the Tahoe Basin Area Plan and the development in Olympic Valley. I'd like to share a few verses from an Eagles song, "The Last Resort." "Some rich men came and raped the land, Nobody caught 'em, Put up a bunch of ugly boxes, And Jesus people bought 'em, And they called it paradise,

The place to be, They watched the hazy sun, Sinking in the sea, You can leave it all behind, Sail to Lahaina, Just like the missionaries did, So many years ago, They even brought a neon sign, "Jesus is coming", Brought the white man's burden down, Brought the white man's reign, Who will provide the grand design?, What is yours and what is mine?, 'Cause there is no more new frontier, We have got to make it here, We satisfy our endless needs,
And justify our bloody deeds, In the name of destiny, And in the name of God, And you can see them there, On Sunday morning, Stand up and sing about, What it's like up there, They call it paradise, I don't know why, You call someplace paradise, Kiss it goodbye." I'd like to express my support for Keep Homewood Public and encourage TRPA to look accordingly on the guidance that we need in this public comment period.

Karen Ingel is also speaking for Peter Stroud said our family has maintained a cabin at Tahoe Pines since 1954. I strongly support closing the loopholes in the current proposal. It seems the amendments are not yet ready, and the plan is not ready for approval at this time. I'm incredibly grateful to Keep Homewood Public for their efforts in raising awareness and keeping the West Shore community informed. I hope you can uphold the community standards and ensure this project truly serves as an enhancement for the community.

Staff responses:

Mr. Nielsen said you've heard about the LEED (Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design) certification which is a great green building standard. It's a certification issued by the Green Building Certification Institute, and I've seen the documentation that shows this project will qualify for LEED certification once built. I've also seen the receipts confirming that the fees have been paid, so that's been taken care of.

Regarding the concerns about the house on Tahoe Ski Bowl Way and the potential conflicts with the South Base changes, as I mentioned earlier, this is not a development permit. If the board chooses to approve the master plan, any future development at the South Base will require notice to surrounding

property owners, who will be informed about the permit application. We often receive comments from people concerned about neighborhood compatibility, and we engage the developers to address those concerns. Nine times out of ten, we can resolve those issues with site plan changes, landscaping adjustments, or modifications to materials and colors. I've already spoken with Mr. Porter, and he's prepared to meet with her sooner rather than later to discuss the matter.

As for the chairlift, someone mentioned that the current chairlift is 50 years old and needs to be replaced sooner than the Madden chair. However, the Madden chair was built the same year I was born and it is over 50 years old. That chair will be replaced first if the gondola is approved, as it is likely the oldest chairlift on the mountain, and it is definitely time for it to be replaced.

Regarding the Tahoe Inn, to clarify, the current plan is to demolish the Tahoe Inn in 2028. I know that people would like it to be done sooner, and we all want that, but for the record, the current plan is for 2028.

You've heard from Homewood staff about day-use lift tickets. There's been some confusion about whether these will be offered, but Homewood has confirmed that day-use lift tickets will be available, as they've stated in the meeting.

On the subject of rules and requirements, like any permit, if it's approved today, the permit stays with the property. Even if the property changes hands, the permit is transferable to the new owner.

The issue of second homeowners has come up several times. Second homeowners will have access to services and tickets, but they don't qualify for the same discounts as West Shore residents, unless they meet specific criteria. They can still purchase tickets and season passes, but they will not receive the local discounts.

There's also been mention of Discovery's history, and I've done some research, as you likely have. However, TRPA cannot base recommendations on a developer's performance elsewhere; we must focus on the facts contained in the application submitted to us. I am aware of concerns about how Discovery operates in other locations. I spoke with Mr. Divita from Discovery, and he assured me that they are committed to ~~embracing a new model~~ensuring a fair share of the total regional capacity for outdoor recreation is available for the general public. This led to the creation of a Community Access Plan—which is not a homeowner association access plan—and~~, which~~ is a result of input from various stakeholders, including Keep Homewood Public, their attorney, TRPA attorney, and members of the board.

Regarding architecture, TRPA does not specify a particular architectural style. As you travel around the basin, you'll see a variety of styles, from Old Tahoe log cabins to modern designs. For example, the new transit center in Tahoe City features a mountain-modern design, which many find refreshing. Concerns about the master plan's shift toward mountain-modern architecture have been voiced. The original 2011 plan included architecture that resembled Viking's Home, with expensive designs. However, the market has changed, and while we all appreciate the Old Tahoe style, there is now an opportunity to update the design approach. The findings can be made to protect scenic quality, which is a key threshold for TRPA. Our scenic evaluation, including flying balloons with engineers to simulate building heights, concluded that this project would not only have a neutral effect on scenic quality but would actually benefit it.

DRAFT

As for monitoring and enforcement, TRPA does not regulate the price of goods and services, including lift tickets. Pricing is determined by the market. Regarding capacity, during the Advisory Planning Commission meeting, it was mentioned that the mountain's capacity is 4,000 people. In recent years, there have been days with fewer visitors. We don't impose a strict capacity limit, as Homewood is assessing how the mountain operates in the future. TRPA manages capacity using a regional growth management tool, calculating PAOTS for persons at one time. Homewood's capacity is set at 1,704 persons at one time, and this will be tracked annually in reports. The average number of people on the mountain will be monitored to ensure that ~~capacity is not exceeded~~recreation capacity is available to the general public, which is consistent with how we manage capacity at other resorts like Heavenly.

Finally, regarding violations, the Access Plan outlines penalties for non-compliance. If violations occur, they must be addressed, and penalties are not seen as a cost of doing business. If a violation occurs, the resort must stop committing the violation, as continued violations would prevent them from operating. I don't believe an oversight committee is needed at this time. If violations become significant in the future, we can revisit the issue and discuss whether a committee is necessary. For now, we believe the plan is a good starting point for ensuring that the policies and vision of the master plan are achieved over time.

Mr. Porter said Mr. Nielsen hit on the second homeowner discussion and there is no need to go there. Further, I've often heard that we can't trust the developer, and I understand that concern. Instead of simply accepting it, I encourage everyone to read and fully understand the relevant documents. I think we heard some excellent points during today's discussion. It's important to carefully read the community access plan and the documents Mr. Nielsen shared things like the monitoring language, discount programs, and enforcement policies. The redline master plan is also crucial. These documents have been carefully reviewed by our team, Keep Homewood Public, and TRPA staff, who have worked hard to identify any potential loopholes and ensure the project is guided towards success, consistent with the 2011 approvals. While it's important not to trust blindly, I ask that you take the time to read the documents.

I've also heard many people say they like the plan and want to see the development move forward, but they have concerns about privatization and members-only concepts. To address this, I want to share an important excerpt from the community access plan: "All commitments within this plan are made in the spirit of ensuring the public that Homewood Mountain Resort will not convert Homewood into a members-only ski resort by limiting the sale of ski packages to members of specific groups, such as an HOA or members-only club, without TRPA approval. If TRPA determines HMR is acting in bad faith to bypass these commitments, TRPA may implement any of the enforcement mechanisms outlined in the plan."

If this resonates with more people, I think it will help clarify the intent behind the language, which was developed through a collaborative effort with many stakeholders. The plan outlines how the board can approve future steps and hold us accountable moving forward, which is very important to us.

Next, I've heard multiple people express support for the community access plan but suggest that it needs to be codified. I'd like to clarify that the community access plan is already a legal document tied to our master ski area plan. It's not a temporary or informal document. It's a formal commitment that will guide future permits, applications, and development efforts on site. We believe this addresses the concerns about codification.

