

From: John Boessenecker <jboess@comcast.net>
Sent: 1/22/2023 4:46:33 PM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: Homewood development

We strongly oppose any development to the Homewood ski resort. It is zoned as a ski resort and needs to stay that way. Just because a developer wants to make a lot of money is no reason to change the use of this land, which will disrupt traffic on and access to the west shore.

John Boessenecker
Marta S. Diaz
545 Grouse Dr.
Tahoma, CA
Tel. 415-392-3374

From: Rick Hoke <rickjanehoke@gmail.com>
Sent: 1/22/2023 8:15:01 PM
To: Arthur Chapman <achapman@jmaventuresllc.com>
Subject: Re: Homewood Master Plan

Dear Mr Chapman,

Nothing that you stated in your efforts to "set the record straight" is new information. We have heard it all. Our main concern is that the project should be considered completely new and go through the same approval process the 2011 project did. As I would, if I had a new project for my home. A lot has changed since the 2011 approval!

1. The new proposal is NOTHING like the original proposal. While it it's kind of them to allow local access to the mountain on "select non holiday weekdays, every few weeks" that is nothing close to the original 2011 view. It was all inclusive and community building. Not exclusive! (a word which was used many times in the new proposal to potential buyers)
2. There has been a drastic increase in traffic in the area. Both from daily visitors and homeowners. Construction traffic alone is nuts. The increase in traffic already poses a hazard to the community and wildlife. (As you stated traffic is one of the reasons you say HMR is not profitable.)
3. If you have spent any time on the lake you could not help but notice the increase in algae and in some areas toxic algae. This increase is due to many reasons, one of which is too much construction around the lake and increase in nutrients feeding the algae.
4. After many year of drought our trees are stressed and dying. Fire risk has increased so much that many insurance carriers are dropping policies. Should a fire happen in the Homewood area and we ADD a development such as Homewood Mountain and Lake Club the results could be deadly to many.

We want all of these things considered, as well as other concerns, BEFORE the project moves forward. That's it! But honestly it seems the project has already been approved. Who's pockets are being filled? How did you get my e mail? TRPA? Humm?!

Sincerely

Richard and Jane Hokanson

On Sun, Jan 22, 2023 at 6:12 PM Arthur Chapman <achapman@jmaventuresllc.com> wrote:

Dear Mr. Hokanson,

During the past several weeks, at the apparent urging of the North Tahoe Alliance and Friends of the West Shore, some residents in Tahoe have written to TRPA expressing concerns over proposed plans at Homewood. Unfortunately, in speaking with several friends of Homewood that did write in, we learned that representatives of these organizations continue to misrepresent the master plan and have actually indicated that they wouldn't mind if the Homewood ski area was closed. We thought it was important to respond to everyone who wrote in recently in an attempt to set the record straight.

The iconic, privately-owned Homewood ski area is 60 years old and so are its aging ski lifts and support facilities. When we first proposed the new master plan sixteen years ago, we thought that a revitalized ski area would attract new visitors to Homewood and support the necessary capital to replace the aging lifts, restrooms, food facilities, and other related equipment. We were wrong - since the Homewood Ski Area Master Plan was approved by TRPA and Placer County in 2011, overall annual attendance at Homewood has fallen by almost 40 %. Why?

During the last 10 years, we have seen the advent of the new Ikon and Epic super ski passes which involve the annual sale of hundreds of thousands of passes that are interchangeable at mountains throughout North America. Not only cannot small, commuter-oriented ski areas compete with these two industry giants, in the case of Homewood, it is difficult to even get to the ski area on a holiday or weekend as masses are drawn to resorts that participate in these pass products. From Truckee and the I-80 freeway exit, what normally is a 40-minute ride typically takes over 1 ½ hours on Hwy 89 because of the congestion waiting to get past Olympic Valley and Alpine Meadows entrances. Hwy 267, which takes you past Northstar, is just as bad. Homewood's drop in visits isn't because it isn't a desirable place to ski, it is because you can't get there to ski and the outdated infrastructure.

As indicated above, Homewood just celebrated its 60th birthday and we are past the point of needing to replace its aging ski infrastructure and related facilities. This involves new lifts, restrooms, food and beverage facilities, and snowmaking, to name a few. When we replaced the former Old Homewood Express lift 15 years ago, it cost \$5.6M. Today, the estimated cost of replacing the Madden chair is \$14M. The cost of other infrastructure - additional lifts, snowmaking, snow cats, etc. - has seen similar increases. There is no mid-mountain warming facility at Homewood and we can't serve hot food or drinks there because of the lack of potable water and proper sanitary facilities. It is estimated that it will cost \$8M just to bring proper sewer and water to the mid-mountain area. Homewood has spent \$10M in capital improvements over the past 15 years in the face of the declining attendance, funding it from outside funds because the resort operations have continued to generate losses.

The fact is, Homewood as a small, commuter-oriented ski area, is no longer viable. It cannot compete with the giant ski operations, absorb the escalating operating and capital improvement costs, and is being choked off by the lack of access. It needs a new model to survive. As proposed, the new model will be membership-oriented with both a resident and non-resident component. The resident component will be comprised of approximately 180 new residential units available to be purchased by the public. This is a reduction of approximately 43 units or approx. 20% from the 223 units that were previously approved in the master plan. There will also be non-residential membership that will be offered to the public. Overall, we are limited to about 1,000 individuals on the mountain in a day based on the number of parking spaces provided. The local community has been very clear that they don't want visitors parking around their driveways and both TRPA and Placer County have incorporated skier restrictions in their respective approvals to ensure that doesn't happen. We won't know how much the non-residential membership will cost until we complete our analysis of what the total costs of necessary improvements will be. We can tell you that it will be a family-oriented, vertical membership that will include the primary member's family (parents, children, grandchildren).

We want to emphasize that, despite rumors you may hear, this new membership-oriented approach will not exclude the local community from enjoying Homewood. As proposed, local residents will still have an opportunity to ski at Homewood on select non-holiday weekdays every few weeks. In addition, we are proposing several community event days per year when local residents can join members for skiing with proceeds going to support local non-profits, fire protection efforts, and environmental causes. Local children's ski teams will be continued, as well as local, volunteer ski patrols. In the summer, we will continue to support craft fairs and farmer's markets and the public will be able to use Homewood's hiking trails.

We hope that the foregoing has been helpful in clarifying what the Homewood Master Plan is all about and correcting the unfortunate and deliberate misinformation that has been disseminated lately in contrast to our transparent approach of community outreach over the past 15 years, including in-person meetings with over 200 members of local HOAs this summer. We realize we may not have answered all of your specific questions in this email and encourage you to write to us directly with those questions.

We are trying to do the right thing here. Homewood is in need of a new vision in order to remain sustainable. We want it to remain part of our local community for another 60 years. Please don't hesitate to contact us at your convenience with additional questions.

Best regards,

Art Chapman

From: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Sent: 1/23/2023 12:49:02 PM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: FW: Homewood Master Plan

From: bowdle <bowdle@protonmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, January 22, 2023 9:36 PM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Subject: Fwd: Homewood Master Plan

Greetings, recently I sent you an email regarding Homewood Mountain Resort. This evening I received what appears to be a response from Art Chapman of JMA Ventures to my email to the TRPA! See below. I thought this was a bit odd. In any case, I wish to clarify that I am not advocating that Homewood Mountain Resort should cease operation. Quite to the contrary my opinion is that Homewood Mountain Resort should remain accessible to the public and not just to a small number of extremely wealthy individuals. Cheers

Andrew Bowdle
GaviaLabs.com

Sent from Proton Mail for iOS

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Arthur Chapman <achapman@jmaventuresllc.com>
Date: On Sun, Jan 22, 2023 at 18:12
Subject: Fwd: Homewood Master Plan
To: bowdle@protonmail.com <bowdle@protonmail.com>
Cc:
Dear Mr. Bowdle,

During the past several weeks, at the apparent urging of the North Tahoe Alliance and Friends of the West Shore, some residents in Tahoe have written to TRPA expressing concerns over proposed plans at Homewood. Unfortunately, in speaking with several friends of Homewood that did write in, we learned that representatives of these organizations continue to misrepresent the master plan and have actually indicated that they wouldn't mind if the Homewood ski area was closed. We thought it was important to respond to everyone who wrote in recently in an attempt to set the record straight.

The iconic, privately-owned Homewood ski area is 60 years old and so are its aging ski lifts and support facilities. When we first proposed the new master plan sixteen years ago, we thought that a revitalized ski area would attract new visitors to Homewood and support the necessary capital to replace the aging lifts, restrooms, food facilities, and other related equipment. We were wrong - since the Homewood Ski Area Master Plan was approved by TRPA and Placer County in 2011, overall annual attendance at Homewood has fallen by almost 40%. Why?

During the last 10 years, we have seen the advent of the new Ikon and Epic super ski passes which involve the annual sale of hundreds of thousands of passes that are interchangeable at mountains throughout North America. Not only cannot small, commuter-oriented ski areas compete with these two industry giants, in the case of Homewood, it is difficult to even get to the ski area on a holiday or weekend as masses are drawn to resorts that participate in these pass products. From Truckee and the I-80 freeway exit, what normally is a 40-minute ride typically takes over 1 ½ hours on Hwy 89 because of the congestion waiting to get past Olympic Valley and Alpine Meadows entrances. Hwy 267, which takes you past Northstar, is just as bad. Homewood's drop in visits isn't because it isn't a desirable place to ski, it is because you can't get there to ski and the outdated infrastructure.

