

1200 Big Pine Dr.
Tahoe City, CA 96145

January 29, 2023

Paul Nielsen
pnielsen@trpa.gov

Dear Mr. Nielsen,

I am writing to express my concern about the proposed (revised) Homewood Mountain Resort development. The project that was originally proposed and supported by the West Shore Community was presented as a "community enhancement plan." The revised plan contains significant changes that will negatively affect the West Shore Community and its residents.

As you know, the revised plan restricts local residents from utilizing the ski resort by limiting use to pre-determined community ski days or vertical membership purchases. Most local residents working in our community cannot schedule their ski days around "community ski days." Many work longer hours and more days during the winter months when ski season is upon us. Local kids cannot schedule around snow days and will be excluded on weekends and holidays, according to Art Chapman. Scheduling a "Homewood ski day" is a vacation minded approach, which local workers do not have afforded to them. Locals typically ski on their random days off, which they take when they can. The vertical membership plan is also cost prohibitive for the majority of local residents. These types of memberships historically cost much more than a typical local Tahoe family can afford. Additionally, the benefits of a multigenerational membership do not apply to most year round residents who do not have extended family in the area. Ultimately the limited proposed "inclusion of the local community" does not pan out practically.

As a local taxpayer and 20+ year resident, I am very concerned that the revised plan was approved with what appears to be lack of critical review. The very limited information I can find detailing specifics of the new plan includes 4 story buildings which do not adhere to either the N. Tahoe building height restrictions or architectural design originally approved. I am concerned that the revised plan failed to undergo new public input meetings or environmental impact studies. There does not appear to be enough, if any, public parking for the ski resort which further suggests that public access will be very limited, if allowed at all. Some public access to Homewood ski resort provides locals and visitors choices in ski areas and helps distribute traffic more evenly throughout the region. Growth is inevitable in the Tahoe basin, however, growth should be balanced to provide the least environmental impact while benefitting visitors, locals, and businesses, not just the top 1%. While initially promoted as a "community enhancement plan," the revised project clearly benefits only an elite few.

The "Homewood Project Overview" repeatedly touts exclusivity that is proven in the plan by outlining inaccessible "community ski days", vertical memberships which outprice most local community members and lack of public parking. The "Old Tahoe Design" of the originally approved project buildings has been replaced by architectural design that does not appear to enhance the region's natural beauty or comply with the same rules that residents must adhere to when building. It is clear that my family's support of Homewood since the 1970s is being forgotten in the revised plan. It is also clear that the TRPA and Placer County Building Department did not critically consider how the revised plan would negatively impact the West Shore Community.

I urge you to bring this revised plan back to your department for re-review, scrutiny and attention to how these revisions will negatively impact the West Shore Community and North Tahoe Region. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Jeanne Plumb". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a large, stylized initial "J" and a distinct "P".

Jeanne Plumb, MD
(530) 401-4606
jeplumb@earthlink.net

Subject: TRPA Public Hearing to Consider Changes to the Homewood Mountain Resort Ski Area Master Plan

To Whom It May Concern:

I attempted to review the proposed changes to the Homewood Mountain Resort Master Plan with an open mind, but I soon realized the proposed changes did not reflect a **development** that the community and the entire basin would be proud to see built. While the original plan would have changed the mountain and, mostly, the northern base area, many concessions were made through public input. The architecture, traffic, noise, and run off contamination were all addressed and appeared to result in a development that fit into the community and would enhance the local economy. However, the sale of the property seems to have removed the historical knowledge of the process from all involved. The Placer County's Design Review Committee quietly approved changes that were not acceptable during the original approval process. The resulting project does NOT fit in with the community, does NOT maintain a scale consistent with the original Master Plan and, most importantly, does NOT protect the groundwater and the lake itself.

Based upon the aforementioned items, I am fervently requesting that TRPA:

1. question the applicability of the existing environmental documents;
2. question the validity of the County's Committee's actions in approving the design review changes to the Master Plan, contrary to prior concessions by the public, TRPA, and the previous owners;
3. require the initiation of an Amendment to the FEIS/EIR; and,
4. request further studies (traffic, noise, water quality) addressing the proposed changes to the previously approved Master Plan.

Five generations of our family have spent summers at Lake Tahoe, and, since 1975, when my husband and I built our current home, have been residents of the West Shore. We watched as changes occurred along the West Shore. We expected that some of those changes would affect Homewood. We appeal to the TRPA, Placer and El Dorado Counties, respectively, to make sure those changes meet the scale of the mountain and the surrounding communities. Please respect those communities and the people living here by protecting the West Shore and the beauty of our wonderful Lake Tahoe for future generations.

Respectfully submitted,

Judith W. Neel

Cc: Steve Buelner—Placer County
Crystal Jacobsen—Placer County
Karen Feathers—El Dorado County
Don Ashton—El Dorado County

From: Kathy Koch <kathyk@faloans.com>
Sent: 1/29/2023 6:04:33 PM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: Homewood Mountain Development

Members of the TRPA,

I would hate to think you as members of a board making decisions for the betterment of the Lake Tahoe Basin, would allow outsiders to develop something that would not be beneficial to the quality of the lake, current residents.

Please review the original plans approved and what any revisions to those plans might do to the future of our beautiful lake and community.

The future is in your hands.

Best Regards,
Katherine Koch
5975 Lagoon Rd.
Homewood, CA 96141

From: Wechter Debra <dgwechter@aol.com>
Sent: 1/29/2023 8:34:16 PM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Cc: Kevin Foster <kevinfoster3489@yahoo.com>; Tilen Lane <tilen.lane@gmail.com>; Rachel Bowdle <rachel.bowdle@gmail.com>; Craig Shipley <craigshipley1952@comcast.net>;
Subject: Plan for Homewood Mountain Resort

I have been a homeowner in Homewood for over 30 years and am appalled at the lack of foresight in decision making about the Homewood ski area. I am writing to demand that the new Homewood development plan proposed by JMA Ventures be squashed. The reasons are legion, foremost the fact that this plan is not the same as the original agreed to by the community many years ago. There are other significant issues including traffic, ease of evacuation in case of fire, effects on the ecosystem, privatization and therefore exclusion of the community from unfettered use of a local ski area. It is hard to conceive how this plan can be construed as an overall benefit to our local communities. Recently, we learned that a majority of the interest in this project has been sold to Mohari, a company based in Cyprus. Even the most basic internet research, and just watching the recent 60 Minutes show about Cyprus, reveal some disturbing possibilities about this organization which merit further research.

I urge you to listen to the concerns of the citizens whose interests TRPA was set up to protect.

Debra G Wechter, MD

From: Eric Plumb <professorplumb@gmail.com>
Sent: 1/30/2023 4:12:30 PM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Cc: Steve Buelna <sbuelna@placer.ca.gov>;
Subject: Concerns about JMA Homewood plan (CBMC member)

Hi, I'm a member of the Chamberlands Beach & Mountain Club over on the West shore and wanted to express my concerns about changes in the proposed development plan for Homewood Mountain Resort.

The original plan was approved more than 10 years ago to my understanding, and much has changed since then. I and many of my neighbors strongly oppose the proposed privatization of the resort - it's been a locals' paradise for decades, and we would be angry to see it disappear into the hands of only a few wealthy members. While JMA has proposed making it available for locals, they're being cagey and noncommittal about when and how, and we don't trust them to keep to anything not in writing. Likewise, we are dubious about their claims that it's impossible to keep it from losing money as-is - their level of investment in it has been minimal over the years.

Please don't give JMA and Art Chapman a blank check to do what they want with our beloved resort. Any updated plan should go through the same level of review that the original plan did. The residents of the West Shore should be among those consulted, as they'll be the most affected. Thank you for your consideration.

Eric Plumb
605 Grouse Dr, Homewood
415-307-2086

From: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Sent: 1/30/2023 1:39:01 PM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: FW: Homewood Privatization

From: Matt Conley <matt.conley16@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, January 30, 2023 12:52 PM
To: John Marshall <jmarshall@trpa.gov>; Julie Regan <jregan@trpa.gov>; Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Subject: Homewood Privatization

Dear TRPA,

This letter has been written in regard to the concern that I share with our community over the privatization of Homewood Mountain Resort. For a variety of reasons, I firmly believe that this development will have a negative impact on the lake and our community.

The loss of recreational benefits for locals who have shared this wonderful resort for so many years was the first concern that came to mind when hearing the news of privatization. Also, the loss of opportunity for the next generation to create new memories for years to come. I am quite honestly shocked and appalled that anyone would want to take this privilege away from our small community that has already endured so much in recent years. If Homewood Mountain Resort is privatized so that only the incredibly wealthy can afford it, where will the exclusivity end? There is a real fear in the Lake Tahoe community that locals will one day no longer be able to remain in the place they call home.

Environmental impact is the greatest concern, as the well being of this area is the single most important issue for anyone that occupies this beautiful place. It is very hard for me to believe that the proposed construction and new infrastructure will not have a negative effect on the water and land that surrounds it. When has luxury development ever been beneficial for anyone other than the people that stand to gain the most financially? Tahoe does not need more condos and restaurants. We need more affordable housing for the people that live and work in our community. The mountains are beautiful, not the golf courses. I feel like this will set a precedent to other luxury developers that anyone with enough money can come here and turn our home into an amusement park for only the wealthy.

As someone who has spent the last twelve years here, living and working in this amazing community, I adamantly oppose the new development for fear that it will not only damage the environment, but that it will shatter the community that loves and surrounds it.

Sincerely,

Matt Conley

From: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Sent: 1/30/2023 10:09:10 AM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: FW: Homewood project
Attachments: [Homewood project letter - pnielsen@trpa.docx](#)

From: jeplumb@earthlink.net <jeplumb@earthlink.net>
Sent: Sunday, January 29, 2023 2:34 PM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Subject: Homewood project

1200 Big Pine Dr.
Tahoe City, CA 96145

January 29, 2023

Paul Nielsen
pnielsen@trpa.gov

Dear Mr. Nielsen,

I am writing to express my concern about the proposed (revised) Homewood Mountain Resort development. The project that was originally proposed and supported by the West Shore Community was presented as a "community enhancement plan." The revised plan contains significant changes that will negatively affect the West Shore Community and its residents.

As you know, the revised plan restricts local residents from utilizing the ski resort by limiting use to pre-determined community ski days or vertical membership purchases. Most local residents working in our community cannot schedule their ski days around "community ski days." Many work longer hours and more days during the winter months when ski season is upon us. Local kids cannot schedule around snow days and will be excluded on weekends and holidays, according to Art Chapman. Scheduling a "Homewood ski day" is a vacation minded approach, which local workers do not have afforded to them. Locals typically ski on their random days off, which they take when they can. The vertical membership plan is also cost prohibitive for the majority of local residents. These types of memberships historically cost much more than a typical local Tahoe family can afford. Additionally, the benefits of a multigenerational membership do not apply to most year round residents who do not have extended family in the area. Ultimately the limited proposed "inclusion of the local community" does not pan out practically.

As a local taxpayer and 20+ year resident, I am very concerned that the revised plan was approved with what appears to be lack of critical review. The very limited information I can find detailing specifics of the new plan includes 4 story buildings which do not adhere to either the N. Tahoe building height restrictions or architectural design originally approved. I am concerned that the revised plan failed to undergo new public input meetings or environmental impact studies. There does not appear to be enough, if any, public parking for the ski resort which further suggests that public access will be very limited, if allowed at all. Some public access to Homewood ski resort provides locals and visitors choices in ski areas and helps distribute traffic more evenly throughout the region. Growth is inevitable in the Tahoe basin, however, growth should be balanced to provide the least environmental impact while benefitting visitors, locals, and businesses, not just the top 1%. While initially promoted as a "community enhancement plan," the revised project clearly benefits only an elite few.

The "Homewood Project Overview" repeatedly touts exclusivity that is proven in the plan by outlining inaccessible "community ski days", vertical memberships which outprice most local community members and lack of public parking. The "Old Tahoe Design" of the originally approved project buildings has been replaced by architectural design that does not appear to enhance the region's natural beauty or comply with the same rules that residents must adhere to when building. It is clear that my family's support of Homewood since the 1970s is being forgotten in the revised plan. It is also clear that the TRPA and Placer County Building Department did not critically consider how the revised plan would negatively impact the West Shore Community.

I urge you to bring this revised plan back to your department for re-review, scrutiny and attention to how these revisions will negatively impact the West Shore Community and North Tahoe Region. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Jeanne Plumb". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a large, stylized initial "J" and a distinct "P".

Jeanne Plumb, MD
(530) 401-4606
jeplumb@earthlink.net

From: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Sent: 1/30/2023 1:28:01 PM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: FW: Subject: Privatization of Homewood Mountain Resort (HMR) Project
Attachments: [image001.jpg](#)

From: Michael B Peterson <mpeterson@microfocus.com>
Sent: Monday, January 30, 2023 11:29 AM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Cc: Ted Peterson <TPeterson@lajollamgt.com>
Subject: FW: Subject: Privatization of Homewood Mountain Resort (HMR) Project

Paul,
I was looking through the letters in the "Public Comment" section, specific to the Homewood Mountain Resort (HMR) project, on the TRPA website. For some reason my letter was not included. I would appreciate your help to include my message below that was sent in early January. We look forward to TRPA's support in requiring HMR to submit a new Master Plan, to include public review and comment, in support of their substantial changes.

Sincerely,
Mike Peterson
916-799-0804

From: Michael B Peterson
Sent: Friday, January 6, 2023 2:19 PM
To: pnielsen@trpa.gov
Subject: Subject: Privatization of Homewood Mountain Resort (HMR) Project

Paul,
My understanding is that TRPA is having an internal meeting with the Executive Committee on January 9th to determine if Homewood Mountain Resort's request for changes to the Master Plan and privatization will require a new Master Plan. We would appreciate you communicating our information, concerns and request outlined below.

The privatization of the Homewood Mountain Resort (HMR) is now a different project not consistent with approved Master Plan. The community support and approval were based on keeping the resort open to the public, privatization was not mentioned anywhere in the approved EIR/S and Master Plan. The ever evolving, significantly altered, piecemeal plans that continue to be approved by TRPA are a considerable deviation from the approved Master Plan for the HMR project. The proposed changes clearly contradict TRPA's Mission of "improving local communities, and people's interactions with our irreplaceable environment." Vision of "Lake environment that is sustainable, healthy, and safe for the community and future generations". Operation of "The Tahoe Regional Planning Agency protects and restores Lake Tahoe's environment while revitalizing and enhancing our communities."
<https://www.trpa.gov/how-we-operate/>

My family's request, please require Homewood Mountain Resort (HMR) to submit a new Master Plan, to allow public hearings and comments. We strongly believe proposed changes, especially the privatization, would have adverse effects on property values and business interests. Moreover, these changes are not at all congruent with TRPA's stated public communication of "How We Operate". With this in mind, the decision should be clear to require HMR to submit a new Master Plan, subject to community review and hearings. We appreciate your help in submitting our request to the committee.

Sincerely,

Michael Peterson Family
5225 Sacramento Avenue, Homewood, CA 96141

Mike Peterson | North America Alliance Manager
Phone 916.799.0804 | mpeterson@Microfocus.com



From: Erika Veidis <erikamagone@gmail.com>
Sent: 1/30/2023 9:32:36 AM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: Fwd: Homewood Master Plan

Dear TRPA,

Forwarding the below exchange in case this is the better email address to use.

Erika

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

From: **Erika Veidis** <erikamagone@gmail.com>
Date: Sun, Jan 22, 2023 at 10:00 PM
Subject: Re: Homewood Master Plan
To: Arthur Chapman <achapman@jmaventuresllc.com>

Dear Mr. Chapman,

Thank you so much for your thoughtful note. It means a lot that you'd respond to my letter (which I've pasted below in case that's easier to track).

I understand what you're contending with - the challenges you've outlined all make sense, and it's clear that a reimagining is in order.

Still, I think there are ways to think more expansively about this issue - and to address concerns that extend far beyond local access to the mountain. At its heart, I'm concerned about the ongoing pandering to the rich and elite at the ultimate cost of the local Tahoe community and environment, and I'm concerned about a lack of imaginativeness in thinking about Homewood's future.

In a warming world, ski resorts' viability is up for grabs anyway. Where I'm from originally in the Northeast, we likely won't have much of a winter to speak of by the time I'm middle aged; resorts across the country are expected to similarly struggle with snowfall not long afterwards. An intention to make Homewood financially sustainable for the next 60 years has to go far beyond the current plan of building residences and privatizing skiing access. Ski resorts overall will have to reimagine what they can offer. Could Homewood seize this moment to become a visionary, innovative national - or even world - leader in this space, a model for other resorts in years to come?