DRAFT

Additionally, I've heard some people say the JMA has done nothing since the 2011 approvals. To clarify, we received approvals in 2011 but were immediately sued, which led to over five years of litigation. During that time, we lost investors and financial support, and we were also dealing with a recession. This made progress very difficult. Now, we're at a point where we have good momentum, and we want to see this project through. We are committed to investing in the community. Over the past few years, we've invested over $10 million in the resort, but unfortunately, visitation declined during that time, despite our efforts to boost it.

Finally, flexibility has come up in discussions. My mention of flexibility referred to business decision-making and operational flexibility. We're not asking for flexibility in terms of breaking commitments or backing out of the plan. Instead, we need the ability to make business decisions, what products to sell, when, and at what prices within the bounds of reason. Every business owner in the basin would appreciate the same level of flexibility, and I'm sure local private businesses would agree. No one wants to be told how much to charge for a steak or equipment. We simply seek the ability to operate our business successfully within the approved master plan's framework.

Board Comments & Questions

Ms. Aldean thanked everyone for their courtesy, articulation, and passion in expressing your beliefs. This is a complicated matter, and I don't want to get caught up in wordsmithing. I appreciate that the Homewood Community Access Plan was amended to include additional language.

I have a question relating to a comment I've made, which mirrors a concern raised by the Keep Homewood Public group. It has to do with the use, and I know it's just semantics perhaps to some, "e.g." means, "for example" and "such as" season passes and day tickets or some of the skiing products and packages that will be offered. The response we received was that there is a desire to maintain flexibility regarding the types of products offered. However, it seems to me that the season pass is tied directly to the ski access discount program. If Homewood were to eliminate season passes, it would render those discount programs invalid, as they would no longer be available. I understand some may disagree with that conclusion, but it's how I interpreted the reluctance to explicitly include season passes and day tickets in the language. I'm not an expert in ski operations, but I would be very surprised if most ski resorts don't offer these kinds of products.

The issue isn't that such products are guaranteed forever, it's simply that they are examples of what Homewood Mountain Resort might offer. But because these are tied to the discount program, eliminating season passes would effectively render those programs worthless.

Mr. Porter said there are two key points to consider. First, we use the term "e.g." because the industry is constantly evolving. For instance, an interesting graphic this morning showed that ten years ago, most resorts were selling 70 percent day tickets and 30 percent season passes. That has since flipped, and products are changing over time in response to a dynamic market.

Second, this flexibility is crucial for us as we enter into a long-term binding agreement, extending well beyond those of us in this room. With that in mind, if a situation arises where a technicality prevents us from offering the local discount pass, we would effectively be violating our commitments. However, as the provision I read earlier specifies, we'd be reviewing our compliance with TRPA annually. If an issue were flagged, we could address it accordingly. Ultimately, the process outlined in the document and how we manage it moving forward is just as important as addressing every specific hypothetical scenario. In that case, I don't see it being an issue.

DRAFT

Ms. Aldean said what I'm trying to avoid is having this project come back to the Governing Board, getting involved in litigation, or facing costly enforcement actions. That's why I believe clarity is essential. To address the concern about second homeowners, perhaps we should simply consider whether second homeowners should be included as part of the general public eligible to purchase full-price products. This could help resolve the issue, as second homeowners do pay a significant amount of taxes. While some may not visit their homes frequently, when they do, they're supporting the local economy and, ideally, supporting Homewood.

Mr. Porter said I don't think we'd have any issue adding second homeowners explicitly to the list, along with HOA members, visitors, and HOA hotels. As they all fall under the same category anyway.

Ms. Aldean said dynamic pricing refers to the practice of adjusting the price of a product or service based on changing market conditions, particularly charging higher prices when demand increases. This reminds me of the situation in Los Angeles, where homes have been destroyed by fires and people are forced to pay much higher rents for substitute housing. A place that used to rent for $1,000 is now being rented for $3,000. Can you explain dynamic pricing in your industry? Because based on this definition, it can seem like price gouging, and I'm sure that's not your intention.

Mr. Buckley said dynamic pricing is standard in the industry, similar to how the airline industry works. You pay more during particularly popular times of the year. So, for instance, you might pay more for a day ticket or even a season pass during peak times or holiday periods than you would during quieter, slower times. We've been using this pricing model at Homewood for several years now, so prices may vary between $104 and $240, depending on when you're visiting.

Ms. Aldean said my point is, you can afford to charge less when you have more people, rather than charging more when there are fewer visitors.

Mr. Buckley said that's a great point, but you're highlighting the nature of the industry, it's more of an art than a science. This is why we emphasize flexibility, as we need to understand how to balance everything and create the experience we envision.

Ms. Aldean said it's been pointed out that resorts like Mount Rose and Diamond Peak might be more comparable to Homewood than Palisades and the other resorts used for comparison. How did you choose those two resorts as comps based on the small geographical nature of Homewood?

Mr. Buckley said as we look at comparables in the future, we'll focus more on the overall experience rather than just acreage. As we develop the resort with better lift infrastructure, new restaurants, and a new mid-mountain lodge, the shift in pricing will reflect the unique experience Homewood offers.

Ms. Gustafson wanted to echo my appreciation for the two and a half years of meetings and public input. I truly appreciate everyone's contributions, we've come a long way. Tightening up these last few items will help me. One point I want to address is the ongoing concern about loopholes. The annual report will analyze the number of tickets and products sold. Will it reflect a significant decrease in lift tickets or ski passes if that happens? Is that correct?

Mr. Nielsen said absolutely.

DRAFT

Ms. Gustafson said that would give us a reason to look into potential violations, findings, and their implications.

Mr. Nielsen and maintaining that PAOT number of 1704.

Ms. Gustafson said the figure of 1704 is an average, and I think that might be confusing to the public. It's important to clarify that we have the ability to ensure that the language regarding intent is clear. I'd like to see this language placed at the beginning of the community access plan, so it's obvious.

Additionally, I wanted to address the capacity issue and the potential for extreme pricing. If there's a significant drop in the number of tickets sold, that would trigger the need to review potential violations, which I feel more comfortable with now. Many of the challenges we face at the local level require partnerships. For example, partnerships have helped with bike trails and forest health on the West Shore. I've worked with previous and current owners of Homewood Ski Area to make progress in these areas. Even without the development moving forward, we've made strides in some of these efforts.

One issue I want to raise in terms of partnership is the Tourism Business Improvement Districts (TBID) we've established on the North Shore. These have been vital in raising funds for projects related to housing and transportation, and they're overseen by the business community. Can I count on your continued support for these efforts? This is essential for the ongoing partnership I need to ensure that we protect our community and keep these projects on track.

Mr. Porter said we understand the importance of it and absolutely we'll continue to support those efforts.

Ms. Gustafson said I've been advocating for the demolition of the Tahoe Inn for the past five years since I've been in office. Is it possible to tie its removal to an earlier phase of the development, preferably the first phase of housing? I don't want to wait until 2028. If you're already doing work, have financing in place, and are past any potential litigation or other obstacles, I'd like to see the Tahoe Inn come down sooner.

Mr. Porter said our original timeline was tied to the transfer of commodities towards the build-out of the development. However, we hear the community loud and clear. We understand the importance, and we are committed to demolishing the Tahoe Inn and fulfilling that obligation much sooner. We're happy to tie it to the first phase of residential development or whatever timeline we collectively agree upon that makes sense.

