

**From:** Andy Estopinal <americal@sbcglobal.net>  
**Sent:** 1/14/2023 7:33:06 AM  
**To:** HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>  
**Subject:** Keep homewood public.

---

This is a horrible idea for the west shore. Businesses and residents will suffer. Thx

Sent from Andy Estopinal's iPhone 15 pro-s turbo prototype with built in Electric CanOpener and swing line stapler 916-225-5263.

**From:** Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>  
**Sent:** 1/16/2023 3:09:03 PM  
**To:** HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>  
**Subject:** FW: Homewood Mountain Resort Development and Privatization

---

**From:** Gayle Pigatto <gayle.pigatto@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, January 16, 2023 2:41 PM  
**To:** Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>  
**Subject:** Homewood Mountain Resort Development and Privatization

Dear Paul –

I am writing to you as a concerned homeowner and community member of the West Shore. My husband and I purchased our home in 2019 in the Tahoe Pines neighborhood and instantly fell in love with the community. We have two young children who attend Tahoe Community Nursery School and Tahoe Lake Elementary School – we feel absolutely blessed to call the West Shore home.

Our concern is Homewood Mountain Resort's plans to privatize the ski resort or charge excessive fees for access.

We recognize the resort needs significant investment and revitalization and we welcome the development of the resort within the same TRPA regulations we as homeowners are held to. What we don't support is the privatization of the ski hill.

The West Shore community is thriving and very much alive with young families. Privatization will force these families into excessively crowded ski locations like Palisades Tahoe while also limiting community growth and investment as families disperse across the basin to find winter recreation and ski teams. These commutes hurt our community and small businesses while increasing emissions and pollution.

The community was promised that Homewood Mountain Resort would remain open to the public and any proposed development must align with this promise. TRPA needs to ensure that the proposed development is consistent with the Master Plan approved in 2011 and isn't a bait and switch by JMA and Discovery.

TRPA should require a new plan for this significantly revised project, hold a public hearing and comments. This would ensure that the community has an opportunity to review the proposal and provide feedback.

Thank you for your consideration.

Gayle Pigatto  
670 Sierra Vista Ave, Homewood

--  
Gayle Pigatto

**From:** Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>  
**Sent:** 1/16/2023 3:11:01 PM  
**To:** HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>  
**Subject:** FW: Homewood Ski Resort

---

**From:** M. R. <monicahoperyan@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, January 16, 2023 11:34 AM  
**To:** Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>  
**Subject:** Homewood Ski Resort

Hi Mr. Paul Neilson,

As members of the Homewood neighborhood, we do not want a private club preventing our access to Homewood. My multi-generational family has enjoyed our home in Tahoe about a half-mile away from Homewood since the 1960s, and plan to keep the house in the family for the next generations. We do not Airbnb or rent our cabin, and keep a boat at the Homewood Marina. I learned to Ski at Homewood around age 5, and skied my first black diamond run there as well.

Please consider other options such as allowing access to locals in west-shore only at a subsidized or discounted daily rate, or veto-ing the privatization plan entirely. The billionaires can take their helicopters to private mountains, why take Homewood from everyone else to accommodate the comfort of just a few?

Is this proposition coming to a vote to the public or is it an entirely private decision?

Thank you for your time and consideration.

-Monica

--

Monica Ryan, Esq.  
Sr. Counsel, Visa

**From:** Ron Grassi <ronsallygrassi@mac.com>  
**Sent:** 1/16/2023 8:00:27 AM  
**To:** HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>  
**Subject:** Homewood Ski Resort and change of original plans

---

Dear Sirs, I am very unhappy with the proposal to privatize the Homewood Resort. When the original plans were being formed I remember that the developers promised to always keep Homewood public. The Westshore of Tahoe has no other ski area and Homewood, with its gentle slopes, has always been an important part of our family skiing. I urge TRPA to not allow this privatization to occur, especially since it was not part of the original plan that the public approved of.

Thank you for your attention to this important matter.

Sincerely,

Sally Grassi

**From:** Greg Fibiger <westshore7@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** 1/17/2023 10:23:53 PM  
**To:** HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>  
**Subject:** Future Homewood Plans

---

Hello,

As very concerned Tahoma residents, we would like to be included in whatever news and correspondences are released regarding JMA's Homewood plans. The newest revelations of their modified plans are extremely upsetting and we want to voice our opposition.

Thank you and please let us know what else we can do.

Sincerely,  
Greg Fibiger

**From:** Paul Nielsen <pn Nielsen@trpa.gov>  
**Sent:** 1/17/2023 11:33:25 AM  
**To:** HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>  
**Subject:** FW: Homewood Mountain Resort plans to go "private"

---

**From:** Dennis Kuzak <dekuzak@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 17, 2023 11:12 AM  
**To:** Paul Nielsen <pn Nielsen@trpa.gov>  
**Cc:** dennis kuzak <dekuzak@gmail.com>; jmtornese@aol.com  
**Subject:** Homewood Mountain Resort plans to go "private"

Dear Mr Nielsen

I am a vacation property owner near Meeks Bay and have skied at Homewood for over 30 years. It is a wonderful recreational facility close to the lake with the best views of Lake Tahoe compared to any other Tahoe basin ski area. My family and friends love skiing at Homewood and hope that opportunity continues. However, the resort has not been well managed with various mechanical and electrical problems affecting lift operations along with antiquated resort facilities.