The opportunities are endless. Why not leverage what's essentially already a model of ecotourism to bring people into closer relationship with the natural world, to incubate environmental stewardship, far beyond what can be accessed through ripping downhill on skis? What if instead of focusing on a narrow conception of the on-hill ski experience, we reimagined things entirely, and catered to some of the deeper things that people seek: to feel like part of something larger than themselves, to feel seen, to feel home? Imagine a membership experience that afforded people with much more than days in powder - that cultivated a sense of togetherness, of responsibility for place, of deep connection to and love for the land. We could engage the Washoe Tribe. We could engage local environmental groups. We could engage schools and universities - including UNR's new campus at Lake Tahoe in Incline Village. We could lead nationally-renowned retreats, both for the general public and for key high-level leaders.

In any case, I respect what you're grappling with, and I simultaneously urge you to think more deeply and disruptively about Homewood's future. At the very least, I urge you to reopen a community engagement process that draws locals into this discussion in a more meaningful way, and also considers environmental and community impacts more humbly and honestly - including a frank discussion about the scale and scope of the proposed project. You might be surprised by people's willingness to think through these challenges with you. It's an opportunity to cement a sense of family.

I'd be humbled for any opportunities to talk further and help strategize where I can. Thank you again for your response, and I hope that this can serve as part of a longer conversation.

Respectfully,
Erika Veidis

--

ORIGINAL LETTER

Dear Mr. Nielsen, Ms. Regan, and Mr. Marshall,

I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed development at Homewood Mountain Resort - a proposal characterized by little regard for Tahoe's community or environment.

In short: this proposal requires a more comprehensive process of public engagement, as well as a thorough environmental analysis. The local community should be engaged - in good faith - in evaluating a development project that will fundamentally shake their home. This has not occurred to this point, at least in a way that locals feel is honest, transparent, and meaningful.

My concern is not just about the development itself, and about the process to evaluate it and push it forward, but about the principles underlying its proposal - and about how it serves as a microcosm of a much larger narrative.

I'm an environmental program manager at Stanford. Prior to this position, I worked at Harvard, supporting a global network of hundreds of universities, NGOs, research institutes, and government entities in developing environmental and health research-to-action projects. What's striking is the degree to which seemingly-intractable, horribly-overwhelming global environmental challenges come back to a very simple fulcrum: taking more than you need, forgetting to listen, forgetting that you're part of something larger than yourself.

It's projects like these that are at the heart of everything that we're contending with globally. While the actual footprint of Homewood's development is negligible at a planetary scale, it's the spirit characterizing the whole project that's dangerous. It's the same wolf behind rabid oil consumption, rabid deforestation, productivity-at-all-costs decimation of ecosystems and communities and cultures that have taken millennia to develop – and for what? For profit? For status? For some other flimsily-hypothesized vehicle for happiness that ultimately misses the entire point?

From working with some of the world's most respected researchers, policy makers, innovators, and environmental leaders, I've been struck by the simplicity of it all. By how much of these challenges are really an issue of culture and of values. And I can say confidently that the Homewood development project – and everything behind it – is the problem.

Relatedly: I've been floored by the amount of brainpower and resources going into desperately trying to figure out how to make concrete more sustainable, how to make steel more sustainable, how to make buildings slightly more energy efficient. Researchers' entire careers are eaten up by a single small slice of these questions. And we could and should research and innovate to make all of these marginal improvements in building sustainability practices; we have no other choice. But at the same time: why are we treating unfettered ongoing development as inevitable? Isn't it possible that we could also just stop building – at least in projects like these that are ultimately unnecessary? Whose main benefit, beyond catering to rich vacation-goers, is the vague appeal of revenue? Why can't we question some of this as well?

Tahoe is rare. In a world where so much has been disrupted, what Tahoe hangs onto is deeply special. We have the opportunity to serve as a beacon of light for the rest of the world. This is what matters – living gently, embracing humility, connecting to the world around us, creating a true sense of home. If we were to embrace these values as a community and find ways to show that to the rest of the world... we can't underestimate the potential that holds for change, for shifting culture, for sparking ripple effects across the planet.

I'm not sure how to best accomplish this – through story? through a more humble form of ecotourism? But what I know is this: reminding people how to listen and sharing the wisdom and beauty that Tahoe has to offer can't be achieved through luxury, through a thirst for dollars, through pandering to the elite.

If increasing revenue and tourism is what Tahoe is after – let's figure out how to do this in a way that's visionary, honest, authentic; that's rooted in our true values as a community. Let's establish a committee to think through these big questions. Let's reimagine our approaches to proposals like these – and to what could arise in their stead.

At the very least, the Homewood proposal and plans for privatization should undergo a good-faith analysis and public engagement process; something that locals wouldn't feel is a "bait and switch" situation, something that wouldn't feel like, as one long-time Tahoma resident put it, "saying you're going to build a hospital and really intending to build a strip joint." Something that would make the local Tahoe and West Shore community feel like they are meaningfully engaged in a project that will affect them and the place they love and call home.

But I'd also hope that we could go broader. To reconsider the very premise of the proposal and to think about the larger narrative at stake. What do we truly value? Are there ways to think bigger, to question the status quo and dominant paradigms? What does it take to be truly visionary?

I am happy to be of service however I can be; please don't hesitate to reach out if I can be helpful in actualizing any of what I've noted herein.

Thank you for taking the time to read this letter – and for all that you do on behalf of Lake Tahoe and its community.

Sincerely,
Erika Veidis
Tahoe City resident

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

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: Sean Yudice <syudice@novoconstruction.com>
Sent: 1/30/2023 11:08:33 AM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: Homewood Development Issues

To whom it may concern,

Our family owned a house in Tahoma in the mid 70's for 15 years and now own a home in Homewood since 2012 (6140 Lark Drive). The West Shore of Lake Tahoe is considered the last "Old Tahoe" area around the lake and needs Placer County to do their part in preserving the West Shore. As homeowners we are the major contributor of Placer County's revenue with property and sales tax along with supporting our local businesses. These businesses rely on in the tourist that visit Homewood for their income during the winter which is a very difficult time in the area. With the privatization of Homewood, the private members would unlikely venture outside of the resort amenities provided to support the local businesses.

The construction of the resort would also contribute to pollution to the lake even with all pollution control measures required by Placer County as there is no guaranteed way to contain 100% of all construction debris from contaminating the lake. The lake has degraded much more rapidly in the past 20 years due to all the development around the lake and clarity is what the lake is known for.

The master plan is very vague regarding the local community's ability to utilize Homewood for skiing and given the history of Discovery Developments past project, the opportunities to gain membership will be far too expensive and realistic for locals to utilize the resort. If there was language that guaranteed pricing for locals with a long-term agreement, I believe that that there may be more acceptance by the local community.

The fact that locals would need to drive past the resort to ski at another resort in the Tahoe basin would create a very negative culture in the community. In addition, the traffic on highway 89 from Tahoe City to the Palisades turn offs are very heavily impacted during winter holiday weekends and heavy winter storms impeding life and safety services to Truckee Forest Hospital which is the closest major hospital in the area. Additional traffic resulting from West Shore skiers traveling to Palisades would cause a major traffic impact to the existing traffic problem and increase response times for emergency services.

In my opinion, the redevelopment of Homewood has lacked transparency with the local community and the plan needs to be revised to clearly outline the plan for public use in the future. TRPA, North Lake Tahoe Resort Association and Placer County need to listen to the taxpayers of area and demand a revised plan for the redevelopment of the resort and have a public hearing that has proper notification to all homeowners and businesses that are affected by the development.

Sean Yudice
6140 Lark Drive
Homewood, CA
415.760.1878

From: Kimberly Wilson <kimwilsonsb@yahoo.com>
Sent: 1/30/2023 9:36:54 AM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Cc: Steve Buelna <sbuelna@placer.ca.gov>;
Subject: Homewood Development Project

To All Concerned,

The idea that one of the few ski hills that offer a truly old school edition of ski Tahoe and the locals favorite would become a private resort is simply astounding and absurd. It does not fit with the culture of the West Shore community or California in general. The plan needs to go back to where it was at inception in 2011/2012.

If the development company wants a private resort, go elsewhere. There is plenty of open space in other states.

There are no arguments Mr. Chapman can make that would make this an appropriate project. Not for Homewood, the West Shore or all of Lake Tahoe.

My family owns a home on Lagoon. My husband learned to ski at Homewood. We got married at West Shore in 1999. My kids learned to ski at Homewood. There are people from all over California who have similar ties to Homewood.

Regards,

Mrs. Kim Wilson

From: Michele Thompson <mlthompson49@gmail.com>
Sent: 1/30/2023 9:56:48 AM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>; Jeffrey Holifield <jeff_holifield@live.com>; Jennifer Funk <jenniferkfunk@gmail.com>; Kevin Foster <kevinfoster3489@yahoo.com>
Subject: Homewood Development

To Whom It May Concern,

As a Homewood resident I have big concerns regarding the new plans to privatize the area, dramatically changing the development plans submitted in 2011.

These new plans don't seem to accomplish any of the previously approved benefits to the community. As I understood it, the prior plans were approved as they were deemed environmentally sound while providing beneficial services to the community (eg./ housing, hardware store, ice cream shop, ice rink, amphitheatre, boat storage, skiing etc..).

It seems the new plans consist of a gated/exclusive community, with a questionable building/pavement to nature ratio.

Please advise as to what rigor is underway to ensure the beauty and community of Homewood is retained?

KEEP HOMEWOOD BLUE!

Best Regards,
Michele Thompson
Lagoon Street

From: Pasha Fazeli <pashafazeli@yahoo.com>
Sent: 1/30/2023 3:44:56 PM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: Homewood Development...

Hello,

I'm writing you on behalf of our family however I believe most if not all of the West Shore Community would agree with us in being against the development plan proposed by JMA and Discovery. Our home is in Tahoe Pines and we hope that we can avoid more of the decline than what we have already been witnessing.

We've seen some of the locals fuss about not being able to ski the mountain and use the facility and while yes that would be something to consider, We're really only concerned with the impact that this project has on Lake Tahoe as a whole. The West Shore is what we see as one of the last remaining Gems in Tahoe that hasn't been overdeveloped by big Development money but unfortunately it appears the big money developers are coming for it and making great strides influencing the TRPA organization to give in.

The impact to the lake with hundreds of new homes, hotel and infrastructure to go with it will be detrimental to the lakes pristine state. How is it that we can allow this kind of development all while we say we work to keep it clear and pure as it is?

I understand these giant firms with tons of money can pay whatever they want and whoever they want to get the job approved, but at what point does this actually get a clear impact review? One that isn't fluffed up with phony information made by people who are totally bias in the situation.

How is it going to look on the highway mid winter or mid summer when traffic is backed up solid to Sunnyside and further as it already goes that far right now. Is there a traffic plan? With this development Id expect another lane added both ways and we may as well put in more stops lights and an overpass while we're at it.

On ski weekends it already takes us 90 minutes to get into Truckee due to all the traffic from Squaw Valley. Are we just going to continue to give in to big money greed and bail on Tahoe and everything it is? I hope that's not the case for the sake of the lake and the community.

Regards,

Pasha Fazeli
310.795.1118

From: Dave Kruse <Dave@ljkruse.com>
Sent: 1/30/2023 2:29:13 PM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Cc: Lisa Kruse <kruse2742@gmail.com>;
Subject: Homewood Development

Hello,
As a 27 year property owner and part time resident I am writing to demand that the new Homewood development, as proposed by JMA and Mohari, be strictly held to the original permit conditions. This revised plan needs to be fully vetted to protect our community and environment.
Thank you for your time and consideration.
David and Lisa Kruse
425 Grouse Dr
Homewood, CA`

From: Michael Fahn <fahn@cwo.com>
Sent: 1/30/2023 1:34:18 PM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: Homewood privatization!

To whom it may concern,

We my wife and I and three young kids purchased a home in Chamberlands seven years ago for the purpose of enjoying some solitude in the beautiful Tahoe area and teaching my young kids to ski and being able to ski a few minutes from our door. It was a big decision for lots of reasons, most importantly, economic. We felt if we didn't get in when we did we would never be able to afford such a home. With that said, if Homewood were to go private now, not only would we not be able to ski eight minutes from our door but we would have to drive to on already congested small two-lane highway to Alpine Meadows-Palisades, or Northstar. The obvious inconvenience of doing so and the expense of gas and frustration with traffic already at a standstill on weekends would make our skiing almost impossible. It would also lower the property value of our home by not having a fair priced and local ski resort. I'm sure we could lose hundreds of thousands of dollars on our property value. If Homewood continues on this path as opposed to the path, they got us to support, which was, remodel and rehab existing facilities, I would be left with no choice but to throw my hat in the ring economically to whatever lawsuit would be filed to protect our interests. Yes, not to mention going through the pain and suffering of many many years of construction for a facility that we were promised to be able to use at a "fair price", but not be able to use it all unless we could afford hundreds of thousands of dollars to join their membership which we would not, and could not!

I'm not what would be considered an anti- growth advocate, but I am for smart growth and keeping promises made to people that have invested literally their life savings into being able to enjoy our cabin at Chamberlands!!

Thanking you in advance for your understanding and support of our position.

Sincerely,
Michael H Fahn

Sent from my iPhone

From: Debbie Webb <webbdds@earthlink.net>
Sent: 1/30/2023 10:57:22 AM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: Homewood resort plan

Dear Sirs,

Was very disappointed to see Homewood Mountain Resort latest proposal. Ten years ago it seems we went through a very detailed process and got to a reasonable solution that was acceptable to most. Their new proposal is totally out of character for the area and had they proceeded with the original proposal they would be able to compete in the area. But having no improvements in the last ten years the area is showing that it has not kept up the other resorts.

Please hold them to their original design and do not approve any of the development and going private. It has no benefit to the community.

Debbie Webb DDS, 5905 Lagoon Homewood

From: Noreen DeVito <noreendevito@att.net>
Sent: 1/30/2023 1:16:33 PM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: Homewood

Do not deviate from the original plan. This is not in the interest of neighbors. Please tell me who's being paid off.
Sent from my iPhone

From: Jordan Shields <Jordan@jordanshields.com>
Sent: 1/30/2023 8:03:06 AM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: Opposition to development

I am a long time resident at 415 Snowbird Loop. I am opposed to the new development/privatization taking place at Homewood. Access to a more community based, open resort is important to my family and to the area. Privatization also works against the original Homewood development plan, which was presented to me when I bought the house.

This also seems to be moving through without the opportunity for opposition. The recent design change was approved without comment. Further, the architect for the project is on the Placer County Design Review Committee. While she recused herself from a vote, that is not really the point...she should not be allowed to participate in the matter at all.

Mark us down as adamantly opposed to the project.

Jordan Shields
415 515 6710
jordan@jordanshields.com
415 Snowbird Loop

From: Rebecca Sweet <rebecca@harmonyinthegarden.com>
Sent: 1/30/2023 1:47:36 PM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>; Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Cc: Steve Buelna <sbuelna@placer.ca.gov>;
Subject: Opposition to Homewood Privatization PLN22-00534

Dear Mr. Nielsen and Mr. Buelner,

For the past 57 years, our family has lived full and part-time in Chamberlands. We find it outrageous that a developer is attempting to substantially alter usage plans for the Homewood Mountain Resort at Lake Tahoe's West Shore.

Equally outrageous is the fact that the TRPA supports this. In fact, according to the TRPA's website, their mission is: to lead the cooperative effort to preserve, restore, and enhance the unique natural and human environment of the Lake Tahoe Region while improving local communities, and people's interactions with our irreplaceable environment.

Your approval of this entirely different plan (vs. the approved 2011 Master Plan which indicated access would remain open to the public.) should not only nullify the new plan, it should nullify the TRPA's written mission statement to 'improve local communities, to preserve, restore, and enhance the unique natural environment of the lake.'

Please require the re-submission of this NEW, significantly revised plan so it can be appropriately reviewed (including public hearings which are clearly advertised to the community.)

Our desire is to see proof that the TRPA is, in fact, protecting the interests of the community, and not the developers' pocketbooks, and that the original approved plan is what's implemented - not this ridiculous version, which is the opposite of a 'community asset.'

As you've no doubt realized through the hundreds of emails and complaints you've received, West Shore residents thoroughly oppose the changes to this altered project.

Thank you,

Rebecca Sweet, Tom Urban & Linda Anderson
6320 Flicker Ave.
Tahoma

From: Colin Bauer <colinbauer@gmail.com>
Sent: 1/30/2023 2:43:05 PM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: Opposition to new Homewood Mountain Resort Master Plan

I write today in opposition to the changes to the Homewood Mountain Resort master plan. The original approved design was in keeping with the aesthetic of the area. The new plan's architecture does not fit in with the surroundings and is a betrayal of the community's willingness to agree to significant development in the region.