Ms. Gustafson said another item that's critical to me is ensuring that you've had meetings with the fire district. We will need their sign-off before we approve housing projects moving forward on this site. Have you had those discussions? I was confused by earlier testimony and want to make sure that you are fulfilling those commitments. I understand there are still ongoing negotiations, but I want to confirm that you're making the necessary efforts.

Mr. Porter said we were a little confused by the comments as well, but yes, we have had ongoing discussions with the fire district. We recently shared an updated red-line DA agreement, and we are currently in discussions to finalize it. We are committed to executing our obligations and reaching an agreement with Chief Armstrong and the fire team.

DRAFT

Ms. Gustafson said you have the process to go through, but you'll also need to go through Placer County for building permits. The final item I'd like you to consider is we did negotiate with Palisades to increase the Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT), as we face a dire shortage of workforce housing. We know we can't address this issue without significant funding. Looking at the workforce housing element, it was approved at a time when our needs weren't as critical as they are now. I know the industry understands that, but in addition to the TBID, I would love to see additional TOT committed to funding the new units, so we can continue supporting housing programs for our local workforce.

Mr. Porter said we understand the dire need and we are committed to assisting in any way so happy to put that commitment here today.

Mr. Rice said the concerns I had have been addressed, and the questions I had have been answered. Thank you very much for your presentation and for all of the public comments. I kept track of the pros and cons, and "I'm okay with it." I think we can handle most of the "ifs," and I'm comfortable moving forward.

Ms. Laine said thank you for the presentation and for all the public comment. There are two things that continue to nag at me: the evacuation planning and any possibility of privatization occurring at some point. I was born and raised here, and I raised my kids here. I'm very concerned that in 20 years, I would look back and say, "I had a chance to help with that, or I was part of that," and look what happened." So, the issue of loopholes is something I want to focus on a bit.

My question is regarding the Community Access Plan and that last paragraph. Mr. Bass and I were just talking about this earlier. We deal with loopholes all the time. Every time we think we've figured something out and plugged a hole, we get a new one. This language is very specific: that Homewood Mountain Resort (HMR) will not convert Homewood to a members-only ski resort by limiting the sale of ski packages to specific groups. What other way could they potentially convert, without limiting who they sell their packages to? For example, Discovery could they close the mountain to the public and not sell ski packages to non-members, just telling the members, "This is your mountain"? What's the loophole here? I'm really worried that the language is too specific, and I want to understand what the workaround could be.

Mr. St. Michel said we talk a lot about loopholes, but I think there's a difference between loopholes and something being unclear. Maybe someone doesn't fully appreciate the commitments that are being made here. One commitment that's not being made as we've talked about is a price limitation on full-price products. That's not a commitment; that's not a loophole. That's simply not a commitment that Homewood Mountain Resort is willing to make for those full-price packages. We can discuss whether that falls under TRPA's purview, but that's a different matter.

I think there's a difference between what qualifies as a loophole and what is simply a commitment that hasn't been made. We recognize, as you mentioned, there will always be another loophole if we try to close every single one. If there's ambiguity in language or confusion about what something means, we'll work on that. The purpose of the last paragraph was to clarify the intent: if we need to come back and enforce something, the intent is clear. There should be no manipulation of these terms to turn Homewood into a member-only ski resort. If that were to happen, we would be on solid ground to say you're violating the spirit and intent of this agreement.

Also, this is likely going to be my responsibility if such a situation arises. But I'm confident in the record we've built over time with Homewood, not just in these meetings but in the statements, they've made

and the public record. I'm not overly concerned about getting into a situation where someone could argue that there's been a technicality or loophole. I think there's enough here to go to court, seek an injunction, and implement penalties. The main remedy would be to force a return to TRPA, where the proposed change would need to be analyzed for its impact on the recreational threshold.

Mr. Nielsen said you asked about other ways they could potentially convert the mountain to a private setting. Well, there are resorts around the country where they reserve certain runs. They could, for example, close off some runs and designate them only for homeowners. They could also restrict skier service spaces in the lodge to homeowners only. However, both of these actions would be inconsistent with the vision and goals outlined in the master plan. They would also violate our Regional Plan policy, which mandates general public access. Any such actions would be seen as violations of both the permit and the master plan.

Ms. Laine asked why Discovery Land Company was brought onto the team. What was the purpose behind that decision?

Mr. Porter said projects of this scale and complexity involve big, audacious ideas that require strong partnerships. Over the course of Homewood's history, we've explored various solutions. As some members of the public have mentioned today, we currently have a partnership with JMA, Discovery and Mohari Hospitality.

This partnership, we believe, successfully balances our goals. Homewood has faced significant challenges, and frankly, we've been one of the first casualties of small businesses on the West Shore struggling to survive. While we understand the ripple effect this has on others, we acknowledge that we are the first to experience a major downturn this year due to poor performance. However, this partnership enables us to navigate those challenges and find a path to thrive through thoughtful development and community engagement, offering various ski products, packages, and a hybrid model. We feel confident in the direction we're heading.

Ms. Laine said I'm just confused because Discovery doesn't have any models that resemble what you're doing. Typically, when you bring in other companies, it's because they bring something to the table, either investment, a solid business model, or relevant experience. However, you brought in Discovery, a company that has a very clear business model focused on privatization. They've expressed openness to a hybrid model, but I'm curious what do you feel they bring to the table that your group didn't already have?

Mr. Porter said I do not work for Discovery and am speaking on behalf of myself and JMA Ventures. Discovery does a lot of things well. From what I understand, they do have resorts with elements like hotel components, beach access, and public access. While it may not be their core business, I do understand your question. For us, their strength lies in sales, marketing, and their ability to execute and deliver on projects. This makes sense, especially in such a phenomenal location and property within the Tahoe Basin. Again, I can only speak from my perspective and from our company's standpoint. We believe that this partnership will allow us to execute effectively and ensure that this business stays in operation, thriving through the development lifecycle.

Mr. Bass said thank you for the presentation and all the public comments. When I look at this, it seems like what we are looking to approve right now is just the permit to construct a gondola. It's not an ongoing operational permit that would require annual renewals from TRPA to operate the gondola.

DRAFT

So, once we issue this permit and the construction is completed, does it not satisfy the requirements? Once we've fully completed our inspections and signed off that everything is good to go, doesn't that become a vested property right for Homewood? That doesn't come with an annual renewal that requires meeting certain requirements, right?

I feel like we might be setting ourselves up for a situation where, as you said, we would need to go to court for an injunction, rather than simply denying an annual renewal. Shouldn't we be looking at an operating permit that requires annual renewals to ensure these requirements are met each year in order to continue operating? Once we grant a vested property right, it becomes a pretty hard thing to take back, from what I know, and in my experience with my own businesses.

Mr. St. Michel said the answer to that is that the master plan amendments, as Mr. Porter mentioned earlier, are key here. The community access plan is part of the master plan amendments, which effectively acts like an ongoing operating permit. As you said, the gondola permit itself is not an operating permit, at least not in the way we're discussing it. However, the community access plan is a part of the master plan amendments, and the master plan is a component of the Regional Plan. It's fully enforceable and has been adopted by ordinance. This means it will be enforceable going forward, not just a one-time approval once the permits are issued.

Additionally, there are future permits, and these are included as part of the enforcement mechanisms in the access plan. The ability to withhold future permits gives us extra leverage. In addition to the court option, we can withhold future permits if we believe the project is out of compliance with the community access plan.