As indicated above, Homewood just celebrated its 60th birthday and we are past the point of needing to replace its aging ski infrastructure and related facilities. This involves new lifts, restrooms, food and beverage facilities, and snowmaking, to name a few. When we replaced the former Old Homewood Express lift 15 years ago, it cost \$5.6M. Today, the estimated cost of replacing the Madden chair is \$14M. The cost of other infrastructure - additional lifts, snowmaking, snow cats, etc. - has seen similar increases. There is no mid-mountain warming facility at Homewood and we can't serve hot food or drinks there because of the lack of potable water and proper sanitary facilities. It is estimated that it will cost \$8M just to bring proper sewer and water to the mid-mountain area. Homewood has spent \$10M in capital improvements over the past 15 years in the face of the declining attendance, funding it from outside funds because the resort operations have continued to generate losses.

The fact is, Homewood as a small, commuter-oriented ski area, is no longer viable. It cannot compete with the giant ski operations, absorb the escalating operating and capital improvement costs, and is being choked off by the lack of access. It needs a new model to survive. As proposed, the new model will be membership-oriented with both a resident and non-resident component. The resident component will be comprised of approximately 180 new residential units available to be purchased by the public. This is a reduction of approximately 43 units or approx. 20% from the 223 units that were previously approved in the master plan. There will also be non-residential membership that will be offered to the public. Overall, we are limited to about 1,000 individuals on the mountain in a day based on the number of parking spaces provided. The local community has been very clear that they don't want visitors parking around their driveways and both TRPA and Placer County have incorporated skier restrictions in their respective approvals to ensure that doesn't happen. We won't know how much the non-residential membership will cost until we complete our analysis of what the total costs of necessary improvements will be. We can tell you that it will be a family-oriented, vertical membership that will include the primary member's family (parents, children, grandchildren).

We want to emphasize that, despite rumors you may hear, this new membership-oriented approach will not exclude the local community from enjoying Homewood. As proposed, local residents will still have an opportunity to ski at Homewood on select non-holiday weekdays every few weeks. In addition, we are proposing several community event days per year when local residents can join members for skiing with proceeds going to support local non-profits, fire protection efforts, and environmental causes. Local children's ski teams will be continued, as well as local, volunteer ski patrols. In the summer, we will continue to support craft fairs and farmer's markets and the public will be able to use Homewood's hiking trails.

We hope that the foregoing has been helpful in clarifying what the Homewood Master Plan is all about and correcting the unfortunate and deliberate misinformation that has been disseminated lately in contrast to our transparent approach of community outreach over the past 15 years, including in-person meetings with over 200 members of local HOAs this summer. We realize we may not have answered all of your specific questions in this email and encourage you to write to us directly with those questions.

We are trying to do the right thing here. Homewood is in need of a new vision in order to remain sustainable. We want it to remain part of our local community for another 60 years. Please don't hesitate to contact us at your convenience with additional questions.

Best regards,

From: Andy Estopinal <americal@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: 1/23/2023 4:34:49 PM
To: Arthur Chapman <achapman@jmaventuresllc.com>
Cc: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>;
Subject: Homewood Master Plan

First of all how did you get my email address?

Second you don't mention how much your non resi membership will cost. I've heard some astronomical numbers.

Third you said...As proposed, local residents will still have an opportunity to ski at Homewood on select non-holiday weekdays every few weeks. This seems to exclude us pretty effectively. And what about the people that rent their homes for vacation? They are screwed.

Fourth I seriously doubt people who ski at Homewood are coming up for the day. Most are on the Westshore already so no traffic congestion. In fact we ski at Homewood to stay out of traffic.

Fifth the declining usage is partly your fault. You've signaled to people the you aren't interested and you've kept WSC closed mostly.

Sixth how much has your land value increased? Your improvement numbers of about \$22,000,000 are equal to 2 or 3 houses or maybe one midsize cabin Private Jet. I'm sure you have one.

I don't normally jump into stuff but you can do better for the locals.

Sent from Andy Estopinal's iPhone 17 pro-s turbo prototype with built in Electric CanOpener and swing line stapler 916-225-5263.

From: Allyson Schreiber <abaccagl@yahoo.com>
Sent: 1/23/2023 12:44:47 PM
To: Arthur Chapman <achapman@jmaventuresllc.com>
Cc: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>; Cindy.Gustafson <cindygustafson@placer.ca.gov>;
Subject: Re: Homewood Master Plan

Dear Mr. Chapman,

First off, I am curious how you were able to access the information of those that emailed in opposition to your plan. I do appreciate that there is an effort being made to communicate with the local community.

My family are homeowners and have lived full time on the west shore for almost 17 years. We are raising 3 children in this community. We live less than 2 miles from Homewood and have been season pass holders almost every year since we moved to the west shore.

I stood up and spoke in support of the development, as the local community viewed it as a necessary means to keep Homewood as a place we could all enjoy for years to come. The ski area obviously needs updating and maintenance. We viewed the original development as a means to build up the west shore community, giving us a beautiful place to keep skiing that was just down the street, an ice rink where we could spend time, and even a pool that the public would be able to access. All of the extra amenities proposed by the plan were not things we viewed as necessary for our continued enjoyment of Homewood, but JMA was promising to do all this in an environmentally responsible way that would minimally impact the community. You were promising to do these things for the benefit of the community. These are the reasons I spoke up in favor the development. Our West Shore community needed to be strengthened and supported, and it seemed that this was one way we could accomplish that while making needed upgrades to our favorite ski area.

To be frank, we feel completely betrayed, enraged, and saddened by the new plan to make Homewood private. Our community would NEVER have agreed to the proposal, and I don't believe it would have been approved. Instead of bringing the West Shore community together, the privatization of Homewood will have the opposite effect. The social and economic impacts of the new proposal would be disastrous to our local community. It would take one of the gems of the West Shore, one of the reasons that many of us chose to live here, and completely cut off our access, putting it into the hands of wealthy people, many of whom would not call Tahoe home or live here full time. The whole purpose of belonging to a "private resort" seems to be to separate yourself, and I can't envision any way that this would benefit the local community. We will do everything we can to protect our access to what we see as "the heart of the west shore" community.

Your below email contains many false assumptions and poor arguments.

You have not revitalized the ski area over the last 16 years. In fact, you have put very little money into any upgrades. It feels as though you have been "running Homewood in the ground" and yet still raising the prices to ski there each year. I now believe that this was a purposeful action to make the argument that you have just made below, about annual attendance at Homewood falling. Just a couple weekends ago, a friend and fellow pass holder had to pay \$250 for a lift ticket when they wanted to bring a visitor to the resort! Homewood can be sustainable if the owners of the mountain have this as a goal. This has not been your goal over the last few years.

The Ikon and Epic passes, and the subsequent overcrowding of the resorts which belong to those collectives, are why we choose to ski at Homewood. It is why many choose to ski at Homewood. Homewood is not a "commuter resort" in the minds of the locals, homeowners, and visitors that choose to buy passes there. It is our local hometown mountain. All of our 3 children took their first ski runs at Homewood. We consider it our backyard, and it is one of our favorite places to spend time together as a family in the winter and summer months. On any given day at Homewood, while we are out skiing, we will run into multiple long time friends and neighbors. No other ski resort in the North Tahoe area has the same local community feel. It is a treasure, and the interest and desire to ski there will only increase as the larger resorts deal with intense overcrowding.

The privatization of Homewood will only add to the traffic congestion you mentioned in your email. Those of us who live at the lake will now have to change our commutes and join in the crowds on HWY 89 and 267 in order to access skiing. The project will increase traffic congestion and take away one of the solutions. We will have to drive right past the resort which is less than 2 miles from our house to ski.

Homewood does not need a mid-mountain warming facility. It does not need a gondola to mid-mountain. The expenses you list with large price tags are not essential to keeping the mountain open and serving the community.

Based on JMA's past actions, I do not believe that the local community will have continued access to Homewood. I do not believe we will continue to be able to enjoy the resort or have continued access during summer months. I believe that these promises are another tactic being used to gather community support for your project. You make no promises about what these local memberships will cost or who they would be able to purchase them. Any easy way to ensure that locals can't access the mountain would be to price us out of the memberships. We do not want access to Homewood on "select non-holiday weekdays every few weeks or community event days". These concessions to the local community seem like poor mitigation efforts for community damage..."We are going to come in and destroy the West Shore community by taking away one of your treasures, but don't worry. There will be some crumbs for all of you that live here." There are also many rumors circulating around about the way Discovery Land Company runs the Yellowstone Club ski area and none of those are in line with how you are promising that they are going to run Homewood in the future.

I would not mind if the alternative to your plan is that Homewood ski area was closed. I believe there would be opportunities for the land to enter into a conservancy that would guarantee access to the public to the land for all future generations. I believe that there are options for Homewood that do not include privatization. I would happily sacrifice ski lift access to avoid having Homewood become a private playground for the 1% of the 1%. It is the heart of the our community and should remain open and accessible to all of us that live here and call Tahoe home. I am not at all in support of the additional development and housing proposed in the Homewood Ski Area Master Plan if there is going to be no community benefit, which I see as the case with the new plan.

There has been nothing transparent about your community outreach and the communication of your plan for Homewood. Every

local community member I speak with is extremely concerned about the project, and every person has a different set of information about what is actually happening. No one seems to know the truth about the project and your email below does not contain much information either. One thing that is clear is that Homewood will not remain a part of our local community if your plan moves forward.

Our family is going to do what we can to protect our access to Homewood.

Best Regards,
Allyson Schreiber

On Jan 22, 2023, at 6:12 PM, Arthur Chapman <achapman@jmaventuresllc.com> wrote:

Dear Ms. Schreiber,

During the past several weeks, at the apparent urging of the North Tahoe Alliance and Friends of the West Shore, some residents in Tahoe have written to TRPA expressing concerns over proposed plans at Homewood. Unfortunately, in speaking with several friends of Homewood that did write in, we learned that representatives of these organizations continue to misrepresent the master plan and have actually indicated that they wouldn't mind if the Homewood ski area was closed. We thought it was important to respond to everyone who wrote in recently in an attempt to set the record straight.