The original plan allowed continued use of Homewood Mountain Resort by the community. The new plan appears to limit or eliminate the ability of the public to use a local ski resort.

The ownership group has made little effort to improve the amenities of the resort as it currently exists. It is, frankly, uncompetitive with regional alternatives such as Pallisades and Northstar. The main advantage Homewood has is two-fold

1. It is accessible for locals on the West Shore.
2. It is a family-oriented resort that tends to be less crowded.

While the ownership group gripes that their investment is not profitable, they have done, and continue to do, little to try to make skiing at the resort more enticing. Addition of the snowcat adventures is an excellent example of expansion of services to meet needs and wants of the skiing community. The resort ownership should have focused on priorities like improving lift infrastructure such that skiers could enjoy more time skiing and less time waiting for lifts or on lifts. Their lift technology is in relatively poor shape and suffers from mechanical breakdowns which make parts of the mountain essentially inaccessible. Food options on the mountain may have improved from long ago, however they pale in comparison to food options at resorts like Palisades.

To think that privatizing the ski area and limiting the number of skiers to a small number of wealthy individuals is the answer to the challenges of the region is absurd. To what end would "saving" the resort for the enjoyment of the few be a worthwhile goal?

In addition, pushing local skiers away from the mountain resort area will, necessarily increase traffic on Highway 89 as residents and vacationers will be forced to seek skiing opportunities elsewhere.

Arguments made for the need to change include skier counts on non holiday weekdays following extended dry warm weather, which meant snow conditions were poor.

significantly expanding the residencies in the region will have detrimental impact to the environment, as it will increase the paved surface area, and it will also increase traffic substantially. Highway 89 is, frankly, incapable of handling this traffic.

Expanding Homewood will take what has been a jewel of the Tahoe region, the West Shore, and commodify it and turn it into just another resort area, and the process by which the changes in the Master Plan were allowed to move forward is a shameful example of local government at work.

-Colin Bauer
Homeowner and member of Chambers Beach and Mountain Club

From: Anna Oliva <annaoliva424@gmail.com>
Sent: 1/30/2023 9:59:01 AM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: PLN22-00534 Homewood Development Activities

To whom it concerns,

I am a Homewood resident and I do not approve of the master plan. The plan not only violates the original agreement, but also failed to inform residents and owners of the new plan moving forward. The minimal effort put forward for public awareness was not intended to inform the community, it was simply something that was checked off the box.

I and my neighbors do not agree with the TRPA Tahoe plan fro Homewood Development. Don't destroy the mountain or the areas for profit. It is not in the best interest of the people or the lake.

I do not approve or support moving forward with the development process at Homewood.

Anna Oliva

From: Tom Urban <urbantom@gmail.com>
Sent: 1/30/2023 2:24:31 PM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>; Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>; Steve Buelna <sbuelna@placer.ca.gov>
Subject: Re: Homewood Privatization PLN22-00534

Regarding the Homewood Privatization,

I know you've heard from several residents about their opposition to the altered plans. But, I'd like to add a different perspective based on a situation that happened in our old neighborhood:

In that situation, an exception was granted based on some back-office arrangement and the neighbors affected sued the board of directors for making that exception. It was outside the bylaws and in direct opposition to what was in writing. Both the board of directors and the individuals involved lost in court.

You may be thinking that your backers from Cyprus have deep pockets and will pay to defend their interests. But, their protection will only protect THEIR interests – it will also not erase the time or scars created by this. Nor will it restore the area to what was originally approved.

Are you sure you want to set this precedent and (potentially) defend it in court?

Tom Urban
6320 Flicker Avenue,
Tahoma

From: Denis Long <dlong@bagatelos.com>
Sent: 1/30/2023 8:55:49 AM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>; Steve Buelna <sbuelna@placer.ca.gov>
Subject: Reference PLN22-00534 -- Homewood Ski Resort
Attachments: [image001.jpg](#)

Good Morning

I am writing regarding the development plan under consideration for the Homewood Ski Resort. I have followed the discussion for the past couple of years, without involvement. However, the fact that plans now seem to be firming up, I feel compelled to add my family's voice to the opposition of the current plan.

We have been homeowners in the Chamberlands subdivision for the last 32 years, and visitors to the Homewood area for an additional decade. We have been frequent skier at the Homewood Resort over the past 30-40 years. The likelihood that local homeowners will now be precluded from skiing at the local resort (or provided only very limited access during off season) as it turns private or membership only does not seem to be in the spirit of the master plan as conceived in 2011/12.

I would hope that Placer County and TRPA can encourage the new owners to broaden their view and embrace the West Shore community. I certainly respect the right to private ownership and the fact that the new group faces enormous renovation and expansion costs; but the original plan did not exclude local residents from continuing to enjoy the resources that drew us to West Shore so many years ago.

Looking forward to finding a mutual beneficial outcome.

Appreciate your consideration.

590 Grouse Homewood CA

Denis R. Long
Corporate Controller



2750 Redding Ave., Sacramento, CA 95820

dlong@bagatelos.com

Office: (916) 364-3600 x125

From: Katherine Bowe Fumia <bowekatherine@gmail.com>
Sent: 1/30/2023 3:38:05 PM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Cc: Steve Buelna <sbuelna@placer.ca.gov>;
Subject: Reference: PLN22-00534

Hello,

I am writing to demand that TRPA protect the interests of Homewood residents and not the developers for the Homewood project. I also am writing to voice my right to ask that they do not vary from the original approval which was supposed to be a community asset.

This has been our family home for over 50+ years, the mountain is a vital part of our community. If anything this Homewood existing homeowners should be grandfathered into any changes without payment to have access to this mountain.

This plan is hiding under a community enhancement plan, they state "In keeping with what Homewood has meant to so many of us over the generations, the design theme is 'Old Homewood,' which will find expression in the future architecture and design." This at the expense of the community that created and bought homes here when no one wanted to, this community that will be punished by the sheer cost of membership of this planned project to be kicked out of our mountain.

We strongly voice our condemnation of this plan.

Katherine Fumia
Lagoon Drive

From: Jon Witty <jonwitty@hotmail.com>
Sent: 1/30/2023 2:45:58 PM
To: pnielsen@trpa.com <pnielsen@trpa.com>; Julie Regan <jregan@trpa.gov>; Jeff Cowen <jcowen@trpa.gov>; Wendy Jepson <wJepson@trpa.gov>; Steve Buelna <sbuelna@placer.ca.gov>; pnielsen@placer.ca.gov <pnielsen@placer.ca.gov>
Subject: URGENT: Homewood Going Private

Dear Mr. Nielsen, Mr. Buelna, TRPA leadership,

My wife and I have owned our home at 435 Grouse for 31 years. We love the Westshore and all it offers including Homewood Ski Resort.

The Privatization of the Homewood Resort is in direct conflict to the spirit of the original project, the previously approved master plan and the oral representations made by Art Chapman of JMA Ventures to secure the original approval. This alteration of the original usage plans for the Homewood Mountain Resort at Lake Tahoe's West Shore should, without question, require a new master plan process.

Specifically:

- Require the submission of a new plan to fully review this significantly-revised project, including public hearings and community comment.
- The original intent of the 2011 Master Plan indicated **access would remain open to the public**, thus invalidating the spirit of the original plan and its approval.

Residents of the West Shore would never have supported the plan in its current form. I feel we are all suffering from a sense of bait and switch. At a minimum this feels unfair and is likely unlawful in the subverted way the originally approved plan, both architecture and public access, has been changed materially.

I am asking you to champion the halt of this process and force a new evaluation of the plan. If not, the negative public sentiment and firestorm of negative publicity will put the TRPA governing body in a very bad light. Imagine a headline or media story that reads "TRPA enables middle eastern-based developer to privatize Lake Tahoe jewel for billionaires – locals no longer allowed to ski Homewood" This is the reality. National media outlets will have a field day. Today it's about equity and inclusion and this denies access by the public to a lakeside jewel, Homewood.

Sincerely,
Jon & Amy Witty
435 Grouse Drive, Homewood, CA
971-221-0790

From: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Sent: 1/31/2023 10:34:59 AM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: FW: [BULK] Re: Homewood Mountain Resort - Public Comment
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

From: AJ Cheline <ajcheline@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, January 31, 2023 10:00 AM
To: Jeff Cowen <jcowen@trpa.gov>; Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>; John Marshall <jmarshall@trpa.gov>; Julie Regan <jregan@trpa.gov>
Subject: [BULK] Re: Homewood Mountain Resort - Public Comment

I would like to express my deep concern with the fact that someone from your organization must have provided Art Chapman of JMA Ventures my personal contact information without my consent. He sent a blanket email directly to me (and others) following my (our) email to you and your team. Conveying public concern to JMA is not the issue, and we crave the opportunity to have discussions with all the stakeholders, but by sharing our personal contact information raised the community's concern about trust.

BTW, Mr. Chapman's response to me (us) shows how disconnected they are from the reality of the local community.

On Thu, Jan 12, 2023 at 12:40 PM Jeff Cowen <jcowen@trpa.gov> wrote:

Thank you for your email about the new proposal from Homewood Mountain Resort to make changes to its 2011 master plan. We understand the Homewood resort means a great deal to the community and to Lake Tahoe's cultural heritage.

While Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA) planners have met with representatives from Homewood Mountain Resort, no formal plan revisions have been submitted yet. TRPA planners are currently working to determine what the process, timeline, and public input opportunities will be for the changes to be considered. Once the agency receives more information, planners will consider what impact the proposed changes might have on the resort Master Plan and the Tahoe Basin. As part of the process, the agency will ensure community input is gathered and partner agencies and community groups are consulted.

There was no TRPA meeting scheduled this week and no decisions have been made. While Homewood representatives have released information to the public and made presentations in the community, TRPA is still working with the project applicant to establish the appropriate permitting process.

We appreciate your input and the time you have taken to reach out to us. Your comments have been received and noted by our planners and will be included in the record.

Please direct all future emails to us at homewoodplan@trpa.gov and watch for emails from us with updates and possible opportunities for public input.

Regards,

Jeff W Cowen
Public Information Officer
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
775.589.5278



trpa.gov | [facebook](#) | [twitter](#) | [instagram](#)

--

AJ Cheline
REALTOR License 02110911
Keller Williams Real Estate



From: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Sent: 1/31/2023 8:12:08 AM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: FW: Homewood Development (Ref PLN22-00534)

From: Michele Thompson <mlthompson49@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, January 30, 2023 7:44 PM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Subject: Homewood Development (Ref PLN22-00534)

Mr. Nielsen,

As a Homewood resident I have big concerns regarding the new plans to privatize the area, dramatically changing the development plans submitted in 2011.

These new plans don't seem to accomplish any of the previously approved benefits to the community. As I understood it, the prior plans were approved as they were deemed environmentally sound while providing beneficial services to the community (eg./ housing, hardware store, ice cream shop, ice rink, amphitheatre, boat storage, skiing etc..).

It seems the new plans consist of a gated/exclusive community, with a questionable building/pavement to nature ratio.

Please advise as to what rigor is underway to ensure the beauty and community of Homewood is retained?

KEEP HOMEWOOD BLUE!

Best Regards,
Michele Thompson
Lagoon Street

From: Eric Everson <eric.everson@matchps.com>
Sent: 2/1/2023 1:30:35 PM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>; Steve Buelna <sbuelna@placer.ca.gov>
Subject: Fw: Homewood Master Plan

I wanted to forward you the email response that I sent to Art Chapman for your files.

From: Eric Everson <eric.everson@matchps.com>
Sent: Friday, January 27, 2023 5:36 AM
To: Arthur Chapman <achapman@jmaventuresllc.com>
Subject: Re: Homewood Master Plan

Mr Chapman,

Thanks for your email. I tried to find you on LinkedIn with no luck. I was curious to know your role at JWA.

Just an FYI on my background. I'm someone who has been in Homewood for 50+ years, learned to ski at Homewood, taught my kids to ski at Homewood, patronize the West Shore Cafe on a regular basis, and have shared year-round storage/services/buoy at Hi & Dry for 15+ years.

It may be true that the North Tahoe Alliance and Friends of the West Shore may have misrepresented some aspects. They claim that can also be said for JWA and Discover Lands. There appear to be many facts that are not made clear to the general public. I would appreciate it if you would provide clear details on the following:

1. The non-residential membership will be approx \$1.5M. You mention in your email that the exact cost has not been determined yet, which I assume is true. I believe the impression you leave makes it appear as if the membership would not be cost prohibitive for most.
2. It would be a first for any Discover Lands property to be open to the public. It would be nice to get more details on if/how that would work, and the costs associated. As far as I know there are no Discover Lands properties anywhere else in the world that allow any type of public access.
3. No mention in your email that the West Shore Cafe will now be a private beach club for members only.
4. No mention that existing buoy renters will eventually be terminated and those buoys going to members.
5. I agree on the Epic and Ikon challenge. However, their busiest weekends are also the busiest times at Homewood.
6. There will be a significant increase in traffic to other ski areas when Homewood is closed to the public. As you mentioned it is already bad enough.
7. Increased traffic along the West Shore for people going to (open) restaurants.
8. Increased traffic along the West Shore for people who will now have to launch boats. Where will vehicles and trailers park?
9. Assuming your project goes through as currently planned, are there any plans to help alleviate the increased traffic and parking issues caused (see 6-8 above).
10. Since the original plan has been changed has there been a new environmental review? Tahoe is precious to all of us so a new review shouldn't take as long.

I was optimistic when the Homewood Ski Area Master Plan was approved by TRPA and Placer County in 2011. My assumption was that TRPA and Placer County would only approve something that would be beneficial for the entire west shore. I was hopeful that more amenities for the general population would become available not at just the ski area but also in the surrounding area.

I understand as a business you have to find a viable solution to maximize profits for JWA. I do feel confident that if the lifts and facilities were upgraded that you would have many more people patronizing.

Your plan will be great for the people who can afford to buy into this new development. I'm not convinced, however, that the solution you have will have anything but a negative impact on the rest of the west shore.

Feel free to contact me if you want to discuss further.

Regards,

Eric

From: Arthur Chapman <achapman@jmaventuresllc.com>
Sent: Sunday, January 22, 2023 6:11 PM
To: Eric Everson <eric.everson@matchps.com>
Subject: Homewood Master Plan

You don't often get email from achapman@jmaventuresllc.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Mr. Everson,

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: benjaminjkruse@gmail.com <benjaminjkruse@gmail.com>
Sent: 2/1/2023 1:31:31 PM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Cc: Dave Kruse <Dave@ljkruse.com>; Will Kruse <will@ljkruse.com>; 'Ben&Melody' <melodyvt@gmail.com>; Nate Kruse <Nate@ljkruse.com>; 'Lisa Kruse' <kruse2742@gmail.com>;
Subject: Homewood development comments

Good afternoon,

My family has owned a home in Homewood for almost 30 years. I learned to ski at Homewood and I am now teaching my young daughter to ski there as well.

I speak for many when I say we were devastated to hear that JMA and Mohari are continuing to push forward with their development plans. We cannot stand by while our family ski hill and the anchor of our community is cordoned off for the 1%.

And at what cost? The real cost will be for us local homeowners and residents to bear. This proposed development will absolutely have a negative impact on our community and the environment. Traffic, parking, clarity of the lake, emergency evacuations plans, and accelerating the climate emergency are only a few of the issues that me and my family are extremely concerned about. We also firmly believe that a small, family oriented, and publicly accessible ski resort is critical to what makes the west shore so special.

I am writing to demand that the new Homewood development, as proposed by JMA and Mohari, be strictly held to the original permit conditions. The revised plans must be fully vetted to protect the integrity of our community and the environment on the West Shore. We must work together to do what is best for this community.

Thank you for your time and consideration,

Ben Kruse and Melody Bessett
425 Grouse Dr.
Homewood, CA

From: rickyrodgers007@gmail.com <rickyrodgers007@gmail.com>
Sent: 2/1/2023 1:29:26 PM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Cc: Steve Buelna <sbuelna@placer.ca.gov>; Lorie <lorierodgers@sbcglobal.net>; Evonne <vibrationtravel7@gmail.com>;
Subject: Homewood Development Plan

To: Paul Nielsen, TRPA
Cc: Steve Buelner, Placer County, Reference PLN22-00534

Dear Mr. Nielsen,

I write on behalf of my family in grave concern over the proposed privatization of the Homewood Mountain Resort. The 2011 approval of its expansion plan emphasized its continuing focus on and benefit to the West Shore community; the proposed changes to that plan bear no such focus or benefit.

My wife, Lorie, and her sister, Evonne Revitt, own our home in Chamberlands, which was purchased in 1965 by their grandfather, who prized the quietude of the West Shore as well as the cultural omnipresence of the Washoe people. They were both ski instructors at Tahoe Ski Bowl (*now part of HMR*) in college, and our family has skied there for many years. Lorie and I both worked there after college (*1977-78 season*). It is a valued, enjoyed and integral part of our Tahoe life.