Ms. Gustafson said I do think the applicant initially wanted to just process a gondola permit. However, we required the master plan for this very reason. I just want to make sure the public is clear on this that we didn't allow them to simply process a gondola permit on its own. We required the master plan because of the authority and enforceability it brings.

Ms. Regan said that's correct.

Mr. Bass said I hear your point about, yes, we could potentially pull back their permits. But if we look at the completion of all permits, say in 10 years, there would be nothing left to hold back. At that point, we could end up in a lawsuit about land use and whether the vested rights have been granted. Their argument would likely be that they're complying with the master plan, and we'd find ourselves in a long lawsuit, which no one wants.

In my experience with permits, I deal with annual renewals that require showing ongoing compliance. I wonder if that mechanism might be better for ensuring compliance here. I'm not in their business, but the closure of Homewood this year raises concerns about their level of commitment, as it shows they're willing to push things through to make progress.

I don't want to stop this development, I think it's needed, but we need to ensure we have strong enforcement. I don't want them to have the ability to get around it. If they don't comply, the gondola should not be allowed to operate. To me, that would require annual renewals for the gondola's operation. While I hear that the master plan is enforceable, it creates a potential conflict where it becomes a back-and-forth on whether they're complying. After 10 years, when all permits are completed, we might lose our leverage. That's why I think an annual operating permit could offer more ongoing control, even though it might make things more complex. It's important that we have

DRAFT

those mechanisms in place rather than relying on the courts, because, as we know, the legal path is full of uncertainties.

Ms. Regan said we do have the annual monitoring report. Typically, we do not issue operating permits for other ski resorts like Heavenly or Diamond Peak, and I don't believe that's on the agenda for today. However, it's something we can discuss further. When you look at resorts around the country, we understand the concerns that have been raised. That's why we've been working diligently for the past six months. When we started with the application in May, it was just one page, the community access provision of the master plan. We've pushed very hard to get to where we are, and we believe we've developed a package that we can legally defend. The remedies available to us under the Compact include the court system. We've been to the Supreme Court and back, and our proven track record of legally implementing our regional plan shows that we're prepared to take action if necessary. Our executive team is fully committed to maintaining the integrity of this process.

Mr. Aguilar said we have the community access plan and then we have a response from Keep Homewood Public with the suggested changes. Are these suggested changes reflected in this document, or do these changes need to be further considered? Where have these changes been accommodated, and where have they not been accommodated?

Mr. Porter said I'm not sure exactly which documents or versions you're referring to, as there have been several updates. We have continuously updated the community access plan based on feedback from Keep Homewood Public, supporters of the project, and others. I believe there was another version finalized either last night or this morning, which includes some of the additional edits in the final draft. That being said they will not include all of the suggested edits as proposed from Keep Homewood Public.

Mr. Aguilar asked which of these is included and not included.

Mr. St. Michel said this came in late last night. We've been working with Keep Homewood Public (KHP) through numerous meetings, and Mr. Nielsen has been in daily and weekly contact. Many of the suggestions are similar to what we've already seen. One of the requests, for example, was about setting a capacity limit, only selling tickets and passes until a certain capacity is reached. This is not included in the community access plan. However, I would note that for the discount programs, there is language stating that there will be no limits on the quantity, and anyone eligible can purchase those tickets.

Mr. Aguilar said there's four. The first one is on page 1 at the bottom.

Mr. St. Michel said the first one is not included which is the capacity.

Mr. Aguilar asked if they want a capacity limit for the mountain.

Mr. St. Michel said not a limit but a commitment, minimum to continue selling tickets until a certain capacity of the mountain is reached, meaning there should be a minimum number of people on the mountain.

Mr. St. Michel said like other Tahoe Basin ski resorts, Homewood Mountain Resort will offer full-price, non-blackout season passes and day tickets for sale to everyone on a first-come, first-serve basis.

DRAFT

While some aspects of this concept are included, it's not reflected in the exact language as suggested, so, I would say no. The community access plan has undergone extensive negotiation, and we've worked closely with Homewood to find a balance. We have not simply adopted the Keep Homewood Public proposals but have engaged in a process to agree on mutually acceptable terms. The final language reflects that collaborative process.

Mr. St. Michel said moving on to the third point, there are no price limitations on the full-price products. However, there are price limitations on the discount programs. These programs have more defined criteria around quantity and price. For the full-price products, those specifics are not detailed. This is not an oversight; rather, it's a result of negotiations. If needed, we can ask Homewood for further information, which they've already provided.

Mr. Aguilar said the last one is at the bottom of page three, it states that the permittee will make commercially reasonable efforts to open up the ski hill during the gondola construction period.

Mr. Nielsen said we have three conditions we'd like to read into the record to help address that issue. These conditions have been discussed, and the origin comes from Keep Homewood Public and their attorney. We have also discussed these with Homewood, and there is agreement among all parties.

Condition One: The permittee shall make commercially reasonable efforts to open and operate the ski hill to the general public during the gondola construction period. This addresses potential conflicts of operating the mountain while the gondola is being constructed.

Condition Two: The permittee shall prepare and submit a parking management plan, effective during the gondola construction period, to manage parking and traffic impacts within the master plan area.

Condition Three: Shuttles between the North Base and South Base will continue to operate each day the mountain is in operation, until 4:30 p.m. This shuttle service is part of the master plan amendment's alternative transportation plan and ensures smooth transit between the two areas during construction.

Mr. Settelmeyer said we've had a lot of discussions on this at the Regional Planning Committee, as well as many discussions today. This is a new concept for JMA Ventures, and it's interesting that they're willing to go down this path. I look at this from many different levels and appreciate the discussions, especially with Ms. Gustafson's comments about adding this through master plan, rather than just a yearly permit. It would be nice to monitor this and have this conversation annually, but perhaps it might be wiser to try and resolve this now.

You mentioned dynamic pricing, and I agree, dynamic pricing isn't gouging, gouging only applies to necessities during emergencies. I ran into this issue when I was in the state legislature and we passed the Uber and Lyft legislation, which involved transportation network companies. You've mentioned that you've been operating under dynamic pricing, how long have you been operating with this model, aside from this year when you're not operating?

Mr. Buckley said I don't know the exact number of years, but for many years, dynamic pricing has been a model adopted in the industry and also at Homewood. I'll refer to my colleagues.

Mr. Porter said it's been around six or seven years. It's very much the norm.

DRAFT

Mr. Settelmeyer said I Onyx, which is a hunting app that I find very reliable for my other jobs. It was especially useful when I was in the legislature, ensuring I didn't place signs on someone else's property. Homewood Mountain Resort owns 1,068.14 acres of private property. How many acres do you operate on public property, and how many on Forest Service lands?

Mr. Buckley said we have two permits. We have approximately 200+ acres covered by a special use permit, primarily around the vicinity of Quail Face, which extends into Quail Lake. Under the special use permit rules, this area is treated as if it were our land, and we pay fees for its use. Additionally, we hold an outfitter permit, which covers about 400 acres, up to Ellis Peak. This area is not for exclusive use, but we run cat tours there. It's open to the public, who can access it by skinning or snowmobile if they can get there.

Mr. Settelmeyer said that it totals approximately 606 acres of public land that they use. What percentage of your business is conducted on public land versus private land?