The iconic, privately-owned Homewood ski area is 60 years old and so are its aging ski lifts and support facilities. When we first proposed the new master plan sixteen years ago, we thought that a revitalized ski area would attract new visitors to Homewood and support the necessary capital to replace the aging lifts, restrooms, food facilities, and other related equipment. We were wrong - since the Homewood Ski Area Master Plan was approved by TRPA and Placer County in 2011, overall annual attendance at Homewood has fallen by almost 40%. Why?

During the last 10 years, we have seen the advent of the new Ikon and Epic super ski passes which involve the annual sale of hundreds of thousands of passes that are interchangeable at mountains throughout North America. Not only cannot small, commuter-oriented ski areas compete with these two industry giants, in the case of Homewood, it is difficult to even get to the ski area on a holiday or weekend as masses are drawn to resorts that participate in these pass products. From Truckee and the I-80 freeway exit, what normally is a 40-minute ride typically takes over 1 ½ hours on Hwy 89 because of the congestion waiting to get past Olympic Valley and Alpine Meadows entrances. Hwy 267, which takes you past Northstar, is just as bad. Homewood's drop in visits isn't because it isn't a desirable place to ski, it is because you can't get there to ski and the outdated infrastructure.

As indicated above, Homewood just celebrated its 60th birthday and we are past the point of needing to replace its aging ski infrastructure and related facilities. This involves new lifts, restrooms, food and beverage facilities, and snowmaking, to name a few. When we replaced the former Old Homewood Express lift 15 years ago, it cost \$5.6M. Today, the estimated cost of replacing the Madden chair is \$14M. The cost of other infrastructure - additional lifts, snowmaking, snow cats, etc. - has seen similar increases. There is no mid-mountain warming facility at Homewood and we can't serve hot food or drinks there because of the lack of potable water and proper sanitary facilities. It is estimated that it will cost \$8M just to bring proper sewer and water to the mid-mountain area. Homewood has spent \$10M in capital improvements over the past 15 years in the face of the declining attendance, funding it from outside funds because the resort operations have continued to generate losses.

The fact is, Homewood as a small, commuter-oriented ski area, is no longer viable. It cannot compete with the giant ski operations, absorb the escalating operating and capital improvement costs, and is being choked off by the lack of access. It needs a new model to survive. As proposed, the new model will be membership-oriented with both a resident and non-resident component. The resident component will be comprised of approximately 180 new residential units available to be purchased by the public. This is a reduction of approximately 43 units or approx. 20% from the 223 units that were previously approved in the master plan. There will also be non-residential membership that will be offered to the public. Overall, we are limited to about 1,000 individuals on the mountain in a day based on the number of parking spaces provided. The local community has been very clear that they don't want visitors parking around their driveways and both TRPA and Placer County have incorporated skier restrictions in their respective approvals to ensure that doesn't happen. We won't know how much the non-residential membership will cost until we complete our analysis of what the total costs of necessary improvements will be. We can tell you that it will be a family-oriented, vertical membership that will include the primary member's family (parents, children, grandchildren).

We want to emphasize that, despite rumors you may hear, this new membership-oriented approach will not exclude the local community from enjoying Homewood. As proposed, local residents will still have an opportunity to ski at Homewood on select non-holiday weekdays every few weeks. In addition, we are proposing several community event days per year when local residents can join members for skiing with proceeds going to support local non-profits, fire protection efforts, and environmental causes. Local children's ski teams will be continued, as well as local, volunteer ski patrols. In the summer, we will continue to support craft fairs and farmer's markets and the public will be able to use Homewood's hiking trails.

We hope that the foregoing has been helpful in clarifying what the Homewood Master Plan is all about and correcting the unfortunate and deliberate misinformation that has been disseminated lately in contrast to our transparent approach of community outreach over the past 15 years, including in-person meetings with over 200 members of local HOAs this summer. We realize we may not have answered all of your specific questions in this email and encourage you to write to us directly with those questions.

We are trying to do the right thing here. Homewood is in need of a new vision in order to remain sustainable. We want it to remain part of our local community for another 60 years. Please don't hesitate to contact us at your convenience with additional questions.

Best regards,

Art Chapman

From: Tim Angst <timangst@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: 1/23/2023 9:50:59 AM
To: Arthur Chapman <achapman@jmaventuresllc.com>
Cc: Jeff Cowen <jcowen@trpa.gov>;
Subject: Re: Homewood Master Plan

Art, thanks for the email and the background information. Much of what you share makes complete sense and I agree that Homewood is in dire need of capital investment to modernize its facilities.

A couple of questions:

- It is not clear from your email - what is your role/interest relative to the Homewood development?
- Is parking really the limiting factor on how many skiers have access to the mountain? Obviously, car pooling and public transportation would allow skiers to arrive at the mountain without the need for parking.
- If the thought is to limit the number of skiers to 1000 per day on the mountain and there are 180 residences - this implies a very limited number of memberships for the public. Do you have an idea of how many will be sold to the public? Given a very limited number of memberships, the demand and pricing for these memberships is likely to be cost prohibitive - how do you envision allocating these memberships across the community?
- With Discovery Land Co. being one of the investors, are there examples of their other developments where they have previously partnered with local communities and provided access to their facilities?
- How does the Homewood Privatization and development align with long term west shore development plans? Has there been a broader consideration for how the development supports/complements the existing development plans?
- There has been very little information made available to the public, when will the complete details be shared and open forums?

Obviously, there is never a solution that accommodates everyone (or makes everyone happy) - and whatever solution is developed needs to be economically viable for the investors and community. My interest is really in making the overall process and details more transparent to the general public.

- Tim

Tim Angst

415-244-8252

timangst@sbcglobal.net

On Sunday, January 22, 2023 at 06:12:27 PM PST, Arthur Chapman <achapman@jmaventuresllc.com> wrote:

Dear Mr. Angst,

During the past several weeks, at the apparent urging of the North Tahoe Alliance and Friends of the West Shore, some residents in Tahoe have written to TRPA expressing concerns over proposed plans at Homewood. Unfortunately, in speaking with several friends of Homewood that did write in, we learned that representatives of these organizations continue to misrepresent the master plan and have actually indicated that they wouldn't mind if the Homewood ski area was closed. We thought it was important to respond to everyone who wrote in recently in an attempt to set the record straight.

The iconic, privately-owned Homewood ski area is 60 years old and so are its aging ski lifts and support facilities. When we first proposed the new master plan sixteen years ago, we thought that a revitalized ski area would attract new visitors to Homewood and support the necessary capital to replace the aging lifts, restrooms, food facilities, and other related equipment. We were wrong - since the Homewood Ski Area Master Plan was approved by TRPA and Placer County in 2011, overall annual attendance at Homewood has fallen by almost 40 %. Why?

During the last 10 years, we have seen the advent of the new Ikon and Epic super ski passes which involve the annual sale of hundreds of thousands of passes that are interchangeable at mountains throughout North America. Not only cannot small, commuter-oriented ski areas compete with these two industry giants, in the case of Homewood, it is difficult to even get to the ski area on a holiday or weekend as masses are drawn to resorts that participate in these pass products. From Truckee and the I-80 freeway exit, what normally is a 40-minute ride typically takes over 1 ½ hours on Hwy 89 because of the congestion waiting to get past Olympic Valley and Alpine Meadows entrances. Hwy 267, which takes you past Northstar, is just as bad. Homewood's drop in visits isn't because it isn't a desirable place to ski, it is because you can't get there to ski and the outdated infrastructure.

As indicated above, Homewood just celebrated its 60th birthday and we are past the point of needing to replace its aging ski infrastructure and related facilities. This involves new lifts, restrooms, food and beverage facilities, and snowmaking, to name a few. When we replaced the former Old Homewood Express lift 15 years ago, it cost \$5.6M. Today, the estimated cost of replacing the Madden chair is \$14M. The cost of other infrastructure - additional lifts, snowmaking, snow cats, etc. - has seen similar increases. There is no mid-mountain warming facility at Homewood and we can't serve hot food or drinks there because of the lack of potable water and proper sanitary facilities. It is estimated that it will cost \$8M just to bring proper sewer and water to the mid-mountain area. Homewood has spent \$10M in capital improvements over the past 15 years in the face of the declining attendance, funding it from outside funds because the resort operations have continued to generate losses.

The fact is, Homewood as a small, commuter-oriented ski area, is no longer viable. It cannot compete with the giant ski operations, absorb the escalating operating and capital improvement costs, and is being choked off by the lack of access. It needs a new model to survive. As proposed, the new model will be membership-oriented with both a resident and non-resident component. The resident component will be comprised of approximately 180 new residential units available to be purchased by the public. This is a reduction of approximately 43 units or approx. 20% from the 223 units that were previously approved in the master plan. There will also be non-residential membership that will be offered to the public. Overall, we are limited to about 1,000 individuals on the mountain in a day based on the number of parking spaces provided. The local community has been very clear that they don't want visitors parking around their driveways and both TRPA and Placer County have incorporated skier restrictions in their respective approvals to ensure that doesn't happen. We won't know how much the non-residential membership will cost until we complete our analysis of what the total costs of necessary improvements will be. We can tell you that it will be a family-oriented, vertical membership that will include the primary member's family (parents, children, grandchildren).

We want to emphasize that, despite rumors you may hear, this new membership-oriented approach will not exclude the local community from enjoying Homewood. As proposed, local residents will still have an opportunity to ski at Homewood on select non-holiday weekdays every few weeks. In addition, we are proposing several community event days per year when local residents can join members for skiing with proceeds going to support local non-profits, fire protection efforts, and environmental causes. Local children's ski teams will be continued, as well as local, volunteer ski patrols. In the summer, we will continue to support craft fairs and farmer's markets and the public will be able to use Homewood's hiking trails.

We hope that the foregoing has been helpful in clarifying what the Homewood Master Plan is all about and correcting the unfortunate and deliberate misinformation that has been disseminated lately in contrast to our transparent approach of community outreach over the past 15 years, including in-person meetings with over 200 members of local HOAs this summer. We realize we may not have answered all of your specific questions in this email and encourage you to write to us directly with those questions.