Please require a full review of the new, different and inconsistent proposed plan, including hearings and public input. It seems only fair, particularly given the negative impact of privatization on all residents of the West Shore, and the potential for wildfire and the ability for the safety of the residents to egress on the one and only road, which needs to be taken under serious consideration by the TRPA and the County.

Thank you for your careful consideration of these issues, and for your – and TRPA’s – commitment to our beautiful and beloved Tahoe.

Please feel free to contact me directly.

Respectfully,

Wallace “Rick” Rodgers

Revitt/Rodgers Cabin
6265 Chamberland Drive
Homewood
rickyrodgers007@gmail.com
(916) 835-1036 (cell)

From: Robert Henderson <rob@hendersonsfis.com>
Sent: 2/1/2023 8:06:08 PM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: Homewood Development

To TRPA-

I am very concerned with the new plans. My house backs up to the Resort . I own 5685 Lagoon Road.

The reason all of us love the area is that it is not over developed and Fancy. We prefer the slower lifestyle of Homewood. Fancy has never been associated with Homewood. Family and simple is what everyone loves about Homewood.

Privatizing and building a giant community will impact the environment and the traffic in the community. I was under the impression TRPA was their to protect the environment and the community . I can not see how this development is good for the Homewood community and the environment.

Best regards -
Rob Henderson
5685 Lagoon Road
6507730979

--
robert henderson ~ henderson strategic financial insurance services ~ ca license 0F30712
855 El Camino Real Bldg 4 - Suite 220, palo alto, ca 94301
650-321-2258 ~ 650-773-0979 c ~ 650-321-2533 f ~ rob@hendersonsfis.com ~ www.hendersonsfis.com
We also can protect your family by offering individual life insurance and long-term care. Please reach out if you have questions, or want a quote!!

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This email communication may contain private, confidential, or legally privileged information intended for the sole use of the designated and/or duly authorized recipient(s). If you are not the intended recipient or have received this email in error, please notify the sender immediately by email and permanently delete all copies of this email including all attachments without reading them. If you are the intended recipient, secure the contents in a manner that conforms to all applicable state and/or federal requirements related to privacy and confidentiality of such information.

From: Will Peterson <will.f.peterson@gmail.com>
Sent: 2/1/2023 5:07:06 PM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: Homewood Mountain Resort

I want to express my frustration with the new developments regarding proposed privatization of the Homewood ski hill.

I've spent my whole life in love with the opportunities Homewood has offered during my time at my grandparents' cabin on Sacramento Ave right at the foot of the hill. To think that these developers could come in and totally alter the plan that had received initial approvals is mind-boggling.

There is not a single iota of the Homewood tradition and culture that fits into this "playground of the rich and famous" plan Mohari has for the hill.

Please, do what is right and disavow these unheralded and completely nonsensical changes to the master plan.

In peace,
Will F. Peterson

From: Wechter Debra <dgwechter@aol.com>
Sent: 2/1/2023 9:25:25 PM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: Homewood privatization

I have been a homeowner in Homewood for over 30 years and am appalled at the lack of foresight in decision making about the Homewood ski area. I am writing to demand that the new Homewood development plan proposed by JMA Ventures be squashed. The reasons are legion, foremost the fact that this plan is not the same as the original agreed to by the community many years ago. There are other significant issues including traffic, ease of evacuation in case of fire, effects on the ecosystem, privatization and therefore exclusion of the community from unfettered use of a local ski area. It is hard to conceive how this plan can be construed as an overall benefit to our local communities. Recently, we learned that a majority of the interest in this project has been sold to Mohari, a company based in Cyprus. Even the most basic internet research, and just watching the recent 60 Minutes show about Cyprus, reveal some disturbing possibilities about this organization which merit further research.

I urge you to listen to the concerns of the citizens whose interests TRPA was set up to protect.

Debra G Wechter, MD

From: bryan baldi <bryan_baldi2002@yahoo.com>
Sent: 2/1/2023 5:09:29 PM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: Homewood Privatization

To Whom it may concern,

I wanted to introduce myself and send a note of dismay in regards to the privatization of Homewood Mountain Resort.

I own a home in Chamberlands just South of Homewood.

My family first began visiting Chamberlands 40 years ago where we fell in love with the West Shore. My mother and father in-law also own a home in Meeks Bay (since 1973). My wife and I grew up loving the summer, winter and fall in Lake Tahoe.

In the summer, we hike and bike at Homewood ski resort and enjoy the tranquility and views from the mountain. In the winter we ski Homewood with my wife and 3 younger children. We have many friends and family that join us during the summer and winter months, all enjoying Homewood.

This is our local ski resort where my 3 kids learned to ski and they currently call their 'home mountain'. We also have friends with boats that dock and have buoys at the Homewood marina where we meet them for rides. We loved (we were there on closing night) West Shore Cafe and dressing up for a nice dinner or ordering out for pickup on the lake (via boat).

Homewood is cherished by so many and taking it private would absolutely ruin the vibe of the West shore for years to come.

Please don't take our mountain away and my family is vehemently against this project!

Thank you for listening.

Bryan Baldi

From: Ken Rowles <ChambersTahoe61@outlook.com>
Sent: 2/1/2023 2:44:43 PM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>; Steve Buelna <sbuelna@placer.ca.gov>
Subject: Homewood project PLN22-00534

In the past 11 years, Lake Tahoe has almost never been full and the region has been in a drought for nearly the entire time and continues to be today. The 2012 Homewood plan does not meaningfully anticipate nor address a drought, water usage, water sourcing or water impact remediation in a way that matches the current reality, so it is out of date. Adding a lot of unaffordable, heavily landscaped housing that uses a lot of water (while farmers just over the mountains can't even plant) in the midst of a long term drought lacks common sense. Especially when the Palisades proposed development could use more water each day than all of the current residents of the region. If developers Art Chapman and Mohari care about the community and truly want to be a part of it long term, they should be aggressively leading the charge against the Palisades plan that will likely cause local residents to have to refrain from using water and put many local businesses out of business, possibly even their new Homewood Resort.

Since 2012, the region has suffered horrific fire damage and recently has been threatened each year. The 2012 plan does not contemplate wildfire risk like what we have recently experienced in the past 12 years so again, the plan is out of date. Adding even more responsibility to the already strained fire fighting and prevention resources makes no sense and puts all existing tax paying homeowners at risk and puts the cost on these same people while a foreign funded developer pays nothing.

Since 2012, traffic in the region has increased so that traffic on Lake Boulevard is a daily occurrence throughout the year. It is now common to experience hour long delays during busy times. If a fire were to start at a busy time, it would be catastrophic. The 2012 plan does not accurately contemplate how traffic actually is today and will only exacerbate this issue. Local long term tax paying residents shouldn't have to pay for a problem that a foreign funded developer is making much worse.

A lot has happened since 2012, there is no way that an 11 year old plan accurately anticipated all of the changes. It would be great to see an improved Homewood resort and an up to date plan that doesn't use all of our resources and stick us with the tax bill. A lot of what is on Mohari's website sounds great, but why is there such a rush to try and quickly jam through an out of date plan with a foreign funded developer that no one knows anything about?

From: Patti Doherty <pattidoherty1@comcast.net>
Sent: 2/1/2023 4:38:15 PM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Cc: Steve Buelna <sbuelna@placer.ca.gov>;
Subject: Homewood

Hello

I also am writing you to voice my opposition to the new Homewood Resort Project. The new proposal , “ Modern Mountain” , is vastly different from the previous 2011 approved plans and should not be permitted to go forward. The newly designed cubist buildings are more appropriate for an urban development than our beloved Lake Tahoe community. Square boxes on a hillside do not fit in Lake Tahoe . Just putting the word Mountain in front of the word Modern does not make it acceptable. The original plans complimented our surroundings and blended in with the terrain. They were what we what we have all come know and to love as “Tahoe Style”. Have to wonder why these plans changed given that the majority of the community endorsed them.

I am concerned that an international middle eastern development company , Mohari, is now the majority shareholder in Homewood. Of course they should make a profit but I can’t help but think that their driving concern will be to make a buck, not how can we preserve the beauty and serve the Lake Tahoe community. The community was not consulted about these changes and it appears that they were trying to swiftly get these new, very different plans approved.

Lastly, the idea of making this a members only ski resort is repugnant. Privatizing a ski resort that has served ALL of the community is a slap in that face of those of us who have been invested in our community and are working to make it better. Mr. Chapman has been citing traffic as one of the reasons for privatization. However, he would be in fact telling the locals that they now have to travel 45 minutes, at a minimum, to ski in Tahoe. What would that do to the traffic problems at Palisades and NorthStar? Privatization creates traffic problems, doesn’t fix them. A membership only Homewood creates a greater divide between the have and have nots and serves no one. It’s not who we are. **We are one community wanting what’s best for everyone. Don’t let greed and exclusivity take over Homewood.**

Thank you,

Ed Doherty
340 Tanager
Tahoma. CA

From: Mary <maryransom@gmail.com>
Sent: 2/1/2023 10:29:22 AM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: Opposing privatization of Homewood ski area

My family has owned a cabin nearby and we all grew up skiing at Homewood. How sad for my grandchildren and great grandchildren not to be able to ski at this beloved area. Please stop the privatization. Thank you.

Mary Ransom

Sent from my iPhone

From: James Margolis <jamadapa@att.net>
Sent: 2/1/2023 1:44:18 PM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: Privatization

I'm a retired patroller from Homewood and a property owner on the West shore. I fully support Homewood's real estate and ski area development, but STRONGLY opposed to privatization. This already threatened to take away my life pass which I earned with 30+ years of service. I am also concerned that this will prevent my friends and neighbors from being able to ski at Homewood
Sent from my iPhone

From: Jennifer Funk <jenniferkfunk@gmail.com>
Sent: 2/1/2023 9:13:37 AM
To: Michele Thompson <mlthompson49@gmail.com>
Cc: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>; Jeffrey Holifield <jeff_holifield@live.com>; Kevin Foster <kevinfoster3489@yahoo.com>;
Subject: Re: Homewood Development

To Whom It May Concern,

As a Tahoma resident, I've become aware of the new plans to privatize the Homewood area that differs greatly from the development plans submitted in 2011.

I have grave concerns RE: the ramifications on the environment, the building/pavement to nature ratio and not to mention, the negative impact this could have on the traffic in/out of this area.

Homewood is a very quaint family town. Would be a shame to lose that sense of charm and community that Homewood and nearby areas are known for and a big reason many folks prefer this area.

Wholehearted agree with Michele's comments:

"These new plans don't seem to accomplish any of the previously approved benefits to the community. As I understood it, the prior plans were approved as they were deemed environmentally sound while providing beneficial services to the community (eg./ housing, hardware store, ice cream shop, ice rink, amphitheatre, boat storage, skiing etc..).

Please advise as to what rigor is underway to ensure the beauty and community of Homewood is retained?

KEEP HOMEWOOD BLUE!"

Jennifer Funk
Tahoma Resident

On Mon, Jan 30, 2023 at 9:57 AM Michele Thompson <mlthompson49@gmail.com> wrote:
To Whom It May Concern,

As a Homewood resident I have big concerns regarding the new plans to privatize the area, dramatically changing the development plans submitted in 2011.

These new plans don't seem to accomplish any of the previously approved benefits to the community. As I understood it, the prior plans were approved as they were deemed environmentally sound while providing beneficial services to the community (eg./ housing, hardware store, ice cream shop, ice rink, amphitheatre, boat storage, skiing etc..).

It seems the new plans consist of a gated/exclusive community, with a questionable building/pavement to nature ratio.

Please advise as to what rigor is underway to ensure the beauty and community of Homewood is retained?

KEEP HOMEWOOD BLUE!

Best Regards,
Michele Thompson
Lagoon Street

From: PETE MURCHISON <murchisonp@comcast.net>
Sent: 2/1/2023 11:35:10 AM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Cc: Conor Murchison <conor.murchison@gmail.com>; shane murchison <shanemurchison7@yahoo.com>;
Subject: Tahoe Development Project

TRPA: I am suprized to hear people in the Timberland community frustrated with a growing urge to fight against changes from the original Homewood approved project from 2011 and the privatization of Homewood. I thought most West coast locals had originally Ok'd this project. Now a sense is that big money and goverment agency's are working against local home owners to lock out thier families from ever accessing the mountain.

The first large issue is transparency about what appears to be a bait and switch process. Why are some HOA commuintes hearing about new proposals and others communities nothing. Chambers landing hearing some limited info vs Timberland that has received nothing? Our former HOA s leaders are not hearing anything as the 145 homeowners just a couple miles from the project. Does this mean certain communities are in fror access to year ski passes and others are not? Which ones? Will it be people like us directly affected by increase traffic from Tahoe City to Homewood that do not have access?

I and others are hoping to see TRPA leadership at the next meeting. Would you please forward any information to me about future meetings, decisions made, and changing proposals regarding Homewood. To my e-m and family cc'd here.

Pete Murchison: Tahoe address of Conor Murchison
745 Sugarpine Road
Homewood 96145

Pete Murchison
4882 Richmond ave
Fremont Ca 94536

From: Ed Apodaca <apodaca.ed@gmail.com>
Sent: 2/2/2023 11:40:31 AM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: Development at Homewood

As someone who is owned a cabin in Homewood, for nearly 15 years, I am concerned with the latest development ideas for the Homewood ski resort. I find it hard to believe with the amount of money the investment company is talking about spending they have no idea what the local membership will look like, surely they must have some sense of overall project cost. They act as if they are completely committed to this private club model but didn't they seem equally committed to the plan approved in 2011 it makes me wonder what I can believe?

My main concern is what they are talking about doing will permanently change the character of Homewood and the West Shore. This part of Tahoe has always been quiet and family friendly, away from the crowds, gambling and large scale development. Decisions made should be thought about generationally, and not just with a concern with a short term profit because it will be impossible to go back once major changes have been made.

Ed Apodaca
330 tanager Dr
Homewood, CA

From: Maria Bizzack <mbbizzack@gmail.com>
Sent: 2/2/2023 12:34:05 PM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: Homewood Resort / Private Resort

Dear TRPA,

My parents, Gerald and June Bishop have been property owners in Rubicon Bay for 55+ years. My husband and I, James & Maria Bishop Bizzack, have owned property for 27 years. We are also seasonal residents (5 months a year) in the Rubicon Park Estate neighborhood. You might say our families have a horse in this race!!

WE STRONGLY OPPOSE turning Homewood Resort into a private club. The addition of a clubhouse, 170 homes, restaurants and additional buildings will create a horrific traffic issue!! Highway 89 is already HEAVILY TRAVELED. Redesigning/rebranding and building a "new" private Homewood resort will be detrimental to the west shore and the charm it holds. Why do you think all of us chose the west shore as our home? It's the best shore and **WE DO NOT WANT IT TO BECOME LIKE SOUTH LAKE TAHOE.** With traffic brings pedestrians, lots of them!! People running across the street with their coolers and beach chairs, little kids etc. It's a recipe for disaster!!! No good will come out of this!! Please do not allow this development to go through.

Regards,

Maria Bishop Bizzack

From: Ed Ransom <edransom95249@gmail.com>
Sent: 2/2/2023 12:55:13 PM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Cc: Sue Wilson <billandsuewilson@gmail.com>; Rich Ransom <rransom@sbbmail.com>; Mary Ransom <maryransom@gmail.com>; Jennifer Malena <jennifer.malena@icloud.com>;
Subject: Homewood ski privatetazation.

My siblings and I have enjoyed our cabin on Lagoon for almost 60 years. Our children and grand children learned to ski there while I taught skiing to the public.
Please don't ruin Homewood's legacy by restricting access to members only.
Edward Ransom

Sent from my iPhone

From: Chet Hee <chee03@gmail.com>
Sent: 2/3/2023 1:22:16 PM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: Homewood development

Hello,

Can you please add me to the updates email list?

Thank you,

Chet Hee

From: Cindy Campi <cindy@via-gardendesign.com>
Sent: 2/3/2023 12:23:20 PM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>; Steve Buelna <sbuelna@placer.ca.gov>
Subject: Homewood -PLN22-00534
Attachments: [Screen Shot 2016-02-16 at 8.53.27 AM.png](#)

Hello,

I am a resident on the west shore and would like updated information regarding the Proposed or Approved project at the Homewood Ski Resort.

The TRPA site shows the old plan, my understanding is that the plans have been modified with a more modern architectural style and other changes. I have also been informed that a foreign company has purchased the project.

As the only ski resort on the west shore, and as a vital part of the west shore community, any plans for making Homewood a private and expensive resort is concerning and not in the interest of the community or Lake Tahoe.