Mr. Buckley said it's a very small amount. I don't know the exact percentage, but it's relatively small. Quail Face is a steep and difficult area to ski, so it's somewhat exclusive in terms of the skill level required to use that area. Similarly, the touring areas are generally for powder skiing, so it is limited to a smaller number of people.

Mr. Settelmeyer asked for a ballpark number.

Mr. Buckley said it's about five percent.

Ms. Conrad-Saydah had some questions along the lines of where Director Settelmeyer was going about ensuring that there's signage for the public to reach those public areas. Everything around Quail Lake and the northern boundary of your lands, ensuring that folks can get up there. From the numbers, it's about 38 percent of where you offer your operations on public lands, including the 406 acres that's available to others.

When we think about the numbers of people who should be given access on a daily basis, I think about that as a minimum of your daily capacity. That should be the floor for where you start with your capacity to ensure that access is available on a daily basis. I'd like to see, higher numbers than that, but I see that as a minimum. You are benefiting from the use of lands held in public trust.

We need to think about more definitions around "first come, first serve" so we can understand how you set your daily capacity. "First come, first serve" could mean, great, you're the first five, you get tickets, and everyone else is a member, but it's hard to understand what you mean by that because it's vague.

On enforcement, it's good to hear that TRPA feels enforcement is possible, but we've seen time and time again that TRPA does not have sufficient staffing or funding for effective enforcement. I would prefer to see monthly reporting on your daily numbers instead of annual reporting. You're going to have those numbers because it's all automated. That data is readily available based on the services you use to collect ticket information.

Reporting that monthly via an automated pathway to TRPA would make enforcement much more straightforward. I also think there should be a higher bond paid to TRPA so they can hire the necessary staff for enforcement. This is something TRPA should consider for all operations in the basin, a bond

for monitoring, enforcement, and remediation. For example, we use mitigation bonds for renewable energy permits on federal lands, where developers are required to provide an annual bond to cover costs like decommissioning wind turbines or solar farms if they are abandoned. I think TRPA should consider such bonds for any development in the basin, whether private or public.

On this, I recommend monthly reporting during winter months and once in the summer. We should get a sense of who's using this. I would also like to see a higher daily violation rate because $5,000 a day for a penalty is essentially a drop in the bucket.

Regarding "acting in bad faith," I think that term is vague. What is bad faith? How do we know what their intent is? If TRPA believes there's bad faith, how do we enforce it? I'm concerned about the ambiguity around this, and we need to define it more clearly. For example, is a 5 percent violation of the permit considered bad faith? We need to clarify that.

I appreciate all the comments and candor here today. I want to see Homewood open and see many visitors go there. But I am here representing the state and ensuring that these areas are accessible for all. Right now, my family cannot afford to ski in the basin. For us to ski for the day, it's $1,000.

It's difficult for me to stomach the idea of pushing something that could privatize the area and make it even less accessible for people in the state. I am committed to ensuring that recreation is open and accessible for everyone in the state. I understand the importance of jobs here, and I want to see that for you as well, but we must make sure this jewel of California and Nevada remains accessible for all of us.

Mr. Kieckhefer said the community access plan gets incorporated into the master plan. Are there other components of the TRPA master plan that include a similar definition of a locals' discount? Is there a mandated locals' discount for places like Heavenly or any other resorts? I'm not sure if there's anywhere else in the code that provides this level of benefit for the local community.

Mr. Nielsen said this plan is unique. To be specific, Heavenly does not have a plan. When the Heavenly master plan was developed, the land was mostly public, with a little private land at the base. The idea of privatizing those public Forest Service lands wasn't really considered at the time. In 2011, the assumptions in the Heavenly master plan seemed to indicate that the mountain would remain open to the public, the status quo. It wasn't until it was presented to us more than two years ago that the concept of making it a private, members-only operation was introduced.

That shift made us think more critically about ensuring public access. The conversation started with the idea of members-only access but evolved back to the public model that was originally approved. Going through that process, we wanted to make sure there was something in writing specifying how they would provide public access and how we could enforce it over time. We needed to ensure the public would know that the goals of the master plan would be met in the long term.

Mr. Hester said the term master plan here is applying only to the ski area master plan, not the whole basin.

Mr. Kieckhefer said I feel confident that the Community Access Plan, as presented to us today, meets the requirements set forth in 2011 and aligns with the goals of ensuring access to the lodge.

DRAFT

However, I still have some questions regarding enforcement. Specifically, the annual report you'll receive about the previous year's access is one thing. But what's the mechanism for addressing concerns in the middle of the season? For example, if people are trying to buy lift tickets online and suddenly discover that there are no tickets available for the entire month of January, who do they complain to? How is this issue addressed?

Mr. St. Michel said essentially, just like with other approvals and permits, the public always has the ability to file a complaint with us. Even though we'll be receiving the annual reports, we also expect to receive complaints throughout the season. If we get complaints, we can investigate them at any time, it's not something that needs to wait for the annual report before we act. If an issue arises, such as the lack of ticket availability, that would trigger an investigation. There's also the option of issuing a cease-and-desist order, which is an additional enforcement measure beyond what's covered in the compact.

Mr. Kieckhefer asked if staff have that authority before coming to the board.

Mr. St. Michel said yes, that is a staff level determination.

Mr. Aguilar asked if the issue can be resolved by adding language that Homewood Mountain Resort will continue selling all passes and ticket types to everyone until 1500 non-member passes and ticket holders are skiing on the mountain.

Mr. St. Michel said that goes back to the quantity and the volumetric sort of issue that is not something that is included in the staff proposal.

Mr. Aguilar asked if a board member could recommend it as an amendment.

Mr. St. Michel said that's not currently in the proposal, and while technically something like that could be done, it raises a bigger question about TRPA's authority. This might not align with what Homewood Mountain Resort (HMR) would agree to, so if we pursue this, it's unclear where it would take us in terms of the process.

Mr. Kieckhefer said I wasn't suggesting we go down that road. I think it would be overstepping if we started governing how a private entity conducts its business, which we should be cautious about.

Ms. Hays said recognizing that I don't have a vote, I'm going to yield all of my time to my colleagues that do have a vote because I know we are limited in time.

Ms. Leumer said I also want to express my gratitude to everyone who showed up today. I understand that this takes a lot of time, and people are taking time off work to be here, so I truly appreciate the public input. My top priority here is ensuring that there is consistent public access. If any loopholes or unforeseen circumstances arise, I want to ensure that there is a clear process to go back and enforce public access. At the same time, I recognize the core tenets of capitalism and want to ensure that this remains a profitable business. With that in mind, please explain what a reasonable capacity would look like for a good skier experience. Best case scenario, how many people would you expect to see on the mountain each day? This can be a rough estimate; I'm not holding you to any specifics but I'm just trying to understand what that would look like.

Mr. Porter said that's a tough question. It's interesting because, after hearing over 100 community comments and feedback from both the Regional Planning Committee and the Advisory Planning

Commission, it's clear that when people describe what makes Homewood special, it's not necessarily about Christmas Day with 1,500 or 2,000 people. It's about memories like teaching their kids to ski when there were only 250 people, and it felt more personal, like it was "their" mountain. So, it's difficult to quantify that experience. But I would add that we're not in the quantity business. Our peers in the basin may be, but for us, it's about delivering a high-quality experience. As mentioned on page one of the master plan, we want a resort with no lines, not crowded, and family friendly. We want to make Homewood successful through these values. But we also recognize that the experience can vary greatly depending on the day. For example, a Tuesday in January will feel very different from Christmas Day or a busy day in March. Those are two entirely different experiences.