We are trying to do the right thing here. Homewood is in need of a new vision in order to remain sustainable. We want it to remain part of our local community for another 60 years. Please don't hesitate to contact us at your convenience with additional questions.

Best regards,

Art Chapman

From: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Sent: 1/25/2023 2:05:39 PM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: FW: Homewood Concerns

From: Deanne Bostrom <bostromfamily4@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, January 24, 2023 6:14 PM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>; John Hester <jhester@trpa.gov>; Wendy Jepson <wjepson@trpa.gov>; Kimberly Chevallier <kchevallier@trpa.gov>; Kenneth Kasman <kkasman@trpa.gov>; TRPA <trpa@trpa.gov>
Subject: Homewood Concerns

Hi. I wanted to confirm you received my previous email on January 9th. (See Below)

As stated in the TRPA code of ordinances "Approval by TRPA of any project expires three years after the date the approval is granted by TRPA as defined in TRPA's Rules of Procedure, or December 19, 1980, whichever is later, unless construction is begun within that time and diligently pursued thereafter, or the use or activity has commenced."

I am writing to express my concerns with the new proposed project by Discovery Land Corporation and JMA Ventures. The current privatization plan is not as previously approved in 2011 by the TRPA. As quoted from the TRPA website, "the planned resort upgrades aim to keep the historic ski resort through sustainable development. The overall vision includes improving the Homewood resort property by updating an aging infrastructure. The vision includes preserving Homewood's basic personality as a small, uncrowded, family-friendly enclave..." The original proposal states the upgrades will include making Homewood mountain resort a "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." The goal of the initial 2011 proposal stated to "continue to offer a convenient and quality skiing experience to local, west shore residents."

Contrary to the original plans, there are significant structural and business model changes within the new development. The new privatization plan proposed by JMA ventures does not allow for any of these original propositions to continue. As stated on the "Welcome to Homewood " website, "earlier this year the project began to transform Homewood into a luxury lifestyle club". The new proposal states that neighbors in the west shore will be able to ski Homewood on "occasional pre-scheduled community days". Significant structural changes are also presented such as 4-story units instead of the previously proposed 3-story unit maximum height.

This project should NOT be allowed since it is drastically different from the original proposal over ten years ago. Please require JMA to resubmit a new proposal with these radically different plans and visions.

I urge you to stop the current proposed project and allow for a community forum with input from all community members.

Sincerely,
Deanne Bostrom

From: Tim A. <talbinson@gmail.com>
Sent: 1/26/2023 2:18:09 AM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>; Jeff Cowen <jcowen@trpa.gov>; Julie Regan <jregan@trpa.gov>; HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>; Cindy.Gustafson <cindygustafson@placer.ca.gov>; Steve Buelna <sbuelna@placer.ca.gov>
Subject: Homewood Privatization

Dear TRPA and PCBD Committee Members,

As a longtime Homewood skier/Season Pass Holder, and resident/homeowner of Homewood, I am deeply concerned with and opposed to JMA Ventures Homewood Mountain Resorts plans to privatize the Homewood Ski Area.

In 2011, the TRPA approved proposals for changes and development of the ski area that were presented to the local community did not include privatization of the ski area and closure to the general public. Had privatization been proposed, the community would never have agreed to the proposal.

Because privatization was not what TRPA originally based their approval on, I would urge the TRPA to require JMA Ventures Homewood Mountain Resorts to go through the public and TRPA approval process again with their new plans.

This project should not be allowed under the previous approval because it is significantly different and will have great detrimental economic impacts to the local economy and real estate values in the immediate and surrounding communities.

Please reconsider and withdraw the previous approval. Require a new permit application along with applicable fees, and allow for public comment and input whether for or against this new project of privatization of a public recreational resource, and a huge change to our local neighborhood. — at Homewood Mountain Resort.

Sincerely,
Tim Albinson
Homewood Resident and Homeowner

Tim Albinson
talbinson@gmail.com
Spain mobile +34 686 858 338
US mobile +1 415 531 3134

From: James Lyon <jim@lyonfamily.tv>
Sent: 1/26/2023 5:59:42 PM
To: Arthur Chapman <achapman@jmaventuresllc.com>
Cc: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>; planning@placer.ca.gov <planning@placer.ca.gov>;
Subject: Re: Homewood Master Plan

Dear Mr. Chapman,

Thank you for your response to my note to TRPA. Unfortunately, your response did not address my concerns I outlined in my letter to TRPA. At this point, it is not clear to the public if JMA Ventures is following the approved Master Plan.

Let me elaborate:

First, you continue to raise traffic from I80 and SR89 as why people don't come and ski at Homewood. This is a ruse. The Homewood clientele has always been drawn from local residence between Sunnyside and Bliss State Park. No one is going to day-trip from King's Beach or Truckee to Homewood when Northstar and Squaw Valley are closer to home. Additionally, your proposal to "go private" will only add to the traffic load on West Shore Blvd, with families of skiers from Chambers and Tahoma driving by a private Homewood Resort. This is in direct conflict to the Master Plan stated goal - "Minimize impacts to traffic on the west shore"⁽¹⁾.

You are correct that Homewood is a desirable place to ski - I have been skiing there since I learned to ski on the rope tow in 1968. You are also correct in saying that Homewood has outdated infrastructure. Frankly, it is not the competition from Alpine Meadows and Squaw that created the downfall of Homewood. It is JMA Ventures' under-investment and lack of facility upgrades (you state last investment was 15 years ago) that allowed Homewood to become a substandard ski area. It has been 6 years since the South lodge burned down. Why would skiers want to come to a run down resort? When you compare the cost of a lift ticket to ski at Homewood to the available terrain and facilities, the value proposition falls far below Squaw and Alpine who invested over the last 12 years since the Homewood Master Plan was approved.

By going private, you are only further killing off the ski resort. 180 residential units cannot support the ski operations. Doing simple math - 180 residential units, average occupancy of 5 people per stay, occupancy rate of 80% for the ski season, skiing 5 of 7 days each stay, you arrive at an average of 600 skiers per day from your new residential units. This in no way supports the ski operation, putting more pressure on the ski operation financially and then JMA will be coming back to TRPA and Placer County asking for more concessions.

Frankly, your proposal of "local residents will still have an opportunity to ski at Homewood on select non-holiday weekdays every few weeks" is a non-starter and an insult. This is throwing a bone to the community. Public skiing "on the 3rd Tuesday of every month" is not inclusive of local residents - it is exactly the opposite - excluding the local residents.

It is my opinion that with the community and the residential development together, Homewood can be a successful ski operation. If the public is excluded, the ski resort will fail. If JMA does pursue private memberships for the community and HOA's, they should be by residential unit, not a named individual/family. Look at the Chamberland Beach and Mountain Club and Chambers Recreation Association as a model. The house (residential unit) has access to the beach and other facilities. This is transferable to inhouse guests or renters. The same model could work for skiing at Homewood (or some hybrid of access and a reduced lift ticket price for non-owners).

If JMA does plan to take the resort private, this is a change in the conditional use of the property, and therefore, would be open to public review and approvals. JMA cannot just take the report private without the approval of TRPA and Placer County.

My last issue is one of architecture style. In the approved Master Plan, it was committed to "Consistency with the scale and character of Homewood"⁽²⁾. Further, the Master Plan states in the section titled *Architectural and General Design Character* that "The new Homewood Resort design is conceived as an alpine village community in the architectural style of the classic old Tahoe lodges"⁽³⁾. The first 7 housing units DO NOT fit this commitment nor do they meet the architectural representations in the Master Plan. The illustrations in the Master Plan are buildings styled like old Tahoe lodges - not the flat roofed mountain modern you are proposing. This is a bait and switch. Seven cookie cutter modern boxes do not create a "residential enclave designed to compliment the existing neighborhood"⁽⁴⁾.

It is clear to me, while the Master Plan was approved in 2011 by TRPA and Placer County, the actions of JMA Ventures indicates there is no commitment to follow the intent or spirit of that Master Plan, thus the entire project should be re-opened to public review and reconsideration.

Regards,

Jim Lyon
Chamberlands

cc. TRPA
cc. Placer County Planning Department

From: Arthur Chapman <achapman@jmaventuresllc.com>
Date: Sunday, January 22, 2023 at 6:14 PM
To: "jim@lyonfamily.tv" <jim@lyonfamily.tv>
Subject: Homewood Master Plan

Dear Mr. Lyon,

During the past several weeks, at the apparent urging of the North Tahoe Alliance and Friends of the West Shore, some residents in Tahoe have written to TRPA expressing concerns over proposed plans at Homewood. Unfortunately, in speaking with several friends of Homewood that did write in, we learned that representatives of these organizations continue to misrepresent the master plan and have actually indicated that they wouldn't mind if the Homewood ski area was closed. We thought it was important to respond to everyone who wrote in recently in an attempt to set the record straight.

The iconic, privately-owned Homewood ski area is 60 years old and so are its aging ski lifts and support facilities. When we first proposed the new master plan sixteen years ago, we thought that a revitalized ski area would attract new visitors to Homewood and support the necessary capital to replace the aging lifts, restrooms, food facilities, and other related equipment. We were wrong - since the Homewood Ski Area Master Plan was approved by TRPA and Placer County in 2011, overall annual attendance at Homewood has fallen by almost 40%. Why?

During the last 10 years, we have seen the advent of the new Ikon and Epic super ski passes which involve the annual sale of hundreds of thousands of passes that are interchangeable at mountains throughout North America. Not only cannot small, commuter-oriented ski areas compete with these two industry giants, in the case of Homewood, it is difficult to even get to the ski area on a holiday or weekend as masses are drawn to resorts that participate in these pass products. From Truckee and the I-80 freeway exit, what normally is a 40-minute ride typically takes over 1 1/2 hours on Hwy 89 because of the congestion waiting to get past Olympic Valley and Alpine Meadows entrances. Hwy 267, which takes you past Northstar, is just as bad. Homewood's drop in visits isn't because it isn't a desirable place to ski, it is because you can't get there to ski and the outdated infrastructure.