Questions:

What is the status?

Are there additional public hearings or meetings?

Is the privatization plan finalized?

What HOA's on the West Shore will have access to the ski resort?

Will there be public space?

Does the plan include housing for employees?

Thank you,

Cindy Campi



Cindy Campi
650-255-3159
via-gardendesign.com

From: Lori Murphy <lmurphy@trgn.com>
Sent: 2/4/2023 12:58:00 PM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: Homewood Development Activities

TRPA -

"We want to make sure that whatever happens is in keeping with the character of the Homewood/Tahoma community."

- TRPA spokesperson Julie Regan, 2008

I want to express my concern about the "Evolution" of the Homewood Mountain & Lake Club. The new, modern design belongs outside the community of Homewood/Tahoma. The original 2011 plans were designed in the "Old Tahoe" style and have mysteriously changed without community input. Discovery Land Company and JMA Ventures have done a sneaky job of squeezing out the local community and making this modern project an exclusive, elite, members-only club with no community input.

My family built a home in Chamberlands in the early 1980s, following all the TRPA rules. It was a long, painful process, but we played by the rules. Now, these developers can do whatever they want? The west side of Lake Tahoe is a quiet, family-oriented, old Tahoe community. We have skied at Homewood for years. With the proposed plans, we could only ski on weekdays every few weeks, but no guarantees. What the heck?

I urge you to reign in these developers, return to the 2011 plans, and keep Homewood Ski Resort a classic family-friendly ski resort for the community. These developers are trying to exclude the existing homeowners and are not interested in our values and idea of community. Their only goal is to create and market elite, exclusive, modern homes/resorts and make money. They could care less about the rest of us. Please, save our community.

Sincerely,
Lori Murphy

From: Matthew Johnson <matty1157@hotmail.com>
Sent: 2/4/2023 6:36:29 AM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: Homewood Plan

Hi TRPA,

Please don't allow Homewood to become a private ski resort for the rich. This resort should be enjoyed by all and if the Homewood submits formally plans otherwise please ensure that locals can vote for and against it.

I learned to ski at Homewood and hope my kids will do the same in the near future.

Best Regards,
Matthew from Tahoma

Sent from my iPhone

From: Snamwob <snamwob@comcast.net>
Sent: 2/5/2023 7:55:24 AM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Cc: Matt Bowman <bowman.matthew7@gmail.com>; Andrew Bowman <andrew.bowman@gmail.com>; Vicky Harrison <vlh1@comcast.net>; Mary Murphy <memurphy21@me.com>; Annie Bowman <annie@sunrisehome.com>;
Subject: Homewood Plan

I have been a homeowner in Rubicon since 1995. My children grew up skiing
At Homewood and now my grandchildren and nieces are getting big enough to ski there as well.

We watched as the plan to develop was presented to the community over 10 years ago. I hoped that any plan to increase
growth and traffic on the Westshore would be appealing and in sync with the historical Ski area at Homewood.

I have just learned that major changes are proposed to that plan.

When we skied there during Christmas 2022 we saw no information about the
Changes to the original plan.

What happens at Homewood will have a major impact on the Westshore.

I object to the plan that I have reviewed so far and would like the plan
To be suspended while current public input can be received.

Stephen M Bowman
8801 Victoria Circle
Rubicon

From: THOMAS BROWN <trbjbb@aol.com>
Sent: 2/6/2023 7:18:44 PM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Cc: kevinfoster3849@yahoo.com <kevinfoster3849@yahoo.com>;
Subject: Comment

This is clearly an effort to benefit a few, the Mahari a Cyprus based development company, at the expense of many Tahoe residents and incoming visitors who have long enjoyed the Homewood Mountain Resort.

Tahoe is enhanced by its environmental beauty and historical open space. Time causes change but radical development is inconsistent with retaining what has and can continue to be what is so special about this region.

Yes we have long had South Shore casinos and a few at North Shore but significant new North and particularly West Shore development has been well controlled.

We urge you to resist the temptation to radically impact the West Shore by approving this Homewood development.

Tom and Joan Brown
Chambers Landing #26

Sent from my iPad
Tom Brown

From: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Sent: 2/6/2023 8:50:59 AM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: FW: Homewood Mountain Resort

From: Cathy Bean <cathybean1@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, February 3, 2023 2:16 PM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Subject: Homewood Mountain Resort

Dear Mr. Nielsen,

As we have been Homewood residents for over 60 years, we feel an urgent need to continue to share our interests relative to the proposed Homewood Mountain Resort project. In previous letters submitted by my husband, myself and a number of community members, we have cited a number of concerns related to the Homewood Mountain Resort plans currently being considered by TRPA and the Placer County Planning Department as they relate to the original 2011 Homewood Mountain Resort Master Plan, Community Enhancement Project, and the proposed privatization of the resort. Based upon what we now believe to be true, JMA and Mohari Hospitality are intending to move forward with a project that is significantly inconsistent with the originally approved plans, and will jeopardize the overall well-being of the community and the environment.

This letter is written in efforts to urge TRPA and the Placer County Planning Department to bring the proposed plans for the Homewood Mountain Resort project including the privatization of the ski resort to an open, in person forum prior to taking any further action. This will allow for public comment regarding the impacts and effects of the proposed changes to Homewood Mountain Resort Master Plan and related facilities. The overall well-being of our community is extremely important to us and we believe that by working together, we can find agreements and solutions that will benefit all involved.

Thank you very much.

Cathy and Don Bean
Cathybean1@gmail.com
5285 Sacramento Ave.
Homewood
530.416.2375

From: James Lyon <jim@lyonfamily.tv>
Sent: 2/6/2023 7:40:56 PM
To: Cindy.Gustafson <cindygustafson@placer.ca.gov>; Hayley Williamson <hayley.a.williamson@gmail.com>; Shelly Aldean <shellyaldean@gmail.com>; Francisco Aguilar <cisco@sos.nv.gov>; Ashley Conrad-Saydah <ashley@alumni.princeton.edu>; jdiss.trpa@gmail.com <jdiss.trpa@gmail.com>; Belinda Faustinos <belindafastinos@gmail.com>; John Friedrich <jfriedrich@cityofslt.us>; Bud Hicks <ajhicks@Mcdonaldcarano.com>; Alexis Hill <AHill@washoecounty.us>; Vince Hoenigman <vhoenigman@yahoo.com>; James Settelmeyer <JSettelmeyer@dcnr.nv.gov>; Brooke Laine <BOSFive@edcgov.us>; Wesley Rice <wrice@douglasnv.us>; info@waltonae.com <info@waltonae.com>; SupervisorGore@Placer.CA.Gov <SupervisorGore@Placer.CA.Gov>; slandon@placer.ca.gov <slandon@placer.ca.gov>; suzannejones@placer.ca.gov <suzannejones@placer.ca.gov>; Beverly Roberts <BRoberts@placer.ca.gov>
Cc: Brendan Ferry <Brendan.Ferry@edcgov.us>; Jennifer Carr <jcarr@ndep.nv.gov>; ElleryStahler <estahler@lands.nv.gov>; Hilary Roverud <hroverud@cityofslt.us>; Jason Drew <jdrew@ncenet.com>; Susan Chandler <susanekesslerchandler@gmail.com>; Crystal Jacobsen <CJacobse@placer.ca.gov>; Judy Simon <judymike@mac.com>; Kevin Hill <nvwlfpack@icloud.com>; Ben Letton <ben.letton@waterboards.ca.gov>; Eric Young <EYoung@washoecounty.us>; Kmoneil <Kmoneil@douglasnv.us>; Heather Ferris <hferris@carson.org>; Kevin Drake <kevin@alibi.beer>; Garth Alling <galling@sierraecotonesolutions.com>; Eric Guevin <eguevin@tahoefire.com>; ExecutiveAssistant Washoe <executive.assistant@washoetribe.us>; Steve Teshara <SteveTeshara@gmail.com>; Steve Buelna <sbuelna@placer.ca.gov>; pnielsen@trpa.gov <pnielsen@trpa.gov>; HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>;
Subject: Homewood Mountain Resort

To:

TRPA Governing Board
TRPA Advisory Planning Commission
Placer County Board of Supervisors
Placer County Tahoe Basin Design Review Committee

I have major concerns over recent developments regarding the implementation of the Homewood Mountain Resort Master Plan. JMA Ventures is not following the Master Plan as approved in 2021 both in terms of conditional use and architecture.

While there is no formal submission, it has been made clear by Art Chapman of JMA Ventures that he plans to take Homewood Mountain Resort private and exclusive. JMA has partnered with Discovery Land and Mohari, a Cypress based PE firm – both of whom are actively marketing Homewood as an exclusive private resort. (<https://discoverylandco.com/communities/homewood-club-1> <https://www.welcometohomewood.com/>).

"The new development will have a strong focus on exclusivity." — Mohari, main equity investor since 2022

"At Homewood, members can expect the privacy, exclusivity, five-star service that define Discovery Land Company." — Homewood Project Overview, 2022

In a response to my letter of public comment to TRPA, Mr. Chapman wrote:

"It needs a new model to survive. As proposed, the new model will be membership-oriented with both a resident and non-resident component."

"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)."

"As proposed, local residents will still have an opportunity to ski at Homewood on select non-holiday weekdays every few weeks."

JMA Ventures continues to raise traffic from I80 and SR89 as why people don't come and ski at Homewood and why they can't make money. This is a ruse. The Homewood clientele has always been drawn from local residence between Tahoe City 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, the JMA informal 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⁾".

Homewood is a desirable place to ski – I have been skiing there since I learned to ski on the rope tow in 1968. But Homewood has outdated infrastructure due to lack of investment. 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 (the 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 – no action nor replacement. Why would skiers want to come to a run down resort? Comparing 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. JMA has jacked lift prices to the highest in the country!

Frankly, the JMA 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. JMA committed to providing community benefit with the approval of the Master Plan. The elimination of public skiing and moving to a membership model adversely impacts the community and provides no benefit.

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

My other concern is the architecture style of the 2021 approval of 7 homes and the recent submission for the next phase (PLN22-00534). 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 that was approved by TRPA and Placer County. This is a bait and switch. Seven cookie cutter modern boxes do not create a "residential enclave designed to compliment the existing neighborhood⁽⁴⁾" TRPA and Placer County DRC should be enforcing the architectural design committed in the Master Plan.

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 both in terms of conditional use and architectural design, thus the TRPA and Placer County should direct JMA to follow and enforce the Master Plan as approved.

If JMA wants to make changes, then they should submit a new Master Plan and the entire project should be re-opened to public review and reconsideration.

Regards,

Jim Lyon
Chamberlands
Tahoma, California

Reference:

1. Master Plan for Homewood Mountain Resort, August 2011 – Page 3
2. Master Plan for Homewood Mountain Resort, August 2011 – Page 2
3. Master Plan for Homewood Mountain Resort, August 2011 – Page 28
4. Master Plan for Homewood Mountain Resort, August 2011 – Page 38

From: Denise Fitzgerald <Denise@landesign-inc.com>
Sent: 2/6/2023 10:56:21 AM
To: Steve Buelna <sbuelna@placer.ca.gov>; HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Cc: John Fitzgerald <John@landesign-inc.com>;
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.

John and Denise Fitzgerald
5596 Lagoon Road
Homewood, CA 96141

From: Judy Neel <jwaughneel@prodigy.net>
Sent: 2/6/2023 2:46:08 PM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Cc: Steve Buelna <sbuelna@placer.ca.gov>; cjacobsen@placer.ca.gov <cjacobsen@placer.ca.gov>; Don Ashton <Don.Ashton@edcgov.us>; karen.feathers@edcgov.us <karen.feathers@edcgov.us>;
Subject: TRPA Public Hearing Homewood Mountain Resort Master Plan
Attachments: [Homewood Master Plan .docx](#)

Sent from my iPad

Subject: TRPA Public Hearing to Consider Changes to the Homewood Mountain Resort Ski Area Master Plan

To Whom It May Concern:

I attempted to review the proposed changes to the Homewood Mountain Resort Master Plan with an open mind, but I soon realized the proposed changes did not reflect a development that the community and the entire basin would be proud to see built. While the original plan would have changed the mountain and, mostly, the northern base area, many concessions were made through public input. The architecture, traffic, noise, and run off contamination were all addressed and appeared to result in a development that fit into the community and would enhance the local economy. However, the sale of the property seems to have removed the historical knowledge of the process from all involved. The Placer County's Design Review Committee quietly approved changes that were not acceptable during the original approval process. The resulting project does NOT fit in with the community, does NOT maintain a scale consistent with the original Master Plan and, most importantly, does NOT protect the groundwater and the lake itself.

Based upon the aforementioned items, I am fervently requesting that TRPA:

1. question the applicability of the existing environmental documents;
2. question the validity of the County's Committee's actions in approving the design review changes to the Master Plan, contrary to prior concessions by the public, TRPA, and the previous owners;
3. require the initiation of an Amendment to the FEIS/EIR; and,
4. request further studies (traffic, noise, water quality) addressing the proposed changes to the previously approved Master Plan.

Five generations of our family have spent summers at Lake Tahoe, and, since 1975, when my husband and I built our current home, have been residents of the West Shore. We watched as changes occurred along the West Shore. We expected that some of those changes would affect Homewood. We appeal to the TRPA, Placer and El Dorado Counties, respectively, to make sure those changes meet the scale of the mountain and the surrounding communities. Please respect those communities and the people living here by protecting the West Shore and the beauty of our wonderful Lake Tahoe for future generations.

Respectfully submitted,

Judith W. Neel

Cc: Steve Buelner—Placer County
Crystal Jacobsen—Placer County
Karen Feathers—El Dorado County
Don Ashton—El Dorado County

From: Darren Kramer <Darren@obexersboat.com>
Sent: 2/7/2023 3:42:59 PM
To: Jeff Cowen <jcowen@trpa.gov>; HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: [BULK] RE: Homewood Mountain Resort - Public Comments
Attachments: [image001.png](#), [3 1 11_letter_supporting_homewood TRPA.docx](#)

Jeff,

Thank you very much for the quick and detailed reply. Glad to hear the formal review hasn't started and the community will have a chance to provide input. I will keep an eye out for updates.

I did see they broke ground in the Fall on the north side of Homewood in the gravel lot to the west of the old Maritime Museum, any idea what that is for? I assume something part of the previous approved plans?

Randomly I was actually writing a letter of recommendation for a former staff member for his college applications and came across a letter that our owner, Sarah Obexer and her late husband, had written in support of the Homewood Project back in March of 2011, see attached. Coincidentally this shows our unwavering support for the project when we, the Tahoe Community and its visitors, were being pitched by Art Chapman of JMA on their Master Plan which was to be open to the public and how without the improvements the business was not sustainable. Fast forward 12 years and they again say the business is not viable which is not surprising since they have not followed through with any of their approved improvements from over a decade ago. The same reasons we supported the project in 2011 are the same reasons we don't support the project now as it is completely against what they had planned to do and does not benefit the public or the community in any way as they told us it all would.

Respectfully,

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: Jeff Cowen <jcowen@trpa.gov>
Sent: Thursday, February 2, 2023 10:37 AM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: Homewood Mountain Resort - Public Comments

Thank you for your email about a proposal from Homewood Mountain Resort to make changes to its 2011 master plan. We understand the Homewood resort means a great deal to the community and to Lake Tahoe's cultural heritage.

Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA) planners are currently working to determine what the process, timeline, and public input opportunities will be for the proposed changes to be considered. To be clear, there have not been any TRPA meetings on this proposal and the agency has not started a formal review process. Once the agency receives more information, planners will consider what impact the proposed changes might have on the resort Master Plan and the Tahoe Basin. As part of the process, the agency will ensure community input is gathered and collaboration with partner agencies and organizations continues.

In anticipation of a process, we have opened a [Homewood Mountain Resort page](#) on our website under Major Projects where your comment letters and other documents and information will remain posted to ensure an open dialogue continues.

We appreciate your input and the time you have taken to reach out to us. Please direct all future emails to us at homewoodplan@trpa.gov and watch for emails from us with updates and possible opportunities for your input.

Regards,

Jeff W Cowen
Public Information Officer
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
775.589.5278



trpa.gov[facebook](#)[twitter](#)[instagram](#)

March 1, 2001

Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
c/o David Landry
PO Box 5310
Stateline, NV 89449

Re: Support of Homewood Mtn. Resort Master Plan

Tahoe Regional Planning Agency,

This letter is to memorialize the fact that Obexer's Boat Co. is in full support of the Homewood Mountain Resort Master Plan. As we begin to celebrate our 100th year in business on Lake Tahoe's West Shore we feel it is prudent to convey our position regarding the proposed development. Homewood's proposed expansion and renovation is a must to keep Tahoe's West Shore businesses viable and feasible. Operating a breakeven or marginally successful year round business is extremely difficult as it is currently; if Homewood is not allowed to improve their facility in a manner that will attract enough visitors to make a profit, they too will be forced to shut down. The closing of Homewood Mountain Resort will have profound adverse effects on the local and visiting West Shore community.