Ms. Leumer asked if we compare the original privatized model to your vision of a public model, is it still profitable? Would shifting to the public model result in significant losses? And if it doesn't prove profitable, what happens then? Do you close? What scenario do you envision playing out?

Mr. Porter said the original model, as Mr. Nielsen mentioned from 2011, was public. We considered a private model years ago, and we still see benefits in it. We have discussed this, and the entire team is aligned. For this deal to work, real estate is essential. We have the approvals to build, and we must build and transact on real estate in order to fund the significant improvements people want to see such as the Mid Mountain Lodge, snowmaking, infrastructure, and fire improvements. Real estate will serve as the vehicle to drive those changes. By creating residences and members, as well as offering local discounts for second homeowners and visitors, we believe we can find a balance that makes the project more profitable in certain scenarios. We're confident the deal will work; we wouldn't be here today if we didn't believe that.

Ms. Leumer asked who is eligible to purchase a ticket during a blackout day.

Mr. Buckley said it depends on the product and pass.

Ms. Leumer said what about a regular member of the public from outside of the basin.

Mr. Buckley said there will be a variety of products available, some of which will have blackouts and some will not, whether it's a pass or a ticket. Those with a non-blackout pass, similar to what other companies in the industry offer, will have access.

Ms. Leumer said if someone from Sacramento wants to buy what Mr. Buckley calls the "Unlimited Pass" (i.e. the non-blackout pass), the price can be whatever. We're not limiting the price; it could be set to whatever amount.

From a business perspective, projections suggest that due to climate change, ski days could be cut in half within this century, especially at lower elevations like Homewood. This might mean that we're facing the possibility that this could be the last generation of skiing at Homewood. At what point does the business model shift? If ski days are reduced by half, how many operating days do you need to stay profitable? Even if the number of visitors isn't the issue, if snow days are cut in half, can the business still make a profit? Or are there other aspects, like real estate, that will help make it a viable model moving forward?

Mr. Buckley said what we've considered operationally in light of climate change is that the gondola, which will take us beyond 7,000 feet, is designed to help us stay above the snow line. We're also investing in the most efficient snowmaking systems in the world to maximize snow production per

DRAFT

kilowatt hour, so we can better withstand the changes that climate change will bring. In terms of future visitation, it's difficult to predict. The industry has undergone many changes over the past decade, and we'll certainly need to adapt, whether that means adjusting product prices, limiting day access, or introducing alternative activities. The whole industry is grappling with these challenges.

Ms. Faustinos said thank you again to all the members of the public, both here in person and online, for the countless hours you've dedicated to this issue. Many of the questions I had have already been addressed. To Ms. Conrad-Saydah's point, access is one of those intangible issues. It's not just about having signage or whether a place is physically accessible, it's also about how the public feels when they arrive. One of the concerns I've had, and it's not just here but in national parks as well, is that the general public sometimes doesn't feel welcome. They feel like it's a private space. The more you can do to ensure the community feels welcome, the better. It's important that people feel connected to the space at all times. That's not something that can be memorialized in a community agreement, but it's essential for keeping this place vibrant and connected to the community.
In your planning, consider offering community events and sponsorship opportunities for youth to engage with the facility. I really appreciate the comprehensive documentation in the community access plan, and I think enforcement will be critical.

On enforcement, I want to reiterate what others have said, it would be helpful to track this on a monthly basis rather than annually. Especially with the ski season, receiving a report in December for the previous year might be too late for adjustments to be made. Monthly tracking would allow for more timely responses and adjustments. I appreciate all the recommendations for strengthening this plan. I want to commend the staff, the project proponent, for doing a great job, and thank the public for their input.

Ms. Williamson asked what's the feasibility of implementing monthly reporting? Is it something we can automate and realistically provide on a regular basis?

Mr. Porter said yes, I think we can do that. And as has been mentioned, we'll highlight any concerns or variations as part of the monthly reports. Right now, for example, snow is at a premium, and each year is different. As long as we include that context with each report, our operations team, along with TRPA staff, will review and take it into account. So yes, we're open to implementing monthly reporting.

Ms. Aldean asked for clarification as to whether Homewood Mountain Resort (HMR) is a legal entity or just a geographical area. All the references are to HMR, but the permit is issued to Homewood Village Resort LLC, which includes specific indemnification language. The ordinance mentions that the indemnification applies to HMR, but I don't believe HMR is a legal entity. Is that correct?

Mr. Nielsen said the legal entity is the entity that's specified on the permit. So, there may be some inconsistencies there.

Ms. Aldean suggested that Attachment A, which is the ordinance under indemnification be amended to read, "To the maximum extent allowable by law, the applicant," and then reference Homewood Village Resort, LLC to align with the language in the permit.

Mr. Porter said yes, that's fine. It's Homewood Village Resorts dba Homewood Mountain Resort. So again, it's one in the same.

DRAFT

Ms. Aldean noted that the mid mountain swimming pool is not identified in the phasing schedule. I believe it's going to be built with the mid-mountain improvements, correct?

Mr. Porter said yes, that's correct.

Ms. Aldean suggested that Homewood Mountain Resort disclose that there is a certain degree of public access when you begin selling merchandise and products at Homewood. This way, it doesn't catch anyone by surprise. The mountain is not private but accessible to the general public. I think this will help avoid complaints from future buyers who may feel they weren't properly informed. Everyone may not be aware of the arrangement set forth in the master plan.

Ms. Gustafson asked when we get these reports from Heavenly or Diamond Peak, do they outline specific packages, programs, pricing?

Mr. Nielsen said no, they don't.

Ms. Gustafson said I understand the reasoning behind this approach, but I just want to clarify that we're not setting a precedent here, as we're entering into competitive models within the industry.

I'm concerned about the data we'll be receiving through these reports, particularly whether we can protect sensitive information. It's important that this data is safeguarded and not shared with competitors in the marketplace. I'm unsure whether we are legally allowed to keep such reports confidential within the agency and not release them if requested. Would it be possible to receive a report from a private entity and keep it internal to the agency without disclosing it if asked?

Mr. Nielsen said I'll defer to the general council on confidentiality. Typically, we do that with archaeological reports, for example.

Mr. St. Michel said when we get records from an external group outside of archaeological and other very narrow circumstances, I don't think we'd have a great basis to protect it. It would be public.

Ms. Gustafson said we want to ensure that the public is clear if an issue arises. However, I do think monthly reporting is necessary to maintain accuracy, but I want to be cautious of what level of detail will be included in that monthly report if no complaints are made. If we start sharing too much data, particularly sensitive information, it could reveal data that other stakeholders might not be willing to share. My concern is to ensure that we strike the right balance in the reporting without disclosing unnecessary or sensitive data.

Ms. Gustafson said doing signage for public access is an excellent idea. Will the applicant agree to that?

Mr. Porter said yes, that's a great idea and we'll commit to doing that.

Ms. Gustafson said in the second paragraph under enforcement in the Public Community Access program, the fourth line from the bottom, we refer to limiting the sale of ski packages to members of specific groups. Could we revise this to say "products and packages," as is used in the first paragraph? This would maintain consistency throughout the document, ensuring we don't unintentionally limit the language to multi-day tickets or season passes when we're also referring to day tickets.

DRAFT

Mr. Porter said we agree.