As indicated above, Homewood just celebrated its 60th birthday and we are past the point of needing to replace its aging ski infrastructure and related facilities. This involves new lifts, restrooms, food and beverage facilities, and snowmaking, to name a few. When we replaced the former Old Homewood Express lift 15 years ago, it cost \$5.6M. Today, the estimated cost of replacing the Madden chair is \$14M. The cost of other infrastructure - additional lifts, snowmaking, snow cats, etc. - has seen similar increases. There is no mid-mountain warming facility at Homewood and we can't serve hot food or drinks there because of the lack of potable water and proper sanitary facilities. It is estimated that it will cost \$8M just to bring proper sewer and water to the mid-mountain area. Homewood has spent \$10M in capital improvements over the past 15 years in the face of the declining attendance, funding it from outside funds because the resort operations have continued to generate losses.

The fact is, Homewood as a small, commuter-oriented ski area, is no longer viable. It cannot compete with the giant ski operations, absorb the escalating operating and capital improvement

costs, and is being choked off by the lack of access. It needs a new model to survive. As proposed, the new model will be membership-oriented with both a resident and non-resident component. The resident component will be comprised of approximately 180 new residential units available to be purchased by the public. This is a reduction of approximately 43 units or approx. 20% from the 223 units that were previously approved in the master plan. There will also be non-residential membership that will be offered to the public. Overall, we are limited to about 1,000 individuals on the mountain in a day based on the number of parking spaces provided. The local community has been very clear that they don't want visitors parking around their driveways and both TRPA and Placer County have incorporated skier restrictions in their respective approvals to ensure that doesn't happen. We won't know how much the non-residential membership will cost until we complete our analysis of what the total costs of necessary improvements will be. We can tell you that it will be a family-oriented, vertical membership that will include the primary member's family (parents, children, grandchildren).

We want to emphasize that, despite rumors you may hear, this new membership-oriented approach will not exclude the local community from enjoying Homewood. As proposed, local residents will still have an opportunity to ski at Homewood on select non-holiday weekdays every few weeks. In addition, we are proposing several community event days per year when local residents can join members for skiing with proceeds going to support local non-profits, fire protection efforts, and environmental causes. Local children's ski teams will be continued, as well as local, volunteer ski patrols. In the summer, we will continue to support craft fairs and farmer's markets and the public will be able to use Homewood's hiking trails.

We hope that the foregoing has been helpful in clarifying what the Homewood Master Plan is all about and correcting the unfortunate and deliberate misinformation that has been disseminated lately in contrast to our transparent approach of community outreach over the past 15 years, including in-person meetings with over 200 members of local HOAs this summer. We realize we may not have answered all of your specific questions in this email and encourage you to write to us directly with those questions.

We are trying to do the right thing here. Homewood is in need of a new vision in order to remain sustainable. We want it to remain part of our local community for another 60 years. Please don't hesitate to contact us at your convenience with additional questions.

Best regards,

Art Chapman

From: Kathleen Annice <katannice@gmail.com>
Sent: 1/27/2023 10:50:11 AM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>; Jeff Cowen <jcowen@trpa.gov>; HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: Homewood Mountain Resort - Noticing Lists of Interested Parties

Hello, I'd like to request to be placed on all email lists concerning the Homewood Mountain Resort project. Please let me know when the meetings are to be held and who best to contact with a written comment concerning the project. Thank you.

From: Darren Kramer <Darren@obexersboat.com>
Sent: 1/27/2023 11:57:46 AM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>; Jeff Cowen <jcowen@trpa.gov>; Julie Regan <jregan@trpa.gov>; HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>; Cindy.Gustafson <cindygustafson@placer.ca.gov>; Steve Buelna <sbuelna@placer.ca.gov>
Subject: Privatizing Homewood Mountain

To whom it may concern:

My name is Darren Kramer and I am a local resident of the West Shore for the past 19 years and also a full time employee at Obexer's Boat Co.

I was made aware of the sale of the long time community ski area, Homewood Mountain Resort, to Discovery Land Company and informed they plan to make the resort a private ski area. I was shocked to hear this as for over the past 10+ years and attending many meetings by the previous owner JMA Ventures, that the ski area was going to be renovated and improved based on a plan that was supported by the community and approved to TRPA and Placer County. To hear this is not the case but rather the resort would be going fully private providing no community benefit is appalling. A private ski area has a large negative affect on both the businesses, local families and visiting families, the housing crisis, traffic and much more. It is my understanding that the new private area with its amenities will actually require more staffing than the current open to public ski area and this puts more strain on the current staffing shortages and housing shortages that are wreaking havoc on local businesses and the community as a whole. In addition this will force even more families and locals to the other ski areas, such as Palisades Tahoe which are unable to handle the volume of day users on weekends. Traffic to these areas is excessive and can often take hours to get to other ski areas which creates serious safety concerns especially when trying to deal with an emergency situation. Even our first responders are unable to get through the gridlock created by the overselling of ski passes at Palisades Tahoe. By Homewood Mountain going private this will only further exacerbate this and many other problems we are dealing with in the Tahoe Community.

Because privatization was not what TRPA originally based their approval on nor what the community supported, I would urge the TRPA to require the new owners to go through the public and TRPA approval process again with their new plans. This project should not be allowed under the previous approval because it is significantly different and will have great detrimental economic impacts to the local economy and surrounding communities. Please reconsider and withdraw the previous approval. Require a new permit application along with applicable fees, and allow for public comment and input whether for or against this new project of privatization of a public recreational resource.

Any further information that can be provided regarding the project would be greatly appreciated.

Thank your for your time,

Darren

Darren Kramer
Obexer's Boat Company
General Manager
Licensed Yacht & Ship Salesperson
(O)530-525-7962 ext. 5
(F)530-525-0703
www.obexersboat.com

Proud host of the Lake Tahoe *Concours d'Elegance* Wooden Boat Show
www.laketahoeconcours.com

From: Kevin McGuire <kevinm@quietrack.com>
Sent: 1/27/2023 9:52:27 AM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: unsecure Homewood Ski Resort privatization
Attachments: [image001.jpg](#), [Homewood Ski Resort Privatization 01242023.pdf](#)

Please find my thoughts and rejection of the privatization of Homewood Ski Resort in the attached letter.

Please include this letter in your meetings and official records regarding this very serious public matter.

Sincerely,

Kevin M. McGuire
President CEO
License #: 0651143



A California LLC
Licensed by the California Department of Insurance # 6004499
P.O. Box 3308
Santa Rosa, CA 95402-3308
Office direct: 707-303-8111
Cell: 707-321-2277
KevinM@QuietTrack.com
<https://RT.QuietTrack.com>

*****NOTE*****

Information contained in this e-mail message is intended only for use by the intended and or addressed individual or entity. The message contains confidential and privileged information. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, or the employee or agent responsible to deliver it to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please contact the sender immediately and destroy the original message. **Thank you.**

Kevin M. McGuire

1501 Warrington Road

Santa Rosa, CA 95404

707-321-2277

kevinm@QuieTrack.com

January 24, 2023

Dear TRPA,

As a native California who has enjoyed the world class, natural blessings of Lake Tahoe for most of my 67 years, I find it appalling that any consideration is given to extract one of the crown jewels of the Sierra ski facilities and allow JMA and their partners to privatize Homewood Ski Resort.

While it's clear that JMA owns the land, let's not gloss over nor forget, it's the public infrastructure paid by taxpayers that enables this resort to function and derive revenues even if privatized.

More so, if this were not a legendary recreational facility enjoyed by generations, and simply a new resort created from scratch somewhere in a remote locale, I could begin to acquiesce this exclusive development.

But to allow JMA to steal away a half century public facility, it will forever stain the true intention of the TRPA and the livability of the West Shore communities and of the entire Tahoe Basin.

As a successful businessman of 41 years, I find their claim of the current and unsustainable business model, to be a deceptive strategy considering JMA's record of success elsewhere. And frankly a bold falsehood to achieve their financial goals.

Please look and listen to your soul and conscience and then deny this 1%er appropriation of a public place of multi-generational happiness. Projects such as this, do nothing but accelerate and further divide Americans as haves and have nots. Can we really afford more of this disparity?

Also consider that property values along the West Shore will certainly be negatively impacted, when the subtracted benefit of a local ski resort reduces real estate values and thus tax rolls, which fund the critical infrastructure of these communities.

And also, seriously consider that this new tact, is far from what JMA presented to the public during the approval process. If nothing else, this project needs to back up and be resubmitted for approval.

I along with most friends of the West Shore, plead for all of you, to do the right thing.

Sincerely



Kevin M. McGuire

From: Evonne Revitt <vibrationtravel7@gmail.com>
Sent: 1/28/2023 9:01:48 PM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Cc: Steve Buelna <sbuelna@placer.ca.gov>;
Subject: Against Homewood privatization

I am against changes from the original approved Homewood resort project from 2011 and the privatization of Homewood. The reasons for my position on this is infrastructure in the area is not set up for more traffic and development. We have had our home in Chambers since 1965. I was a ski instructor at Tahoe Ski Bowl, now a part of Homewood.

I tried to ski at Palisades the other weekend and by the time I got to Tahoe City the traffic was backed up as far as I could see in Tahoe City and the opposite direction all the way to Palisades, people were being asked to park in Truckee and bused to Palisades, the traffic to Palisades was backed up on HWY 80 trying to exit on HWY 89, all trying to get to Palisades. I turned around and went back to Homewood because I couldn't get to Palisades.

If Homewood is privatized, my family and I will be forced add to the traffic problem to get to the nearest resort!

Also, please take another look at the environmental impacts of an underground parking lot at Homewood and the planned number of units seems way to high for the area.