It is our opinion the development and enhancement proposal by JMA is well thought out and has taken into great consideration the environmental and community impact. The increased forest management and reduction of potentially devastating forest fuels alone is a just one of the many reasons we are in full support. How many Angora disasters can we afford? The West Shore is in need of more destination oriented visitors, without them even more businesses will be forced to close their doors. For these reasons, Obexer's Boat Company is in full support of the Homewood Master Plan.

Please feel free to contact us with any questions at (530) 525-7962.

Sincerely,

Sarah Obexer & Keith Fields

Owner/CEO
Obexer's Boat Co
Phone 530-525-7962
Fax 530-525-0703

Cc: Placer County Planning Agency

From: Denise Incerpi <dincerpi@gmail.com>
Sent: 2/8/2023 8:04:34 PM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: Development at Homewood

This Development should not be allowed. This development was told and sold to us locals that this ski area would be for everyone, not just the elite only. For us that live on the West shore of lake Tahoe, this would be a travesty, and the rich people would win again , Please vote NO

--

Denise Incerpi

From: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Sent: 2/8/2023 3:13:16 PM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: FW: [BULK] Homewood ski resort

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

From: Elaine Mccarthy
Sent: Wednesday, February 8, 2023 3:05 PM
To: Paul Nielsen
Subject: [BULK] Homewood ski resort

Mr. Nielsen, Mr. Buelna and Ms Gustafson:

I am writing to express my concerns with the current direction of the Homewood Mountain Resort.

Homewood Resort developers publicly stated plans for the property differ in material ways from the Master Plan ([https://www.skihomewood.com/wp-content/uploads/Homewood-Mountain-Resort-Ski-Area-Master-Plan-Details- Updated-10-04-20112.pdf](https://www.skihomewood.com/wp-content/uploads/Homewood-Mountain-Resort-Ski-Area-Master-Plan-Details-Updated-10-04-20112.pdf)) previously approved by TRPA. Specifically:

- a. Developer Art Chapman of JMA Ventures has stated in writing that the ski area and related amenities will be closed to the general public. This is unacceptable. Non-Homewood residents and guests must be allowed to ski, hike, and bike on Homewood lands, and enjoy the approved amenities.
 - b. TRPA has approved initial development in a mountain modern architectural style. This is unacceptable. The originally approved plan specified a classic old Tahoe lodge architectural style.
 - c. Regulator discussions with developers have not been as transparent to the public as they should be.
- In addition, the approved plans for workforce housing and traffic mitigation are outdated and insufficient. TRPA and Placer County should require a re- plan addressing these. I and my neighbors will be monitoring progress on this project.

Elaine McCarthy
7078 5th ave
7074 5th Ave
Tahoma CA

Sent from my iPhone

From: Eric Engstrom <ericallenengstrom@gmail.com>
Sent: 2/8/2023 3:26:35 PM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: Homewood plan

I'd like to be on the mailing list. Thanks, Eric Engstrom, 8691 Mountain Drive, Tahoma, CA

Sent from my iPad

From: Diana Caldeira <dcaldeira722@gmail.com>
Sent: 2/8/2023 3:38:49 PM
To: Steve Buelna <sbuelna@placer.ca.gov>; HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: PLN22-00534

February 8, 2023

Steve Buelna and TRPA Members,

This letter is in reference to **PLN22-00534**. My family has been a member of the Tahoe community since 1964. We own two homes in Rubicon and are members of Rubicon Tahoe Owners (RTO). Multiple generations of our family have grown up in this beautiful place. We learned to ski at Homewood and have spent literally decades enjoying not only the proximity to our homes, but the beauty of this special mountain.

What is currently being proposed is the elimination of our access to Homewood. Making the mountain unusable, either by making the cost of skiing too high or making it entirely private, is unacceptable. The addition of thousands of people to the West Shore in the form of homes and traffic would cause a safety issue and change the whole nature of the area.

I adamantly oppose the new plans and business model, which have clearly changed and are not in synchrony with the original spirit of the approved plan, until they are subject to a full review by Placer County and TRPA with the input of the West Shore community.

Sincerely,
Diana Caldeira

From: Whitney Booth <w.peel@comcast.net>
Sent: 2/8/2023 11:56:44 AM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>; Steve Buelna <sbuelna@placer.ca.gov>
Subject: Privatization of Homewood Mountain Resort

Dear Steve,

I am writing to you today as a concerned homeowner and 4th generation resident of the West Shore. I grew up spending summers on the lake and winters learning to ski at Homewood. My husband and I purchased our own home in 2013 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 Kings Beach Elementary School – we feel very lucky 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. We were promised a Community Enhancement Project when the 2011 Master Plan was approved.

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.

~ Whitney Booth

From: Austin Payne <chambersdreamin@gmail.com>
Sent: 2/8/2023 11:29:04 PM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: Updates

Hi

Please put me on the distribution for the Homewood plan.

Thanks,
Meghan

From: Jennifer McCausland <mccausland4@yahoo.com>
Sent: 2/9/2023 2:45:33 PM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>; Steve Buelna <sbuelna@placer.ca.gov>
Subject: Chambers Privatization - PLEASE STOP!! - Ref: PLN22-00534

I'm emailing to voice my STRONG PROTEST AGAINST THE PLANS SUBMITTED FOR HOMEWOOD MOUNTAIN BY ART CHAPMAN AND OTHERS.

My family have been residents of Homewood for generations - we have always prized this beautiful location as something not developed (specifically for the uber-wealthy) and with a small-town/local feel. Over the years small businesses and local full time residents have been pushed out in favor of an increasingly more developed and wealthy clientele who don't seem to care much about the landscape, the people, or the lake. They leave trash and dog poop everywhere!

Also, the ridiculous amount of building and development will ABSOLUTELY DESTROY the lake! How much runoff will bleed into the water and forest will have to be cut down to build - more homes!! - for an elite class of people who only look at this area as a short vacation instead of a special place that deserves to be preserved as it is - for middle class families who don't have the means of joining something like the Yellowstone Club. How can I explain to my children who have skied here their whole lives that now they can't go on a mountain that is preserved only for the rich? This is ridiculous! This drive to develop everything has to stop! We love homewood and don't want to see it destroyed or taken away and that is what you are doing!

STOP THE MADNESS! STOP THIS DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND DO THE RIGHT THING!!!

Jennifer Pierce
6190 Flicker

From: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Sent: 2/9/2023 9:16:25 AM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: FW: [BULK] Comments on Proposed Homewood Mountain Resort

From: Andrea Westberg <ajwestberg@comcast.net>
Sent: Wednesday, February 8, 2023 3:54 PM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>; sbulna@placer.ca.gov; supervisor@supervisors@placer.ca.gov
Subject: [BULK] Comments on Proposed Homewood Mountain Resort

Mr. Nielsen, Mr. Buelna and Ms Gustafson:

We are writing to express our concerns with the current direction of the Homewood Mountain Resort.

Homewood Resort developers' publicly-stated plans for the property differ in material ways from the Master Plan (<https://www.skihomewood.com/wp-content/uploads/Homewood-Mountain-Resort-Ski-Area-Master-Plan-Details-Updated-10-04-20112.pdf>) previously approved by TRPA. Specifically:

1. Developer Art Chapman of JMA Ventures has stated in writing that the ski area and related amenities will be closed to the general public. This is unacceptable. Non-Homewood residents and guests must be allowed to ski, hike, and bike on Homewood lands, and enjoy the approved amenities.
2. TRPA has approved initial development in a "mountain modern" architectural style. This is unacceptable. The originally approved plan specified a "classic Old Tahoe lodge" architectural style.
3. Regulator discussions with developers have not been as transparent to the public as they should be.

In addition, the approved plans for workforce housing and traffic mitigation are outdated and insufficient. TRPA and Placer County should require a re-plan addressing these.

We and our neighbors will be monitoring progress on this project. Please add me to any public communications or lists related to this matter.

Thank you,

Gary & Andrea Westberg

7051 Bear Ave, Tahoma

From: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Sent: 2/9/2023 9:00:41 AM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: FW: [BULK] Homewood Mountain Resort

From: Brian Kruse <bk-design@comcast.net>
Sent: Wednesday, February 8, 2023 3:17 PM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>; sbulna@placer.ca.gov; supervisororgustafson@placer.ca.gov
Subject: [BULK] Homewood Mountain Resort

Mr. Nielsen, Mr. Buelna and Ms Gustafson:

I am writing to express my concerns with the current direction of the Homewood Mountain Resort. Homewood Resort developers’ publicly stated plans for the property differ in material ways from the Master Plan (<https://www.skihomewood.com/wp-content/uploads/Homewood-Mountain-Resort-Ski-Area-Master-Plan-Details-Updated-10-04-20112.pdf>) previously approved by TRPA. Specifically:

- a. Developer Art Chapman of JMA Ventures has stated in writing that the ski area and related amenities will be closed to the general public. This is unacceptable. Non-Homewood residents and guests must be allowed to ski, hike, and bike on Homewood lands, and enjoy the approved amenities.
- b. TRPA has approved initial development in a “mountain modern” architectural style. This is unacceptable. The originally approved plan specified a “classic old Tahoe lodge” architectural style.
- c. Regulator discussions with developers have not been as transparent to the public as they should be.

In addition, **the approved plans for workforce housing and traffic mitigation are outdated and insufficient.** TRPA and Placer County should require a re-plan addressing these.

I and my neighbors will be monitoring progress on this project. Please add me to any public communications or lists related to this matter.

Thank you,
Brian Kruse
7275 3rd Ave
Tahoma, CA 96142

BK design | 408.309.2341 | bk-design@comcast.net

From: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Sent: 2/9/2023 9:18:32 AM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: FW: [BULK]

From: Clark Taylor <clarktaylorseven@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 8, 2023 4:51 PM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>; sbulna@placer.ca.gov; supervisor@supervisors.org; sbulna@placer.ca.gov
Subject: [BULK]

February 8, 2023

Dear Mr. Nielsen, Mr. Buelna and Ms. Gustafson:

I am writing to express my concerns with the current direction of the Homewood Mountain Resort.

I've thought about the development of Homewood and the possibility of privatizing the Homewood Ski Bowl for the exclusive use of associated property owners. It would be a sad day when my access to the area was prohibited, as I do enjoy my ski days at the area and appreciate the convenience of having a beautiful ski area close to our Tahoma home. On days when I don't or can't ski down Homewood's face to the bottom, the chairlift ride down the hill is world-class exhilarating! I bought my first lift tickets and lessons there in the mid-sixties and have skied there for well over fifty years during nearly all of my winter trips to Tahoma. I don't mind seeing the development of trail-side homes; almost all major ski areas have them, but why privatize the area?

The developer has expressed an awareness that walk-up ticket sales have dropped precipitously from the heydays of the 60s and 70s. Well, no wonder! Daily lift-ticket prices have soared, and skiers have figured out that season passes, and on-line ticket sales offer some relief. Avid skiers know that season tickets are the way to go. They pay for themselves after a few days on the slopes - but unfortunately, they limit access to specific ski areas and discourage skiers from going elsewhere. These days, even a trip to a local ski hill for a family that just wants a day or two in the snow can wreck a budget! Can't we figure out how to keep the area open for all and increase the number of skiers through an aggressive, affordable and super-competitive lift ticket pricing strategy?

Homewood Resort developers publicly stated plans for the property differ in material ways from the Master Plan (<https://www.skihomewood.com/wpcontent/uploads/Homewood-Mountain-Resort-Ski-Area-Master-Plan-Details-Updated-10-04-20112.pdf>) previously approved by TRPA. Specifically:

- a. Developer Art Chapman of JMA Ventures has stated in writing that the ski area and related amenities will be closed to the general public. This is unacceptable. Non-Homewood residents and guests must be allowed to ski, hike, and bike on Homewood lands, and enjoy the approved amenities.
- b. TRPA has approved initial development in a mountain modern architectural style. This is unacceptable. The originally approved plan specified a _classic old Tahoe lodge_ architectural style.
- c. Regulator discussions with developers have not been as transparent to the public as they should be.

In addition, the approved plans for workforce housing and traffic mitigation are outdated and insufficient. TRPA and Placer County should require a re-plan addressing these.

I and my neighbors will be monitoring progress on this project. Please add me to any public communications or lists related to this matter.

Best wishes,
Clark & Kathy Taylor
442 Oak Street
Tahoma, CA 96142
clarktaylorseven@gmail.com
(951) 329-7551

From: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Sent: 2/9/2023 9:05:04 AM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: FW: Homewood Concerns

From: Greg Fibiger <westshore7@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 8, 2023 3:51 PM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Subject: Homewood Concerns

Dear Mr. Nielsen,

I am writing to express my concerns with the current direction of the Homewood Mountain Resort.

Homewood Resort developers publicly stated plans for the property differ in material ways from the Master Plan ([https://www.skihomewood.com/wp-content/uploads/Homewood-Mountain-Resort-Ski-Area-Master-Plan-Details- Updated-10-04-20112.pdf](https://www.skihomewood.com/wp-content/uploads/Homewood-Mountain-Resort-Ski-Area-Master-Plan-Details-Updated-10-04-20112.pdf)) previously approved by TRPA. Specifically:

- a. Developer Art Chapman of JMA Ventures has stated in writing that the ski area and related amenities will be closed to the general public. This is unacceptable. Non-Homewood residents and guests must be allowed to ski, hike, and bike on Homewood lands, and enjoy the approved amenities.
- b. TRPA has approved initial development in a “mountain modern” architecture style. This is unacceptable. The originally approved plan specified a classic “old Tahoe lodge” architectural style.
- c. Regulator discussions with developers have not been as transparent to the public as they should be.

In addition, the approved plans for workforce housing and traffic mitigation are outdated and insufficient. TRPA and Placer County should require a re- plan addressing these. My neighbors and I will be monitoring progress on this project. Please add me to any public communications or lists related to this matter.

We have been skiing Homewood for generations and absolutely adore the West Shore. Last year we made a lifetime dream come true by purchasing a modest, rustic cabin in Tahoe. A main purpose of this dream is to be able to raise our family skiing at our beloved Homewood. Please don’t allow this dream to be taken away from our community due to corporate greed. All eyes are on you and the choices you make.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,
Greg Fibiger

From: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Sent: 2/9/2023 9:18:53 AM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: FW: Homewood Development concerns

From: Michelle <michellemb@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 8, 2023 5:16 PM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>; sbulna@placer.ca.gov; supervisororgustafson@placer.ca.gov
Subject: Homewood Development concerns

Mr. Nielsen, Mr. Buelna and Ms. Gustafson:

I am writing to express my concerns with the current direction of the Homewood Mountain Resort.

Homewood Resort developers publicly stated plans for the property differ in material ways from the Master Plan ([https://www.skihomewood.com/wp-content/uploads/Homewood-Mountain-Resort-Ski-Area-Master-Plan-Details- Updated-10-04-20112.pdf](https://www.skihomewood.com/wp-content/uploads/Homewood-Mountain-Resort-Ski-Area-Master-Plan-Details-Updated-10-04-20112.pdf)) previously approved by TRPA. Specifically:

a. Developer Art Chapman of JMA Ventures has stated in writing that the ski area and related amenities will be closed to the general public. This is unacceptable. Non-Homewood residents and guests must be allowed to ski, hike, and bike on Homewood lands, and enjoy the approved amenities.

b. TRPA has approved initial development in a “mountain modern” architecture style. This is unacceptable. The originally approved plan specified a classic “old Tahoe lodge” architectural style.

c. Regulator discussions with developers have not been as transparent to the public as they should be.

In addition, the approved plans for workforce housing and traffic mitigation are outdated and insufficient. TRPA and Placer County should require a re-plan addressing these.

My neighbors and I will be monitoring progress on this project. Please add me to any public communications or lists related to this matter.

We have personally been skiing Homewood for generations and absolutely adore the West Shore. Last year I made a lifetime dream come true by purchasing a modest, rustic cabin in Tahoma. I am a proud full time resident here now. A main purpose of this dream is to be able to raise our family skiing at our beloved Homewood. Please don't allow this dream to be taken away from our community due to corporate greed. All eyes are on you and the choices you make.

Thank you for your attention to this important matter.