So I was encouraged to see HMR's plan to propose an new masterplan involving new residential and tourist facilities and more year round use of the property. **"These improvements and new facilities will be privately funded and available to the public to increase recreational opportunity and quality"**( master plan document page 6-24, January 2011). The plan has been revised many times over the past 11 years and finally received TRPA approvals, but no ground breaking. It is obvious that present management has been unable to raise the capital needed to undertake this plan.

So now I have heard rumors and seen media articles that HMR wants to go private, becoming one of the few private ski areas in the US. Somehow going private will permit HMR to finance their plan using a rundown private ski operation to induce wealthy persons to purchase high cost ski residences or condo hotel units? And those new property owners would rent out those units to cover the cost of their purchase. Who benefits from this operation? The HMR investors/ developers cash out and then who cares about the ski operations? This has been a game plan for many years used by developers to build homes around a golf course. And now look at the number of golf courses that have closed. This is a real estate deal and not a ski resort deal. One thing missing in this latest scenario is the impact on the local residents and vacation owners, plus the HMR mountain property. First and foremost, HMR has been a public recreational facility offering both winter and summer recreation. HMR is a unique small mountain resort offering family skiing for those on the West Shore from Rubicon Bay to Tahoe City. Loss of public access would result in local skiers forced into long commute/bus rides to Palisades, Sierra at Tahoe, Northstar, or Heavenly. How many additional automobile miles along with tons of CO2 will be added each year for those residents that cannot ski at the "private" HMR? Are West Shore residents better off with a gated private resort? Going private will eliminate a precious public recreational resource on the Lake.

And who becomes the steward of the ski mountain? Do the new property owners obligate themselves thru CC&R's to maintain the ski resort, environmental requirements and TRPA requirements? HMR is a unique piece of the Tahoe lake shore which should not be left to some HOA rules to protect the lake.

In summary, I urge TRPA to reject a "private" ownership option of HMR, solely to permit current HMR investors to cash out from real estate sales while resulting in a **reduction of public recreational opportunities** on the West shore.

Very truly yours

Dennis E. Kuzak  
410 Sunnyview Dr, Tahoma  
[dekuzak@gmail.com](mailto:dekuzak@gmail.com)

**From:** Paul Nielsen <pn Nielsen@trpa.gov>  
**Sent:** 1/17/2023 11:03:16 AM  
**To:** HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>  
**Subject:** FW: Homewood Ski Resort

---

-----Original Message-----

From: Jerry Manifold  
Sent: Tuesday, January 17, 2023 9:37 AM  
To: Paul Nielsen  
Subject: Homewood Ski Resort

I am asking TRPA to request a review of the area's plan to privatize the resort. I believe this is against your agencies prior approval for the resort. I have skied Homewood for over 40 years ,more than 30 years as a volunteer ski patroller. I currently live in Truckee and under the new Homewood plan would not be eligible to ski anymore at Homewood. Please consider rejecting this outrageous plan to privatize Homewood Ski Resort. Sincerely, Jerry Manifold  
Phone: 1 (707) 337-9248

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** Jim MacLaughlin <jmaclaughlin@macco.org>  
**Sent:** 1/17/2023 2:34:45 PM  
**To:** HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>  
**Cc:** jksmaclaughlin@gmail.com <jksmaclaughlin@gmail.com>;  
**Subject:** notifications for any up dates regarding the Homewood plan.

---

Good afternoon,  
My Name is Jim MacLaughlin and I have been a resident in Homewood since 1960.  
Please add my E-mail address to all notifications to the Homewood Plan.  
Thank you

Jim MacLaughlin  
MacLaughlin & Company  
1401 Shore Street  
West Sacramento, Ca. 95691  
1-(916)-374-4232  
1-(916)-373-0655 Fax  
[jmaclaughlin@macco.org](mailto:jmaclaughlin@macco.org)



**From:** Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>  
**Sent:** 1/19/2023 12:58:42 PM  
**To:** HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>  
**Subject:** FW: Privatization of Homewood Ski Area

---

**From:** Brook Reed <fatskisinpowder@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, January 19, 2023 9:58 AM  
**To:** Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>  
**Subject:** Privatization of Homewood Ski Area

To Paul Nielsen, Special Projects Manager - TRPA,

Hello Mr Nielsen,

I'm a West Shore resident and long time Homewood season pass holder and am concerned about the impact of the proposed privatization of Homewood on the West Shore local community. Information has been scarce to non-existent and from what I have heard the Yellowstone group is planning to move forward with the development plan that local residents and TRPA approved back around 2010. That seems like bait and switch tactics being used by Homewood's owners.

Can you please let me know where I can find out the latest information about this process and if there are any groups of other people that are expressing concern?

Thanks for ALL you do!

Brook Reed

**From:** Pete <peteuehlin@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** 1/20/2023 7:30:32 PM  
**To:** HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>  
**Subject:** Homewood

---

My kids and I truly enjoy skiing at Homewood and I want my grandkids to have the same memories. Please don't take this gem away from the West Shore by privatizing the resort. Places like this are what keep communities and neighbors together. Every time I go there I see neighbors from the West Shore and beyond having a great time. It would be a shame if this is we're taken away. We are the ones that support the area, love the area and, pay taxes in the area. Thanks for stopping the privatization of Homewood.

Pete Uehlin  
7091 Ninth Ave.  
Tahoma

**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](mailto: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:** 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](mailto: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