Sincerely,
Evonne Revitt
Homeowner
Chamberlands

Sent from my iPhone

From: Lou Parrague <louparrague@gmail.com>
Sent: 1/28/2023 9:44:48 PM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: Fwd: Re homewood proposed master plan development

Sent from my iPhone
Lou Parrague
510-551-9666

Begin forwarded message:

From: Lou Parrague <louparrague@gmail.com>
Date: January 28, 2023 at 5:53:40 PM PST
To: trpa@trpa.gov
Cc: Sharon Parrague <ilovemusik@comcast.net>
Subject: Re homewood proposed master plan development

Good day,

My family and I have owned our home in the Chamberlands neighborhood for over 34 years.

Trpa must protect the interests of the community . This proposed development does not resemble what was presented in 2012. The most recent Description of the Homewood project will forever change what has been carefully nurtured for a century.

To have outside investors or whatever they may be , attempt to Disneyfy this region is irresponsible.

Years ago a similar scenario played out in mineral king. In that instance , the outside developers were stopped cold due to dignified efforts by the local community and the preservation authorities.

Kindly stand up and do the same.

Lou Parrague

Sent from my iPhone
Lou Parrague
510-551-9666

From: Kerri Gilbert <kerri.gilbert85@gmail.com>
Sent: 1/28/2023 10:50:49 AM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: Homewood development

I am writing today to voice my opposition to the new Homewood ski area development plan.

First of all the residents in the area have been very clear about their opposition to this project. Privatizing Homewood will create an us and them dynamic. In the world of divisiveness do we really want to fuel that dynamic? These people come in and think bigger is better and it is ruining the west shore. That is not what the West Shore is about.

Secondly, we are now finding that the parent company has connections to Russia and their olegards. I think it is very clear what the decision should be when it comes to interacting with these people. Is it even legal to allow this company to do business here. I thought all connections with Russia and their olegards was sanctioned. Is this who we want to be linked to?

Someone needs to stand up to this company and say no. In 2012 plans were approved. There will be no changes to those plans. End of discussion. If they don't want to build it then, fine. I would rather have nothing than the monstrosity that is being proposed.

Please let me know if there is someone else I should reach out to to voice my outrage against this project.

Thank you

Kerri Gilbert
West Shore Homeowner

Sent from my iPhone

From: Jo Ellen Kaiser <joellen.tmc@gmail.com>
Sent: 1/28/2023 10:50:22 AM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Cc: info@chamberlands.com <info@chamberlands.com>;
Subject: Homewood Development

Dear Paul Nielsen,

My family, the Kaiser-Zailians, has owned a home at Chambers Landing since the area was developed in the 1970s. We use our cabin every summer and rent it out every winter on a ski lease. The ski lease is what makes us able to afford having this little bit of mountain!

The proposed development at Homewood will seriously reduce the value of our home and the value of our ski lease. The ordinary folks who get a ski lease from us--last time they were police officers--can't afford the high price of the lifts at Palisades. They are looking for a family-oriented, cost-effective place to ski. That is what Homewood has always been--a place for locals and middle class folks to be able to enjoy the mountains.

I understand that Homewood needs to be able to turn a profit, but privatizing the mountain and cutting locals out from skiing there is bad for the entire West Shore. If our home values decrease, property taxes on the West Shore will decrease.

The 2012 proposal was negotiated with neighbors, and all sides were satisfied with it. Let's return to that proposal.

Sincerely,

Jo Ellen Green Kaiser
6220 Lark Drive
Homewood CA

From: David Purves <purves.david@gmail.com>
Sent: 1/28/2023 12:10:34 PM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: Homewood Master Plan

Dear Sir or Madam,

Ten years after TRPA approval, the Homewood Master Plan is apparently coming back up for discussion. The Plan has changed significantly during those years, partially due to legal settlements, partially due to ownership changes, and partially due to their own whims.

It seems that many of the features which were used to "sell" the plan to local residents, as well as local planning agencies, have been de-emphasized or perhaps even completely removed. I recall Platinum LEED certification for new buildings being promoted, runoff mitigation efforts, landscape restoration, employee housing, and small-scale hydro power generation, among many other promises, that seem to have disappeared or been decimated. On the other hand, new or completely re-worked plans for construction at both existing base areas, and the largely untouched area in between the base areas, have been added. Even worse is the planned refusal to sell day tickets or season passes to the public for something approximating a typical price. Together these lead to substantially different environmental and community impacts from the plans that were approved 10 years ago.

In total, the current plans are substantially different from the approved plans. It seems like the best approach would be to require a new process of plan approval to be started, using the current plans as a base. I hope TRPA will agree.

--David Purves

From: Carolyn Selig <carolyn.selig@gmail.com>
Sent: 1/28/2023 11:08:22 AM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Cc: Michael Selig <mrselig@yahoo.com>;
Subject: Homewood mountain development - objection

Dear Paul,

My husband, Michael, and I purchased our house at 445 Snowbird Loop in Homewood in 2019, having grown up staying in the neighborhood. The community, quaintness, beauty, charm and amenities of Homewood and the west shore — namely Homewood Ski resort and the proximity to the lake -- were the main factors that influenced our decision to purchase here. Our two boys, ages 10 and 5, have grown to love the west shore and Homewood as much as we do over the past four years.

We are writing to you today to express our concern with the future development and privatization of Homewood Mountain Resort. Ten years ago the development plans included continued public access of the ski resort, surrounding condos and an updated lodge for all neighbors of the west shore. Now, the owners have enlisted Discovery Land Company (who created Yellowstone in Montana) and plan to privatize the ski mountain, excluding local homeowners from access, forcing west shore residents to ski at alpine/palisades and increasing traffic on the west shore as a result. A private ski mountain was never approved by the community and does not feel in line with the original plans/approval.

As reported in Moonshine, Art Chapman and JMA believe the Homewood ski resort is currently not sustainable as structured. While we understand his view, Art has also minimally invested in capital improvements while simultaneously increasing day tickets to be one of the most expensive in the country (reported per Snowstash). Privatization **does not seem** in line with our community, the intent of the original proposal nor with keeping the environmental impact low. We currently have an annual family ski pass to Homewood and our ten year old is on the Homewood ski team - most of his teammates are from Tahoma — all children who would be excluded from the mountain in the future if privatized. Art is suggesting "a few non-holiday community week days" for the neighborhood which is offensive and insincere.

We would like our deep objections noted with TRPA and ask that if this sizable a change (public access versus private resort) is planned that the significantly revised plans go back to the community for approval.

Thank you for your consideration and time.

Sincerely,
Carolyn and Michael Selig
445 Snowbird Loop
Homewood, California

From: Andy Bowdle <bowdle@protonmail.com>
Sent: 1/28/2023 1:25:33 PM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Cc: Kevin Foster <info@chamberlands.com>; tmooers@sierrawatch.org <tmooers@sierrawatch.org>; jqtahoe@sbcglobal.net <jqtahoe@sbcglobal.net>;
Subject: Homewood Mountain Resort

Dear TRPA: I previously wrote to Paul Nielsen on this topic, and subsequently received a threatening email from Art Chapman of JMA Ventures. I did not realize that our communications to TRPA are in the public record, but I am now well aware. I do think that it is extraordinary for myself and other residents of Chamberlands to be singled out and threatened by a real estate developer for exercising our First Amendment right to freedom of speech. Subsequently we have learned that JMA Ventures sold a portion (most or all???) of its interest in Homewood Mountain Resort to Mohari, a shadowy real estate development organization based in Cypress. Not surprisingly, this has set off alarm bells all along the West Shore. I assume this email is being read in Cypress, and elsewhere outside of the United States, in places where freedom of speech is not a right. You may be interested to review this link <https://www.cbsnews.com/news/cyprus-russia-money-60-minutes-2023-01-15/>

I have owned a residence in Homewood for 30 plus years. I have never seen anything like this, and never imagined in my wildest dreams that foreign interests would attempt to manipulate the future of the West Shore. I supported the original development plan for Homewood. I am strongly opposed to the "bait and switch" maneuver now being executed by Mohari, along with privatization of the resort. Much more to come...

Andrew Bowdle

From: Kevin Foster <kevinfoster3489@yahoo.com>
Sent: 1/28/2023 9:51:56 AM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: Strong objection to Homewood Development and Offshore Money Laundering

TRPA -

I am the president of Chambers Beach and Mountain Club which consists of 300 homes directly south of the resort and contiguous to the South Lodge.

I am strongly opposed to any changes to the approved plans from 2012 which would include the privatization of the resort.

I also just learned that JMA sold a majority of their interest in the resort to Mohari. Mohari is based in Cyprus! Cyprus is the primary target for money from Russian Oligarchs and other bad actors.

You cannot let an organization launder money from who knows where and destroy the community that we all call home!

Kevin Foster

From: John Strain <john.f.strain@gmail.com>
Sent: 1/29/2023 12:46:46 PM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: Development at Homewood

Hi,

My name is John Strain. I have been enjoying the West Shore of Lake Tahoe for almost 50 years. My family owns and has owned a home on Snowbird Loop in Chamberlands since the late 70's.

The proposed development of Homewood in its current iteration is a mistake. This isn't what was agreed to initially. This has changed from being about enhancing the community experience to one that benefits very few at the expense of the community.

I urge you to reject the new proposal.

Thanks.

John Strain
John.f.strain@gmail.com

From: sheilamnew@aol.com <sheilamnew@aol.com>
Sent: 1/29/2023 4:17:25 PM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>; Steve Buelna <sbuelna@placer.ca.gov>
Subject: Fw: TRPA approval of 2022 JMA proposal

To TRPA and Placer County

For over 50 years I have enjoyed Tahoe Ski Bowl and Homewood Mountain Resort. I have many concerns with the proposed JMA JMA along with Discovery Land and Mohari have contracted to propose a remodeling of Homewood Mountain Resort which directly contradicts the 2011 plan provided to the public by the TRPA with the stated purpose of:

“Improving the access and experience for locals and tourists”

They have done this ‘bait and switch’ without public input with the goal of actually excluding locals and tourists.