Ms. Conrad-Saydah asked if we could require everyone to report this, right? We don't want to enforce on just one entity and risk unfair enforcement. Ultimately, the enforcement mechanism should apply equally to all ski operators, not just one. I understand we can't do this in this action, but can be in a future discussion of asking all resorts to ensure they're providing adequate public access through certain means.

Ms. Gustafson said I don't know that it's unfair, but rather just pointing it out.

Ms. Williamson asked Ms. Conrad-Saydah if she would be willing to have that sort of ski-wide discussion and include monthly reporting, and table this for Homewood today?

Ms. Conrad-Saydah said yes because I don't want to just put one enforcement mechanism on them and everyone else doesn't have to abide by it.

Ms. Laine suggested that the sentence reads: "All commitments within this plan are made in the spirit of assuring the public that Homewood Mountain Resort will not convert Homewood to a member-only ski resort without TRPA approval." I would like to remove the entire piece about limiting the sale of anything, because as Mr. Nielsen responded to my question, there are other options they could explore. By removing the suggestion of one specific approach, it simply states they will not privatize without TRPA approval.

Ms. Gustafson agreed with that, but I think Keep Homewood Public wanted that language. Is that correct?

Mr. St. Michel said Ms. Laine's suggestion was "All commitments within this plan are made in the spirit of assuring the public that Homewood Mountain Resort will not convert Homewood to a members-only ski resort without TRPA approval." This would involve removing the language about limiting the sale of ski packages to specific members. I believe this paragraph came from staff and HMR, not from Keep Homewood Public. I don't have a strong legal opinion either way on that. We negotiated this, so it's one of those things. I would just ask if Homewood is agreeable to removing that language.

Ms. Regan suggested that we keep moving forward because there's always a risk in making last-minute changes to these documents. I just want to ensure the board is aware of that, as we've spent a lot of time thinking about this. We need a moment to process this before we ask you to vote on it. So, if we could continue the discussion and circle back to this later, that would be helpful.

Ms. Laine said I'm looking for potential loopholes. By including that example of what they could do to privatize the resort, I think it opens the door to other actions they could take without needing TRPA approval. That's where I'm headed with this.

Mr. Bass said I brought this up during the summer tour, but I see Homewood as a potential solution for the park-and-ride access to Emerald Bay, which will eventually be necessary as part of the North Shore's efforts to manage parking for the area. If we close the parking at Emerald Bay, I don't know of another location on the North Shore that would have the capacity for a true park-and-ride system.

DRAFT

At the time I brought it up, I understand it wasn't something you were ready to commit to, but I'm wondering if you've had the chance to look into it further? I know a parking structure is being built at Homewood, so where do you stand on this now?

Mr. Porter said I briefly mentioned this in the condensed presentation, but we are open to discussing those opportunities. We're definitely willing to explore how we can leverage the newly built resources, such as the parking garage, and find synergies that can help reduce traffic and increase efficiency.

Mr. Bass said I'm not sure how we'll be ready to vote on this today with so many unresolved issues.. The idea that we would have an annual operating permit that doesn't require coming back to this board each year and can be handled through staff is very similar to what Heavenly does. They have a special use permit from the Forest Service to open and operate annually, and it's very specific about when and how they can operate. I think it's crucial we establish that mechanism here. That would give us the authority to pull the permit if they're not in compliance, rather than trying to go through the courts over property vested rights. Having an annual permit with the right to revoke or not renew seems like a much clearer path. I don't want to see this process stop progress, though, I want to see Homewood open next year.

One clarifying question: The gondola construction can't begin until May 15th, right? Because of underground requirements and other factors?

Mr. Porter said that's correct.

Mr. Bass said we do have a bit of time, but I'm not ready to vote on this today without having all these issues clarified. I think there are still too many questions. I want to make it clear, though, I don't want to stall progress for this year. I do want to see this move forward, but I think we need to have everything clearly codified before I can vote on it and have all of these questions answered.

For instance, with something like the Emerald Bay issue, I want a hard commitment, not just something noted on the record.

Ms. Conrad-Saydah said as long as we've got the public access included for the signage, I think we can take up the reporting and enforcement bond another time. Those would apply to everyone, so I'm okay with that. However, I do want to address the enforcement bond and the reporting for basin activities.

Ms. Williamson agreed with Ms. Conrad-Saydah. And I do want to note that for our staff, that's a good idea that we need to bring back.

Ms. Regan said yes, staff will bring that back for discussion.

Ms. Gustafson said I just want to be clear with Mr. Bass. This process triggers the county process, so there's a very significant risk of stopping the project if we're not prepared to move forward today. I understand your concern about the permit, but that's something we don't do here, and it would require a whole new process that TRPA would have to take. I'm pretty convinced that the master plan itself is the tool we've always used in the past for TRPA. Am I correct? Because I want enforcement and this is what I understand and what I've talked with staff about this is the way we do it at TRPA versus the local agencies and other entities.

DRAFT

Mr. Bass said my understanding of a master plan is that you've complied with it to get the project built. Once the project is built and the permit is issued, that becomes a vested property right for the property. The building permit has been satisfied, and it complies with the master plan and all related requirements. To come back afterward and argue that you're no longer complying with the master plan would require a court injunction to make that determination. What I'm proposing is that an annual permit allows us to make that finding based on compliance from the previous year. This mechanism gives us much better enforcement ability. However, I'm not trying to stop the project, I just want to make sure we have a process in place. I'm very torn on this.

Mr. St. Michel said the enforcement language we've included here gives us the ability to act without needing to go to court for an injunction. Specifically, it states that HMR will not be permitted to open the mountain for recreational skiing operations until TRPA's reasonable satisfaction that any issues have been remedied. This is part of the master plan. If commitments are not being followed, we can issue a cease and desist. So, while we have the ability to revoke the permit and enforce compliance, the court could still be part of the process if needed. I agree with Member Gustafson that the master plan is effectively acting as the operating permit here.

Mr. Nielsen said we've been working overtime this month to get to this point because Doppelmayr needs a commitment to proceed with building the gondola this year. We're pushing to bring this recommendation forward now because we don't want the mountain to remain closed for another year.

Ms. Regan said we hear the concerns of the board. Staff will take these to heart and keep this moving forward and keep you apprised of how this works out.

Motion:

Ms. Aldean made a motion to approve the required findings, including a finding of no significant effect, for adoption of the proposed amendments to the Homewood Mountain Resort Ski Area Master Plan, as provided in Attachment B subject to a change under the indemnification provision: HMR will be replaced with Homewood Village Resort, LLC as the applicant on page 255 of the ordinance.

Ms. Laine said Ms. Regan pointed out that it's always risky to start making changes from the dais, and I appreciate that. However, when you mentioned that we should allow staff some time to think about this, I want to emphasize my concern. I'm very worried that by specifying one way of privatizing the mountain, when there are multiple potential ways, it could create a loophole. This is concerning enough that I would be inclined to vote against the motion.

Ms. Aldean said this motion is for the ordinance.

Ms. Laine said it's the master plan first then the gondola.

Ms. Aldean said Ms. Laine is correct and corrected the motion.

Ms. Aldean made a motion to approve the required findings, including a finding of no significant effect, for adoption of the proposed amendments to the Homewood Mountain Resort Ski Area Master Plan, as provided in Attachment B subject to the following changes: The requirement will be for monthly reporting during the winter months and one report during the summer months which can

DRAFT

coincide with the current reporting requirement that it take place in August of each year. In addition, we will incorporate the latest changes to the community access plan which was provided to the Governing Board members at the beginning of this meeting.