Sincerely,
Michelle Blondin
Antelope Way, Tahoma CA
--
Michelle

From: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Sent: 2/9/2023 9:34:01 AM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: FW: Homewood Mountain Resort Concerns

From: Stacy Guidice <stacyg@nrgdesign.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 8, 2023 10:12 PM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>; sbulna@placer.ca.gov; supervisororgustafson@placer.ca.gov
Cc: Carol Ford <indesignon@aol.com>; leslie Guidice <leslieg@nrgdesign.com>
Subject: Homewood Mountain Resort Concerns

Dear, Mr. Nielsen, Mr. Buelna and Ms Gustafson

I am writing to express my concerns with the current direction of the Homewood Mountain Resort.

Homewood Resort developers publicly stated plans for the property differ in material ways from the Master Plan (<https://www.skihomewood.com/wp-content/uploads/Homewood-Mountain-Resort-Ski-Area-Master-Plan-Details-Updated-10-04-20112.pdf>) previously approved by TRPA. Specifically:

1. Developer Art Chapman of JMA Ventures has stated in writing that the ski area and related amenities will be closed to the general public. This is unacceptable. Non-Homewood residents and guests must be allowed to ski, hike, and bike on Homewood lands, and enjoy the approved amenities.
2. TRPA has approved initial development in a mountain modern architectural style. This is unacceptable. The originally approved plan specified a classic old Tahoe lodge architectural style.
3. Regulator discussions with developers have not been as transparent to the public as they should be.

In addition, the approved plans for workforce housing and traffic mitigation are outdated and insufficient. TRPA and Placer County should require a re- plan addressing these.

I and my neighbors will be monitoring progress on this project. Please add me to any public communications or lists related to this matter.

Our grandparents built our family cabin in 1970 in Tahoma. We have been skiing Tahoe Ski Bowl and Homewood for decades. All our kids and grandkids have learned how to ski and enjoyed all that this beautiful mountain has to offer. This place is so special and essential to local home owners and keeping the Westshore Tahoe that small town destination. It would be devastating to make it a resort membership only mountain. And it would be a tragedy for all the local families that work and live in Tahoe.

Best regards,
The Guidice-Ford Family

7250 8th Avenue
Tahoma, California 96142

From: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Sent: 2/9/2023 9:16:59 AM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: FW: Homewood proposed privatization

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

From: NL Johnson
Sent: Wednesday, February 8, 2023 4:37 PM
To: Paul Nielsen ; sbulna@placer.ca.gov; supervisorgustafson@placer.ca.gov
Subject: Homewood proposed privatization

Mr. Nielsen, Mr. Buelna and Ms Gustafson: I am writing to express my concerns with the current direction of the Homewood Mountain Resort. Homewood Resort developers publicly stated plans for the property differ in material ways from the Master Plan (<https://www.skihomewood.com/wpcontent/uploads/Homewood-Mountain-Resort-Ski-Area-Master-Plan-DetailsUpdated-10-04-20112.pdf>) previously approved by TRPA.

Specifically:

a. Developer Art Chapman of JMA Ventures has stated in writing that the ski area and related amenities will be closed to the general public. This is unacceptable. Non-Homewood residents and guests must be allowed to ski, hike, and bike on Homewood lands, and enjoy the approved amenities. b. TRPA has approved initial development in a mountain modern architectural style. This is unacceptable. The originally approved plan specified a classic old Tahoe lodge architectural style. c. Regulator discussions with developers have not been as transparent to the public as they should be. In addition, the approved plans for workforce housing and traffic mitigation are outdated and insufficient. TRPA and Placer County should require a replan addressing these.

My neighbors and I will be monitoring progress on this project. Please add me to any public communications or lists related to this matter. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Nancy Johnson
7235 2nd Avenue
Tahoma CA

From: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Sent: 2/9/2023 9:16:39 AM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: FW: Homewood Resort Privatization Concerns

From: Damien Filiatrault <damien626@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 8, 2023 4:08 PM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>; sbulna@placer.ca.gov; supervisorgustafson@placer.ca.gov
Subject: Homewood Resort Privatization Concerns

Mr. Nielsen, Mr. Buelna and Ms Gustafson,

I am writing to express my concern with the plan to privatize Homewood Resort.

One of the primary reasons I bought a home in Tahoma when I started a family so that my children (ages 5 months and 4 years old) could ski at Homewood Resort as they grew up. It is very sad to think that they may not be allowed to use the mountain. In the summer we often hike in the area as well.

I really hope that you can direct the plan to allow Homewood to continue to be a public resource for the community that can be enjoyed by all, not just the super wealthy.

-Damien Filiatrault
(415) 609-0375

From: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Sent: 2/9/2023 9:19:14 AM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: FW: Homewood Ski Area Privatization
Attachments: [image001.png](#) , [Homewood privatization.pdf](#)

From: rsmolen3@comcast.net <rsmolen3@comcast.net>
Sent: Wednesday, February 8, 2023 5:33 PM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>; sbulna@placer.ca.gov; supervisor@supervisors.org; supervisor@supervisors.org
Subject: Homewood Ski Area Privatization

Mr. Nielsen, Mr. Buelna and Ms Gustafson:

I am writing to express my concerns with the current direction of the Homewood Mountain Resort.

Homewood Resort developers' publicly stated plans for the property differ in material ways from the [Master Plan](https://www.skihomewood.com/wp-content/uploads/Homewood-Mountain-Resort-Ski-Area-Master-Plan-Details-Updated-10-04-20112.pdf) (<https://www.skihomewood.com/wp-content/uploads/Homewood-Mountain-Resort-Ski-Area-Master-Plan-Details-Updated-10-04-20112.pdf>) previously approved by TRPA. Specifically:

- a. Developer Art Chapman of JMA Ventures has stated in writing that the ski area and related amenities will be closed to the general public. This is unacceptable. Non-Homewood residents and guests must be allowed to ski, hike, and bike on Homewood lands, and enjoy the approved amenities.
- b. TRPA has approved initial development in a "mountain modern" architectural style. This is unacceptable. The originally approved plan specified a "classic old Tahoe lodge" architectural style.
- c. Regulator discussions with developers have not been as transparent to the public as they should be.

In addition, the approved plans for workforce housing and traffic mitigation are outdated and insufficient. TRPA and Placer County should require a re-plan addressing these.

I and my neighbors will be monitoring progress on this project. Please add me to any public communications or lists related to this matter.

I have enjoyed skiing at Homewood since 1996 with my family and friends. It is heartbreaking to think Homewood will become just another gated community catering to the rich.

Thank you - Richard G. Smolen, 7049 10th Ave, Tahoma, CA, 96142

Mr. Nielsen, Mr. Buelna and Ms Gustafson:

I am writing to express my concerns with the current direction of the Homewood Mountain Resort.

Homewood Resort developers' publicly stated plans for the property differ in material ways from the [Master Plan](https://www.skihomewood.com/wp-content/uploads/Homewood-Mountain-Resort-Ski-Area-Master-Plan-Details-Updated-10-04-20112.pdf) (https://www.skihomewood.com/wp-content/uploads/Homewood-Mountain-Resort-Ski-Area-Master-Plan-Details-Updated-10-04-20112.pdf) previously approved by TRPA. Specifically:

- a. Developer Art Chapman of JMA Ventures has stated in writing that the ski area and related amenities will be closed to the general public. This is unacceptable. Non-Homewood residents and guests must be allowed to ski, hike, and bike on Homewood lands, and enjoy the approved amenities.
- b. TRPA has approved initial development in a "mountain modern" architectural style. This is unacceptable. The originally approved plan specified a "classic old Tahoe lodge" architectural style.
- c. Regulator discussions with developers have not been as transparent to the public as they should be.

In addition, the approved plans for workforce housing and traffic mitigation are outdated and insufficient. TRPA and Placer County should require a re-plan addressing these.

I and my neighbors will be monitoring progress on this project. Please add me to any public communications or lists related to this matter.

I have enjoyed skiing at Homewood since 1996 with my family and friends. It is heartbreaking to think Homewood will become just another gated community catering to the rich.

Thank you – Richard G, Smolen, 7049 10th Ave, Tahoma, CA, 96142

Mr. Nielsen, Mr. Buelna and Ms Gustafson:

I am writing to express my concerns with the current direction of the Homewood Mountain Resort.

Homewood Resort developers' publicly stated plans for the property differ in material ways from the [Master Plan](https://www.skihomewood.com/wp-content/uploads/Homewood-Mountain-Resort-Ski-Area-Master-Plan-Details-Updated-10-04-20112.pdf) (https://www.skihomewood.com/wp-content/uploads/Homewood-Mountain-Resort-Ski-Area-Master-Plan-Details-Updated-10-04-20112.pdf) previously approved by TRPA. Specifically:

- a. Developer Art Chapman of JMA Ventures has stated in writing that the ski area and related amenities will be closed to the general public. This is unacceptable. Non-Homewood residents and guests must be allowed to ski, hike, and bike on Homewood lands, and enjoy the approved amenities.
- b. TRPA has approved initial development in a "mountain modern" architectural style. This is unacceptable. The originally approved plan specified a "classic old Tahoe lodge" architectural style.
- c. Regulator discussions with developers have not been as transparent to the public as they should be.

In addition, the approved plans for workforce housing and traffic mitigation are outdated and insufficient. TRPA and Placer County should require a re-plan addressing these.

I and my neighbors will be monitoring progress on this project. Please add me to any public communications or lists related to this matter.

I have enjoyed skiing at Homewood since 1996 with my family and friends. It is heartbreaking to think Homewood will become just another gated community catering to the rich.

Thank you – Richard G, Smolen, 7049 10th Ave, Tahoma, CA, 96142

From: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Sent: 2/9/2023 9:46:06 AM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: FW: keeping Homewood Ski Resort public

From: John Boessenecker <jboess@comcast.net>
Sent: Thursday, February 9, 2023 8:35 AM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>; Steve Buelna <sbuelna@placer.ca.gov>; supervisor.gustafson@placer.ca.gov
Subject: keeping Homewood Ski Resort public

Mr. Nielsen, Mr. Buelna and Ms Gustafson:

I am writing to express my concerns with the current direction of the Homewood Mountain Resort.

Homewood Resort developers' publicly stated plans for the property differ in material ways from the Master Plan previously approved by TRPA. Specifically:

1. Developer Art Chapman of JMA Ventures has stated in writing that the ski area and related amenities will be closed to the general public. This is unacceptable. Non-Homewood residents and guests must be allowed to ski, hike, and bike on Homewood lands, and enjoy the approved amenities. This is now forcing West Shore residents to drive substantial distances to enjoy these activities which causes environmental harm to Lake Tahoe.
2. TRPA and Placer County have approved initial development in a "mountain modern" architectural style. This is unacceptable. The originally approved plan specified a "classic old Tahoe lodge" architectural style.
3. Regulator discussions with developers have not been as transparent to the public as they should be.

In addition, the approved plans for workforce housing and traffic mitigation are outdated and insufficient. TRPA and Placer County should require a re-plan addressing these.

My neighbors and I will be monitoring the progress of this project. Please add me to any public communications or lists related to this matter.

Thank you.

John Boessenecker and Marta S. Diaz
545 Grouse Dr.
Tahoma, CA

From: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Sent: 2/9/2023 9:33:40 AM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: FW: Locals for Homewood
Attachments: [Homewood Letter_Guidice.pdf](#)

From: Stacy Guidice <stacyg@nrgdesign.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 8, 2023 8:19 PM
To: sbulna@placer.ca.gov; Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>; supervisorgustafson@placer.ca.gov
Cc: Carol Ford <indesignon@aol.com>; leslie Guidice <leslieg@nrgdesign.com>
Subject: Locals for Homewood

Dear,
Mr. Nielsen, Mr. Buelna and Ms Gustafson,

Attached is our letter that expresses our families concerns with the direction of the Homewood Mountain Resort.
We will be monitoring progress on this project. Please add us to any public communications or lists related to this matter

Best regards,
The Guidice-Ford Family

February 8, 2023

Dear, Mr. Nielsen, Mr. Buelna and Ms Gustafson

Our grandparents built our family cabin in 1970 in Tahoma. We have been skiing Tahoe Ski Bowl and Homewood for decades. All our kids and grandkids have learned how to ski and enjoyed all that this beautiful mountain has to offer. This place is so special and essential to local home owners and keeping the Westshore Tahoe that small town destination. It would be devastating to make it a resort membership only mountain. And it would be a tragedy for all the local families that work and live in Tahoe.

Best regards,
The Guidice-Ford Family

7250 8th Avenue
Tahoma, California 96142

Smile you're at Homewood



From: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Sent: 2/9/2023 9:31:47 AM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: FW: New Moonshine article

From: Ted Peterson <TPeterson@lajollamgt.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 8, 2023 6:44 PM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Subject: Fwd: New Moonshine article

Paul,

FYI: Meeting with HOA's and link to Moonshine Ink Homewood article.

Ted

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Ted Peterson <TPeterson@lajollamgt.com>
Date: February 8, 2023 at 6:15:36 PM PST
To: Kevin Foster <kevinfoster3489@yahoo.com>
Subject: Fwd: New Moonshine article

Kevin,

Yes. Agree. Very positive that it's letting people know HOA's are organizing!

Ted

Subject: FW: New Moonshine article

From: 'Kevin Foster' via Keep Homewood Public steering committee <keep-homewood-public-steering-committee@googlegroups.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 8, 2023 1:43 PM
To: keep-homewood-public-steering-committee@googlegroups.com
Subject: New Moonshine article

All - this article came out yesterday. I think it is good from the perspective that it shares that there is a lot of resistance to the project and the resistance is increasing.

Going forward as part of our group, I think we can hone our messages and be strategic in what gets out to the press. I was referenced by name towards the end of the article and it mentioned the zoom meeting we held on Monday. I personally think that is fine but my comments that are included in the article came from an email exchange that I had opened up with the Moonshine editor and I was not made aware that what I was sharing in email would go right into the paper!

<https://www.moonshineink.com/tahoe-news/the-country-club-comes-to-homewood/>

Shared via the [Google app](#)

Kevin Foster

Cell: 925-788-9481

--

You received this message because you are subscribed to the Google Groups "Keep Homewood Public steering committee" group.

To unsubscribe from this group and stop receiving emails from it, send an email to keep-homewood-public-steering-committee+unsubscribe@googlegroups.com.

To view this discussion on the web visit <https://groups.google.com/d/msgid/keep-homewood-public-steering-committee/639044987.1247359.1675892604034%40mail.yahoo.com>.

For more options, visit <https://groups.google.com/d/optout>.

From: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Sent: 2/9/2023 9:35:11 AM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: FW: PLN22-00534
Attachments: [PLN22-00534 2-9-23 meeting.pdf](#)

From: Doug DeAngeli <ddeangeli@rhpinc.net>
Sent: Thursday, February 9, 2023 7:57 AM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>; Steve Buelna <sbuelna@placer.ca.gov>
Subject: FW: PLN22-00534

Subject: PLN22-00534

Please see are comments on the project in the attached letter. The current mountain trails provide access to puplic lands behind the resort. The access to the public needs to remain open.

Highway 89 cannot handle anymore traffic form Truckee to theis site

Thanks

Doug and Heather DeAngeli

Mr. Nielsen, Mr. Buelna and Ms Gustafson:

I am writing to express my concerns with the current direction of the Homewood Mountain Resort.

Homewood Resort developers' publicly stated plans for the property differ in material ways from the [Master Plan](https://www.skihomewood.com/wp-content/uploads/Homewood-Mountain-Resort-Ski-Area-Master-Plan-Details-Updated-10-04-20112.pdf) (https://www.skihomewood.com/wp-content/uploads/Homewood-Mountain-Resort-Ski-Area-Master-Plan-Details-Updated-10-04-20112.pdf) previously approved by TRPA. Specifically:

- a. Developer Art Chapman of JMA Ventures has stated in writing that the ski area and related amenities will be closed to the general public. This is unacceptable. Non-Homewood residents and guests must be allowed to ski, hike, and bike on Homewood lands, and enjoy the approved amenities.
- b. TRPA has approved initial development in a "mountain modern" architectural style. This is unacceptable. The originally approved plan specified a "classic old Tahoe lodge" architectural style.
- c. Regulator discussions with developers have not been as transparent to the public as they should be.

In addition, the approved plans for workforce housing and traffic mitigation are outdated and insufficient. TRPA and Placer County should require a re-plan addressing these.

I and my neighbors will be monitoring progress on this project. Please add me to any public communications or lists related to this matter.

Thank you -

Doug and Heather DeAngeli
7282 5th Avenue
Tahoma, California

From: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Sent: 2/9/2023 9:34:20 AM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: FW: Reference PLN22-00534: Homewood Mountain Resort

From: Warren Harding <warrenh2010@hotmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 8, 2023 11:55 PM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>; sbulna@placer.ca.gov; supervisororgustafson@placer.ca.gov; Trena Harding <trenaharding@hotmail.com>; tyrone harding <tyrone.t.harding@gmail.com>; Kyle Harding <kyleharding47@yahoo.com>; Trevor Harding <trevor@trevorwyattmagic.com>
Subject: Reference PLN22-00534: Homewood Mountain Resort

Mr. Nielsen, Mr. Buelna and Ms Gustafson:

We are writing to express our concerns with the current direction of the Homewood Mountain Resort.