Aside from the stress on an already crowded West Shore Blvd, the increased traffic notwithstanding new shuttles, electric cars or water taxis would be detrimental to West Shore longtime residents and tourists. As well, locals and tourists meant to benefit from the approved 2011 plan would now be universally excluded from Homewood Mountain Resort usage.

Respectfully I ask that the same public impact opinions considered in 2011 be allowed to factor into the 2022 plan. Much planning and activity have been obscured from public access and knowledge. I ask the TRPA to reject any application by Homewood Mountain Resort (HMR) to take the ski area private. Losing HMR to an elitist exclusive entity akin to the Yellowstone Club in Montana would be a tragedy and an affront to the history and culture of Lake Tahoe’s West Shore community.

Respectfully,
Sheila Newton

[Sent from the all new AOL app for iOS](#)

From: rich leftfielddesign.net <rich@leftfielddesign.net>
Sent: 1/29/2023 3:43:13 PM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: Homewood community

Dear TRPA,

Homewood is what I consider the closest I can get to Heaven in this life. Having been a Homewood season pass holder for two decades, I have relished this special place and would sincerely regret denied access during my remaining years. The views are unmatched by almost any other mountain, not to mention the pristine powder runs that are unimaginable at other resorts with hordes of skiers holding Ikon, Epic, or Mountain Collective ski passes.

JMA Ventures claims that a public ski area is no longer a viable option yet they do nothing to market or advertise Homewood and that is why very few people know about it. The area had been viable as a public resort for 60 years, yet all of a sudden it is no longer so.

From an environmental impact perspective, the Master Plan that was approved in 2012 has changed very substantially and should therefore go through the full environmental review process. Some major changes include developing the land between the Quail and Madden chair lifts. Prominent features of the original Plan that are not included in the updated plan include LEED certification for new buildings, power generation, and landscape restoration.

There is also a basic element of fairness that seems to be disappearing from the American landscape. Privatizing Homewood accelerates that trend by benefiting the few at the expense of the many. The TRPA's approval of this Plan contributes to a growing American class divide by making public policy that is exclusive rather than inclusive.

For the benefit of our community and our environment, please reconsider the Homewood Master Plan.

Thanks for your consideration,

Rich Singer

From: Rachel Bowdle <rachel.bowdle@gmail.com>
Sent: 1/29/2023 12:18:13 PM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Cc: Steve Buelna <sbuelna@placer.ca.gov>;
Subject: Homewood Development

Hello,

I have previously written an email in opposition to Homewood Resort (via JMA Ventures) development, and mainly the proposal for privatization. I am learning more and more about the players in this development and growing increasingly more concerned. I am a permanent resident in Homewood, I work for Tahoe Forest Hospital, and I intend to spend my life in Tahoe. I'm only 29 years old, so I have a great interest in the state of my home over the next decades.

A few significant issues:

1) The original development plan has been changed to mountain modern, with a variety of other changes, without any real invitation for public comment; it may seem trivial, but the west shore is a unique place with a culture that local residents would like to preserve. This project is a major development and local comments need to be taken in to account. The development of this resort has so far been lacking dissemination of information to the public, evidenced in Art Chapman's recent email which gave a number of details about his plan that were never shared anywhere—although he seemed to think we should know those pieces of information already.

2) JMA Ventures recently sold the majority of its stakes to a company called Mohari, which, in short, is a shady real estate company based in Cypress that couldn't possibly have ANY genuine interest in the impact of this resort on the local population. This should ring alarm bells for the entire Placer County board.

I work in Incline Village and speak to residents from neighborhoods all around the lake, and no one I have spoken with supports this plan. I hope you will put the interests of your county residents well above the interests of some international company and the ultra wealthy who would buy in to this development, the majority of whom are undoubtedly from far outside of Placer County.

Thank you for your time and attention,

Rachel Bowdle

From: penelope brown <penelopeab4@gmail.com>
Sent: 1/29/2023 2:09:18 PM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: Homewood development

As a longtime homeowner I am very concerned with the possible changes to the original approved plans for the Homewood area. The new plans are quite extensive and would negatively impact the entire area.

Currently ,all year long, it can take up to 45 minutes to get 6 miles from Homewood into town - and this development would only make matters worse. I am in favor of the original plan for I am not opposed to gentle improvements, but the current suggestions are out of line.

Please do not let this development proceed as they would like - it will be the final downfall for our beautiful Lake Tahoe and the negative impact will be immense.

Penelope & William Brown

From: Todd Mercer <toddcmcer@gmail.com>
Sent: 1/29/2023 2:11:58 PM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: Homewood Master Plan

To the TRPA,

I am writing to express my strong concerns with the new proposed project by Discovery Land Corporation and JMA Ventures. My family has owned property on the West Shore, in Homewood (Skyland) since the 1950s, and I am very disappointed to learn about the significant changes to the Homewood Master Plan. The current privatization plan is not as previously approved in 2011 by the TRPA. The original proposal states the upgrades will include making Homewood mountain resort a "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." As one of those West Shore residents, and longtime supporters of Homewood Mountain Resort, this new plan is deeply disappointing.

Contrary to the original plans, there are significant architectural, structural and business model changes within the new development. The design of the new plans bear no resemblance to the style of the 2011 proposal nor the Old Tahoe feel of the West Shore. The new design is modern and cold, exactly the opposite of what was intended with the original proposal. The new privatization plan proposed by JMA ventures does not allow for any of these original propositions to continue. The new proposal states that neighbors in the West Shore will be able to ski Homewood on "occasional pre-scheduled community days". This does not feel like a gathering place for the West Shore community, as originally proposed in the development plan.

As a longtime member of the West Shore, I support the development of Homewood, and the original 2011 plan as originally approved. I vehemently oppose the newly proposed architecture, structural and business plan changes, which amounts to a "bait & switch" and a slap in the face to the existing West Shore community. Please require JMA to resubmit a new proposal which maintains the look and feel of the original 2011 plan, as well as allow for a community forum with input from all West Shore community members.

Appreciate your consideration of this request.

Very Truly Yours,
Todd Mercer
Homewood, CA

From: Heidi Melin <heidi_melin@me.com>
Sent: 1/29/2023 12:07:34 PM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: Homewood Master Plan

To the TRPA -

I am writing to express my strong concerns with the new proposed project by Discovery Land Corporation and JMA Ventures. My family has owned property on the West Shore, in Homewood (Skyland) since the 1950s, and I am very disappointed to learn about the significant changes to the Homewood Master Plan. The current privatization plan is not as previously approved in 2011 by the TRPA. As quoted from the TRPA website, "the planned resort upgrades aim to keep the historic ski resort through sustainable development. The overall vision includes improving the Homewood resort property by updating an aging infrastructure. The vision includes preserving Homewood's basic personality as a small, uncrowded, family-friendly enclave..." The original proposal states the upgrades will include making Homewood mountain resort a "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." The goal of the initial 2011 proposal stated to "continue to offer a convenient and quality skiing experience to local, west shore residents." As one of those West Shore residents, and longtime supporters of Homewood Mountain Resort, this is deeply disappointing.

Contrary to the original plans, there are significant architectural, structural and business model changes within the new development. The design of the new plans bear no resemblance to the style of the 2011 proposal. The 2011 proposal included designs that kept the Old Tahoe feel of the West Shore. The new design is modern and cold, exactly the opposite of what was intended with the original proposal. The new privatization plan proposed by JMA ventures does not allow for any of these original propositions to continue. As stated on the "Welcome to Homewood" website, "earlier this year the project began to transform Homewood into a luxury lifestyle club". The new proposal states that neighbors in the west shore will be able to ski Homewood on "occasional pre-scheduled community days". This does not feel like a gathering place for the West Shore community, as originally proposed in the development plan.

As a proud, longtime member of the West Shore, I support the development of Homewood, and the original plan. However the architecture, structural and business plan changes of the plan feel a bit like a "bait & switch" to the West Shore community. Please require JMA to resubmit a new proposal with these radically different plans and visions.

Please allow for a community forum with input from all community members.

Appreciate your consideration of this request.

Best,
Heidi Mercer Melin
3220 Ann Rd
Homewood, CA

Sent from my iPhone

From: eileenwee@aol.com <eileenwee@aol.com>
Sent: 1/29/2023 3:55:15 PM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>; Steve Buelna <sbuelna@placer.ca.gov>
Subject: Homewood Mountain

TRPA and Placer County,

I am extremely opposed to the current 2022 plans for Homewood. They are in direct violation of the 2011 plans that were approved. The new plan does not share any of the Old Tahoe heritage values and preservation of the Community of Homewood that were prioritized in the years garnering support (2007-11)for the approved 2011 plan.

Our family has enjoyed this ski mountain since we built our family home here in 1963. We have skied here every year since then as have many of our long time neighbors and friends in Chamberlands. Many of us are going on 3,4 and 5 generations of our families spending summers on the beach and runs on the mountain together. It is heart breaking to think that you would approve this plan to exclude all of us from our ski mountain.

These outside developers have no interest in preserving our quiet, beautiful mountain paradise.
It is also obvious they have been keeping this revision VERY quiet to avoid the landslide of protest.
Please stand up to them as your position DEMANDS.

Lover of Homewood,
Eileen Wee
6285 Lark Dr.

From: Steve Becker <stbecker@aol.com>
Sent: 1/29/2023 10:35:08 AM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: Homewood Plan
Attachments: [Planned Homewood Ski Resort.docx](#)

Dear TRPA - please find my letter to you from last year. I did not receive a response; perhaps the email never got through. In any event, my grave concerns are just as valid today, if not more so. Please do not approve this expansion now led by Cypress/middle easterners which would destroy our beautiful neighborhood.

Thank you for being guardians of the Tahoe basin.