Ms. Laine read from the last page, second paragraph of enforcement of the community access plan. "The intent of the community access plan is to demonstrate how HMR will ensure the public has access to Homewood's recreational opportunities while respecting HMR's property rights and operational needs as a private business. All commitments within this plan are made in the spirit of assuring the public that HMR will not convert Homewood to a member only ski resort without TRPA approval. If TRPA determines that HMR is trying in bad faith to circumvent the commitments and requirements set forth herein, TRPA shall have the option to implement any or all of the enforcement mechanisms set above."

Ms. Regan said staff is comfortable with that if it's the pleasure of the board.

Ms. Aldean amended the motion to include the addition as read into the record by Ms. Laine. In addition, we will amend the Homewood Community Access Plan to include second homeowners as being eligible for full-price ski products. We will add the construction of a swimming pool to the phasing plan which occurs in 2028. We will require that public access signage be installed to facilitate access to federally owned property adjacent to Homewood. The Tahoe Inn will be demolished during the first phase of the project.

Ayes: Ms. Aldean, Mr. Aguilar, Ms. Conrad-Saydah, Ms. Faustinos, Ms. Gustafson, Mr. Hoenigman, Mr. Kieckhefer, Ms. Laine, Ms. Leumer, Mr. Rice, Mr. Settelmeyer, Ms. Williamson

Nays: Mr. Bass
Absent: Ms. Hill
Motion carried.

Mr. St. Michel said the master plan requires four California members. The permit for the gondola requires five California members.

Ms. Aldean made a motion to adopt Ordinance 2025-__ (Attachment A), to amend the Homewood Mountain Resort Ski Area Master Plan as provided in Exhibit 1 thereto with the change of the applicant from HMR to Homewood Village Resorts, LLC.

Ms. Laine asked if the evacuation plan has to be in place before the gondola permit can be approved.

Ms. Regan said the evacuation plan is an agreement between the fire district and the applicant. They have to give a willing to serve agreement before anything can be constructed. So yes, they have to get permits from the fire district, including the fire evacuation plan that's between the two parties.

Ms. Laine said read all of the permit conditions for the gondola permit And the only thing I saw with regards to evacuations was how you would evacuate the gondola. In the case of an emergency, I didn't see anything that had that as a permit condition, but we still have a way of triggering that, even though it's not written in here.

Mr. Nielsen said the master plan includes an appendix and appendices and includes evacuation plans for things like avalanches hazmat spills fires, medical disasters. So that is in the master plan today.

DRAFT

Ayes: Ms. Aldean, Mr. Aguilar, Mr. Bass, Ms. Conrad-Saydah, Ms. Faustinos, Ms. Gustafson, Mr. Hoenigman, Mr. Kieckhefer, Ms. Laine, Ms. Leumer, Mr. Rice, Mr. Settelmeyer, Ms. Williamson

Absent: Ms. Hill
Motion carried.

Ms. Aldean made a motion to approve the required findings, including a finding of no significant effect for the approval of the proposed new gondola project, as provided in Attachment C.

Ayes: Ms. Aldean, Mr. Aguilar, Mr. Bass, Ms. Conrad-Saydah, Ms. Faustinos, Ms. Gustafson, Mr. Hoenigman, Mr. Kieckhefer, Ms. Laine, Ms. Leumer, Mr. Rice, Mr. Settelmeyer, Ms. Williamson

Absent: Ms. Hill
Motion carried.
Ms. Aldean made a motion to approve the proposed new gondola project, subject to the conditions in the draft permit (see Attachment D) and the conditions read into the record by Mr. Nielsen.

Ayes: Ms. Aldean, Mr. Aguilar, Mr. Bass, Ms. Conrad-Saydah, Ms. Faustinos, Ms. Gustafson, Mr. Hoenigman, Mr. Kieckhefer, Ms. Laine, Ms. Leumer, Mr. Rice, Mr. Settelmeyer, Ms. Williamson

Absent: Ms. Hill
Motion carried.

VII. REPORTS

A. Executive Director Status Report

Ms. Regan said mark your calendar for the April 24th Governing Board retreat. We plan to have the meeting on Wednesday, with a dinner that evening, followed by the retreat session the next day. Thank you for your thoughtfulness throughout this process. We recognize how consequential this decision is, and we truly appreciate your involvement."

B. General Counsel Status Report

No report. I appreciate everybody's attention, and we all learn a lot through these processes. And I think the discussion will help us going forward. We'll continue to be diligent with the enforcement piece.

VIII. GOVERNING BOARD MEMBER REPORTS

No report.

IX. COMMITTEE REPORTS

A. Local Government Committee

No report.

DRAFT

B. Legal Committee

No report.

C. Operations & Governance Committee

No report.

D. Environmental Improvement Program Committee

No report.

E. Transportation Committee

No report.

F. Regional Planning Committee

No report.

G. Tahoe Living Working Group

No report.

X. PUBLIC INTEREST COMMENTS

Ellie Waller said the next messy project is the Douglas County South Shore Area Plan Packet 1, along with the subsequent Amendment Packet 2, including the partner Barton, has left the public confused. Additionally, TRPA's separate amendment for Phase 2 housing is also in play with amendment 1.

You're set to approve Amendment 1 in March, but I want to fast forward to Amendment Packet 2. This packet, which was bifurcated from Amendment 1, includes the proposed hospital and a new healthcare sub-district, which requires additional environmental analysis. The environmental assessment (EA) should, in my view, trigger an environmental impact report (EIR). Just because the approval of the event center was handled with an EA and went unchallenged, and now faces noncompliance issues, does not mean an EIR isn't appropriate.

Releasing the EA scoping meeting notice on December 20th, just before TRPA and Douglas County staff went on holiday break, with a comment deadline on January 31st, sets an unreasonable timeline. This process should have been kicked off in January 2025, not during the holiday period. I acknowledge that I was contacted by legal counsel and responded "let's wait until after the holidays to discuss these issues" which was agreed to. South Tahoe News reported on December 23rd, announcing the meeting and the scoping period ending December 31st for comments. I am requesting an additional week to be added to the comment period, as this should not have been released during the holidays.

Though I understand that the EA scoping meeting was not required. Additionally, I am requesting that you schedule a public review period of at least two weeks for public and agency reviews when the Barton assessment is ready for comment. This project, which includes a hospital and a helipad, has

DRAFT

never been analyzed in this context and should trigger an environmental assessment. Community character and nearby meadow, although adjacent but within the town center does not alleviate the responsibility to analyze nearby impacts. In the event that TRPA determines an EA is still sufficient, I request that you exercise the extended public review option stated in the November 24th request for proposal documentation. This would ensure a transparent process and provide the public ample time for meaningful participation.

Lastly, I ask why no financial penalties have been assessed for the event center, as I know this matter will be discussed in February. This is a critical issue and should be addressed as part of the ongoing discussions.

Ann Nichols, North Tahoe Preservation Alliance said sorry about this comment, but Paul Nielsen is doing all the tough projects. He did Waldorf Astoria, the Boatworks, everything. He's one person. I'm sure, he's doing a yeoman's job but it's too much. You need more people. He's up against billionaires, smooth planners. It needs to be more than one person just for another set of eyes on this. It's way too big, too complicated. These meetings and approvals can't be completed in one day when there's this much community dissent.

XI. ADJOURNMENT

Ms. Williamson adjourned the meeting at 5:08 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Marja Ambler

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.

DRAFT