Steve & Donna Becker
6170 Chamberland Dr
Homewood

March 31, 2022

Placer County Planning Division
775 N Lake Blvd
Tahoe City, CA 96145

Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
128 Market St
Stateline, NV, 89410

Dear Placer County and TRPA:

We are 33 year homeowners in Homewood that has taken great pride in the small town of ours, enjoyed now by our children and grandchildren. Homewood is the special place that my wife and I met.

We supported the JMA Ventures development plan back in 2011 and would continue to support it to this day if their model was not so dramatically different to what was approved.

Their Master Plan Executive Summary under Vision, called for preserving the character of Homewood as a “small, uncrowded, family friendly enclave”. One original goal was to “maintain the heritage that can be equally shared by local residents and visitors”. It is our understanding that both goals have been compromised or “reset” and locals will soon feel like victims of a bait and switch strategy.

Below are the changes that not only were modified, but are dramatically altered:

1. Moving from public to “semi-private”. This is precisely what we did not want as homeowners when we approved the plan. We want Homewood Ski open to all, not a select few
2. Restricting access to season pass holders and only full-time HOA residents. This provision is entirely unfair to those who use their Tahoe cabins regularly as a 2nd home. You can't spring this new provision on us after approval – it is simply unethical.
3. Eliminating day tickets – How can homeowners invite family to Tahoe and not have access to day passes for their family and guests?
4. Changing the chalet style homes that fit the neighborhood to modern cookie cutter homes.

These alterations are a far cry from a family friendly enclave. They appear to be more of an exclusive property, unfriendly to locals and outsiders. JWA originally stated that it would be equally shared by locals and visitors alike; however, these changes are at the expense of the local residents. When they state that “pass prices in the future will increase” that probably will mean by many thousands of dollars a year, which would price out locals, just as they hoped.

JWA says they are “trying to do the right thing” and yet we find that hard to believe as they retain Discovery Land Company, the mastermind behind the **very** private, **very** exclusive Yellowstone Club. Local homeowners do not want and did approve a development that caters to the super rich, the Silicon Valley Mark Zuckerbergs. Family friendly by definition should cater to families!

We certainly hope we have the support of both agencies, Placer County and TRPA, in “disapproving” the revised plans of JWA. Please do what they promised to do by doing the right thing. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Steve and Donna Becker
6170 Chamberland Dr/Homewood

From: paula mix <pmixed@att.net>
Sent: 1/29/2023 8:29:56 AM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: Homewood project

To Whom it May Concern:

We own a home on Chamberland Drive in Tahoma and are very concerned and disappointed if the Homewood Resort becomes privatized! Our family members currently love skiing and hiking this mountain and have for the past 20 years! Please do not allow privatization this is not what the mountain should be!

We understand that it needs to be updated and become profitable but this is definitely not the way to go about it. Please keep this mountain available to all, life is already difficult in so many ways, we cannot keep taking things from the every day person and give it to those who can afford it more than others. Keep Homewood about Family.

Paula Mix

From: Frank Kelly <frankpkelly3@gmail.com>
Sent: 1/29/2023 9:43:35 AM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Cc: Steve Buelna <sbuelna@placer.ca.gov>;
Subject: Homewood Resort Revisions

I am a homeowner in Tahoma, Placer County, and have enjoyed the Homewood Resort for over 50 years. It is shocking to see how the latest architectural renderings of the revised plan diverge from the original proposal's thematic connection to "Old Tahoe". The buildings look like they were adapted from a low-end strip mall. Perhaps they are a vision from the "future Tahoe", rather than the "Old Tahoe" that was proposed. This seems like a classic case of bait and switch. Moreover, the proposal for a "membership only" resort has little to offer the surrounding community, and is, in reality, the exact opposite of community. Community is about inclusion, providing for all community members as much as possible as equally as possible so that as many as possible can benefit. A "membership only" resort is about exclusion, creating a small community that separates itself from the historic community surrounding Homewood Resort.

Please reconsider supporting this revolting revision and exclusionary vision.

Frank P. Kelly
frankpkelly3@gmail.com

From: Julie Thomas <jlwxthomas@gmail.com>
Sent: 1/29/2023 4:09:03 PM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: Keep Homewood is for family not exclusively for elite wealthy people

To whom it may concern,

My family owns a cabin on lagoon and has done since the 1960s when my grandfather built it. Before tahoe ski bowl was owned by homewood, my grandfather had a run named after him, "Ed's Run". This is our family mountain and part of my grandfather's memory. If you make the family mountain private, I may never ski on my grandfather's run again. Skiing has gone from a family activity to a sport that only rich people can afford. Please save our family mountain and keep it open to the public so that future generations can make memories.

Sincerely,
Julie Thomas (granddaughter of Ed Ransom)

From: Cece Siino <cecesiino@gmail.com>
Sent: 1/29/2023 3:20:48 PM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: Mohari Homewood Development

Ladies and gentlemen;

My family has invested in an area where we have been coming to and enjoying for many decades and to have the integrity of the area put in jeopardy by some possible bad dark money, is beyond comprehension. It is imperative that TRPA hold the "developers" to the original 2012 plan and to protect the homeowners before the "developer". The integrity of the area we love should not be put in such jeopardy!

Cecilia Siino
Homewood owner

From: Nancy Cooper <n.coop@comcast.net>
Sent: 1/29/2023 9:46:36 AM
To: Steve Buelna <sbuelna@placer.ca.gov>; HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Cc: Kevin Cooper <k.coop@comcast.net>;
Subject: Objection to PLN22-00534

To whom it may concern,

As long time residents of the west shore, we strongly object to the privatization of the Homewood project. We see no benefit to the community as proposed in the original plan. As residents, we will have to endure years of construction, increased traffic, noise and delays, interruption of local businesses and when the project is completed we will have no access to the new facilities.

Please Do Not Approve the changes that have been requested.

Kevin and Nancy Cooper
395 Elizabeth Drive
Homewood, CA 96141

From: Nichole Rowles <nrowles@mac.com>
Sent: 1/29/2023 12:20:06 PM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: [BULK] OPPOSITION TO HOMEWOOD MOUNTAIN RESORT DEVELOPMENT

Dear Placer County officials:

My name is Nichole Rowles, and I'm a homeowner in Homewood, CA.

I'm writing to express my deepest concerns over the proposed development at Homewood Mountain Resort.

First and foremost, there are grave environmental impacts of the proposal. For decades, the region's community has worked to protect the clarity of Lake Tahoe by trying to limit car travel to the Tahoe Basin. Sadly, there has not been an improvement in the lake's clarity. The proposal would add hundreds of new daily car trips to the West Shore.

As an important side note, traffic is already heavy during peak seasons in both the summer and winter. With one lane each direction, CA 89 cannot handle the additional traffic that the project would bring.

The proposed development will consume millions of gallons of water annually. This is IRRESPONSIBLE as the entire state of California is in a drought, and we have witnessed firsthand increased wildfire risk and activity in recent years – namely 2022 and 2021 – as a result.

There are other concerns, too. Since 2020, the basin's workforce can no longer afford to live in the area. The proposed project would only exacerbate this concern.

I URGE Placer County to DO THE RIGHT THING and SAY NO to Mohari – based in the Middle East! – and JMA Ventures, which are acting recklessly to benefit only themselves.

Sincerely,
Nichole S. Rowles, Ph.D.
6180 Lark Drive
Homewood, CA 96141

From: Bill and Sue Wilson <billandsuewilson@gmail.com>
Sent: 1/29/2023 12:32:43 PM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>; Steve Buelna <sbuelna@placer.ca.gov>
Subject: privatization of Homewood Resort (Reference PLN22-00534)

I am writing to demand that the interests of the residents of Chamberlands and surrounding communities be protected. Our family has been a homeowner on Lagoon Rd., Homewood since 1964. We are on our fourth generation of skiers. All of us, along with our many neighbors, strongly oppose the plan to privatize the Homewood Ski Area. This should not happen!!
Thank you,
Susan Wilson (of the Ransom family)
5740 Lagoon Rd.
Homewood

From: patrice murphy <pinchott@att.net>
Sent: 1/29/2023 10:36:19 AM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: Privatization of Homewood Resort

My name is Patrice Murphy and my family has owned a home in Homewood for over 40 years. We are against the changes that are now occurring to our West shore ski resort. The TRPA did not approve these plans back in 2012, and they should be considered for a new approval process before any action by the resort is taken.

The west shore of Tahoe is a special place, that is why we all have homes here. The TRPA made my parents jump through hoops back in the day to be able to build on their lot in Chambers. They followed the rules and procedures and were granted their permits.

We expect the current TRPA to behave in the same fashion in regards to Homewood Ski. The new plans are not community friendly and will be an unwelcome neighbor in our community.

Thank you for your time,

Patrice Murphy
460 Chukar Circle
Homewood, CA

Sent from my iPad

From: Andi Mccausland <andigreek@yahoo.com>
Sent: 1/29/2023 11:34:52 AM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: Privatization of Homewood

I am viciously against changing Homewood and allowing it to go private to an investment, venture capital firm, based in Cyprus, that is probably using Russian oligarch money. Do you not watch 60 Minutes? How much more of our country is going to go to foreign people. Homewood is a family Community that is enjoyed its small footprint. Don't make this another Vail, Colorado, or Aspen. We don't need this! It's just a playground for the rich that I bought a properties on the lake.

Andrea Mccausland
Chamberlains homeowner

Sent from my iPhone

From: kelker.kevin <kelker.kevin@gmail.com>
Sent: 1/29/2023 7:41:46 AM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: RE: Homewood Ski Resort Privatization

Hello,

I have been going to our family home in Homewood for 55 years. I learned to ski at both Homewood and Tahoe Ski bowl. I find it hard to believe that that are attempting to go private. Our family is against this proposal, and say NO thank you.

Kevin Kelker
555 Grouse Drive
Homewood

Sent from my Verizon, Samsung Galaxy smartphone