Homewood Resort developers publicly stated plans for the property differ in material ways from the Master Plan

(<https://www.skihomewood.com/wpcontent/uploads/Homewood-Mountain-Resort-Ski-Area-Master-Plan-DetailsUpdated-10-04-20112.pdf>)

previously approved by TRPA. Specifically:

a. Developer Art Chapman of JMA Ventures has stated in writing that

the ski area and related amenities will be closed to the general public. This is unacceptable. Non-Homewood residents and guests must be allowed to ski, hike, and bike on Homewood lands, and enjoy the approved amenities.

b. TRPA has approved initial development in a mountain modern architectural style. This is unacceptable. The originally approved plan specified a classic old Tahoe lodge architectural style.

c. Regulator discussions with developers have not been as

transparent to the public as they should be. In addition, the approved plans for workforce housing and traffic mitigation are outdated and insufficient. TRPA and Placer County should require a replan addressing these.

We and our neighbors will be monitoring progress on this project. Please add us to any public communications or lists related to this matter.

Thank you.

Warren and Trena Harding

7095 10th Ave., Tahoma, California 96142

From: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Sent: 2/9/2023 9:16:10 AM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: FW: Strong Objection to HMR current direction

From: Eric Niello <e.j.niello@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 8, 2023 3:52 PM
To: sbulna@placer.ca.gov; Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>; supervisororgustafson@placer.ca.gov
Subject: Strong Objection to HMR current direction

Mr. Nielsen, Mr. Buelna and Ms Gustafson:

I am writing to express my concerns with the current direction of the Homewood Mountain Resort.

Homewood Resort developers publicly stated plans for the property differ in material ways from the master plan previously approved by TRPA. Specifically:

a. Developer Art Chapman of JMA Ventures has stated in writing that the ski area and related amenities will be closed to the general public. This is categorically unacceptable. Non-Homewood residents and guests must be allowed to ski, hike, and bike on Homewood lands, and enjoy the approved amenities. Many of us bought homes here for that very reason. I ski here with my wife and kids and countless friends.

b. TRPA has approved initial development in a mountain modern architectural style. This is unacceptable. The originally approved plan specified a classic old Tahoe lodge architectural style, which is consistent with the West Shore.

c. Regulator discussions with developers have not been as transparent to the public as they should be. We demand to be kept in the loop regarding the direction of our most valuable **PUBLIC** asset on the West Shore!

In addition, the approved plans for workforce housing and traffic mitigation are outdated and insufficient. TRPA and Placer County should require a re-plan addressing these.

I, along with my neighbors will be monitoring progress on this project. Please add me to any public communications or lists related to this matter.

Thank you -
Eric J. Niello
916-549-1232

From: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Sent: 2/9/2023 9:15:16 AM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: FW: TRPA Public Hearing Homewood Mountain Resort Master Plan
Attachments: [Homewood Master Plan .docx](#)

From: Judy Neel <jwaughneel@prodigy.net>
Sent: Monday, February 6, 2023 2:46 PM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Cc: Steve Buelna <sbuelna@placer.ca.gov>; cjacobsen@placer.ca.gov; Don Ashton <Don.Ashton@edcgov.us>; karen.feathers@edcgov.us
Subject: TRPA Public Hearing Homewood Mountain Resort Master Plan

Sent from my iPad

Subject: TRPA Public Hearing to Consider Changes to the Homewood Mountain Resort Ski Area Master Plan

To Whom It May Concern:

I attempted to review the proposed changes to the Homewood Mountain Resort Master Plan with an open mind, but I soon realized the proposed changes did not reflect a development that the community and the entire basin would be proud to see built. While the original plan would have changed the mountain and, mostly, the northern base area, many concessions were made through public input. The architecture, traffic, noise, and run off contamination were all addressed and appeared to result in a development that fit into the community and would enhance the local economy. However, the sale of the property seems to have removed the historical knowledge of the process from all involved. The Placer County's Design Review Committee quietly approved changes that were not acceptable during the original approval process. The resulting project does NOT fit in with the community, does NOT maintain a scale consistent with the original Master Plan and, most importantly, does NOT protect the groundwater and the lake itself.

Based upon the aforementioned items, I am fervently requesting that TRPA:

1. question the applicability of the existing environmental documents;
2. question the validity of the County's Committee's actions in approving the design review changes to the Master Plan, contrary to prior concessions by the public, TRPA, and the previous owners;
3. require the initiation of an Amendment to the FEIS/EIR; and,
4. request further studies (traffic, noise, water quality) addressing the proposed changes to the previously approved Master Plan.

Five generations of our family have spent summers at Lake Tahoe, and, since 1975, when my husband and I built our current home, have been residents of the West Shore. We watched as changes occurred along the West Shore. We expected that some of those changes would affect Homewood. We appeal to the TRPA, Placer and El Dorado Counties, respectively, to make sure those changes meet the scale of the mountain and the surrounding communities. Please respect those communities and the people living here by protecting the West Shore and the beauty of our wonderful Lake Tahoe for future generations.

Respectfully submitted,

Judith W. Neel

Cc: Steve Buelner—Placer County
Crystal Jacobsen—Placer County
Karen Feathers—El Dorado County
Don Ashton—El Dorado County

From: Burton Crinklaw <burton_penny@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: 2/9/2023 3:30:38 PM
To: sbuela@placer.ca.gov <sbuela@placer.ca.gov>; supervisorgustafson@placer.ca.gov <supervisorgustafson@placer.ca.gov>; HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>; Julie Regan <jregan@trpa.gov>; pnielson@trpa.gov <pnielson@trpa.gov>
Subject: Homewood Mountain Resort Resolution
Attachments: [RUBICON TAHOE OWNERS RESOLUTION.pdf](#)

Good Afternoon,

The attached Resolution is from the Rubicon Tahoe Owners, Inc. (RTO), a homeowners association in Rubicon Bay, Lake Tahoe and is in response to the latest developments regarding the Homewood Mountain Resort.

In essence, the Board of Directors, acting on behalf of its 250 homeowners and members, is strongly encouraging the Placer County Board of Supervisors and the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency to conduct a comprehensive review, with the inclusion of public input, in light of the revised plans and business model being put forth by JMA Ventures, Discovery Land Company and Mohari Hospitality that includes the privatization of Homewood Mountain and Ski Area.

It's our belief that this new model for development is the antithesis of what Placer County and TRPA envisioned and approved in 2011 – that it would be an enhancement to the West Shore community. This new plan by the developers is not in any way in synchrony with the original intent.

Thank You,

RTO Board of Directors
<http://www.rubicontahoeowners.com>

RUBICON TAHOE OWNERS, INC.

RESOLUTION REGARDING HOMEWOOD MOUNTAIN RESORT

WHEREAS, Rubicon Tahoe Owners, Inc., (RTO) a homeowners association of approximately 250 property owners, was established in 1960 in Rubicon Bay, Lake Tahoe to promote the preservation of a family oriented community,

WHEREAS, RTO has a duly elected Board of Directors whose responsibilities are to manage, operate, repair, and maintain the common area beaches and facilities as well as oversee what is in the best interests of its members regarding environmental stewardship and development that might impact homeowners and the West Shore at large,

WHEREAS, because of its longevity, RTO has many homeowners representing multiple generations whose families have enjoyed the opportunity to ski the family friendly and proximally located Homewood Ski Area for many years,

WHEREAS, RTO's Board of Directors has closely monitored the proposed redevelopment of Homewood Mountain since the property was purchased by JMA Ventures in 2006 and the subsequent approval by TRPA and the Placer County Board of Supervisors in 2011,

WHEREAS, the approved proposal included upgrades and facility renovations which RTO's Board and members supported and viewed as an enhancement to the West Shore community,

WHEREAS, JMA Ventures has partnered with Discovery Land Company and Mohari Hospitality and is putting forth a modified development plan that significantly alters what was previously approved and includes privatization with paid membership and annual fees as well as major changes in the architectural design,

WHEREAS, the development was originally proposed as an enhancement to the community and the West Shore at large, the version as now proposed represents exclusivity that will have a material negative impact on the community with token regard to the public's interest,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Rubicon Tahoe Owners, Inc. Board of Directors, and its members, oppose the new plans and business model, which have clearly changed and are not in synchrony with the original spirit of the approved plan, until they are subject to a full review by Placer County and TRPA with the input of the West Shore community.

PASSED AND ADOPTED this 9th day of February 2023 by the Rubicon Tahoe Owners, Inc. Board of Directors.

AYES:

Ryan Gowdy, President	Adam Gates, Treasurer	Diana Caldeira, Secretary
Matthew Estes, Director	Bing Presnell, Director	Krista Spence, Director
Alan Ziffer, Director	Matt McDonald, Director	Lee Watrous, Director
Burton Crinklaw, Director	Carol Isham O'Neill, Director	

From: Eileen Eileen <eaicardi@pacbell.net>
Sent: 2/9/2023 11:51:08 AM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: Homewood ski project

As a long term owner of property in Chamberlands, I want to add my voice to the concerns of local homeowners on the west shore about the potential plans to privatize the Homewood ski resort. My understanding is that there have been no plans approved but the current plan on the table is substantially different than that approved in 2011. It is critically important that we the homeowners be involved in helping determine the future of the ski area and that it be available to the public. We love the summer and the winter activities the west shore allows and do not want that disrupted by real estate investors with no connection to the values and needs of our community. Eileen Aicardi, M.D.
490 Chukar

From: Liz McMillan <tahomaliz@yahoo.com>
Sent: 2/9/2023 2:56:35 PM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: Homewood

Hi,

Privatization and the EIR from 2011 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.

Originally community enrichment was part of the plan. Now they do not have commercial space for community business and sustainability. The community commented on the original plan which had so much more potential for economic growth and enrichment. The architecture, building locations and commercial space is nothing like the original plan. I am pretty sure phase one, to build single family housing was a parking structure originally. This would not be acceptable for a local contractor to change plans so drastically; it should not be for a multi million-dollar corporation either.

I am sure you are well aware of the economic impacts to all of Tahoe, housing ,business etc. this is just another hardship for our community that does not have to be.

Any further information that can be provided regarding the project would be greatly appreciated. A community meeting with Placer County and TRPA is important for all of us who make the West Shore our home and would be impacted by the approval of this project without further review and modification.

Thank you for your time.
Liz McMillan

From: H Terry Cush <htcush@yahoo.com>
Sent: 2/9/2023 1:06:57 PM
To: Steve Buelna <sbuelna@placer.ca.gov>; HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>; info@chamberlands.com <info@chamberlands.com>
Subject: Ownership of Homewood

Good afternoon,

It has come to light that JMA sold a majority ownership in 2022 to a company called Mohari which is based in Cyprus. International ownership brings out the question of who Mohari is owned by and how it raises funds for projects and who are it's clients.

Cyprus is know (60 Minutes segment) as a haven for Russian oligarchs and drug money. Many banking institutions in Cyprus have been investigated by international banking regulators for suspicious activities. I don't know what due diligence was done by JMA last year before doing the transaction with Mohari. Has this aspect been looked into by Placer County or TRPA? I don't think either of these entities wants to appear on the "follow up" episode of 60 Minutes as having allowed dirty money into Lake Tahoe.

Mohair's clients are said to be ultra rich international families who like to own properties around the world in great areas where they can vacation for a few weeks per year. Sounds like the properties sit vacant for large periods of time. If this is the the how it will work, I think it will have many negative effects on the Tahoe community. First and foremost, you will be cutting residents/vacation home owners/visitors from a fabulous recreational opportunity for the benefit of ultra rich, possibly foreign, families who have no real connection to or interest in preserving our Lake Tahoe region.

We, Terry and Lisa Cush, are against altering the approved Master Plan for Homewood.

Sincerely yours,
Terry and Lisa Cush
235 Snowbird Loop
Homewood, Ca

Sent from my iPad

From: Steve Balsiger <stevebalsiger@gmail.com>
Sent: 2/9/2023 4:15:32 PM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: Privatization of the Homewood Resort

I own and live at a property in Rubicon Bay and am part of the Rubicon HOA. I've been a resident for over 20 years.

I am concerned about the Privatization of the Homewood Resort. The developer is attempting to alter usage plans for the Homewood Mountain Resort at Lake Tahoe's West Shore. This is inconsistent with the Master Plan approved in 2011, which had no mention of resort privatization. The community was promised that it would remain open to the public. This significant change to the Master Plan I believe requires a new plan to review this significantly-revised project, including a public hearing and comments. The original intent of the 2011 Master Plan indicated access would remain open to the public, invalidating the original plan approval. Please require the submission of a new plan to fully review this significantly-revised project, including a public hearing and comments. Thank you for your attention to this and careful consideration of what is truly the Tahoe region.

Please do the right thing.

Thank you

Steve Balsiger

8982 Scenic Drive Rubicon

From: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Sent: 2/10/2023 9:02:32 AM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: FW: [BULK] Concern on Material Deviations from Previously Approved Homewood Mountain Resort Master Plan

From: J. Michael Knight <j.michaelknight@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 9, 2023 10:49 AM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>; sbulna@placer.ca.gov; supervisor.gustafson@placer.ca.gov
Subject: [BULK] Concern on Material Deviations from Previously Approved Homewood Mountain Resort Master Plan

Mr. Nielsen, Mr. Buelna, and Ms. Gustafson:

I am writing to express my concerns with the current direction of the Homewood Mountain Resort.

Homewood Resort developers' publicly stated plans for the property differ in material ways from the Master Plan previously approved by TRPA. Specifically:

- a. Developer Art Chapman of JMA Ventures has stated in writing that the ski area and related amenities will be closed to the general public. This is unacceptable. Non-Homewood residents and guests must be allowed to ski, hike, and bike on Homewood lands, and enjoy the approved amenities.
- b. TRPA has approved initial development in a mountain modern architectural style. This is unacceptable. The originally approved plan specified a classic old Tahoe lodge architectural style.
- c. Regulator discussions with developers have not been as transparent to the public as they should be.

In addition, the approved plans for workforce housing and traffic mitigation are outdated and insufficient. TRPA and Placer County should require a replan addressing these.

I and my neighbors will be monitoring progress on this project. Please add me to any public communications or lists related to this matter.

Thank you!

Best Regards,
J. Michael Knight
7205 Third Ave., Tahoma, CA

From: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Sent: 2/10/2023 9:05:41 AM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: FW: [BULK] Concern on Material Deviations from Previously Approved Homewood Mountain Resort Master Plan

From: J. Michael Knight <j.michaelknight@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 9, 2023 11:22 AM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>; Steve Buelna <sbuelna@placer.ca.gov>; supervisor@supervisors@placer.ca.gov
Subject: [BULK] Concern on Material Deviations from Previously Approved Homewood Mountain Resort Master Plan

Mr. Nielsen, Mr. Buelna, and Ms. Gustafson:

I am writing to express my concerns with the current direction of the Homewood Mountain Resort.

Homewood Resort developers' publicly stated plans for the property differ in material ways from the Master Plan previously approved by TRPA. Specifically:

- a. Developer Art Chapman of JMA Ventures has stated in writing that the ski area and related amenities will be closed to the general public. This is unacceptable. Non-Homewood residents and guests must be allowed to ski, hike, and bike on Homewood lands, and enjoy the approved amenities.
- b. TRPA has approved initial development in a mountain modern architectural style. This is unacceptable. The originally approved plan specified a classic old Tahoe lodge architectural style.
- c. Regulator discussions with developers have not been as transparent to the public as they should be.

In addition, the approved plans for workforce housing and traffic mitigation are outdated and insufficient. TRPA and Placer County should require a replan addressing these.

I and my neighbors will be monitoring progress on this project. Please add me to any public communications or lists related to this matter.

Thank you!

Best Regards,
J. Michael Knight
7205 Third Ave., Tahoma, CA

From: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Sent: 2/10/2023 9:02:45 AM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: FW: [BULK] Concern on Material Deviations from Previously Approved Homewood Mountain Resort Master Plan

From: Sheyla Aquise <sheylaaquise@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 9, 2023 10:51 AM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>; sbulna@placer.ca.gov; supervisor@supervisors@placer.ca.gov
Subject: [BULK] Concern on Material Deviations from Previously Approved Homewood Mountain Resort Master Plan

Mr. Nielsen, Mr. Buelna, and Ms. Gustafson:

I am writing to express my concerns with the current direction of the Homewood Mountain Resort.

Homewood Resort developers' publicly stated plans for the property differ in material ways from the Master Plan previously approved by TRPA. Specifically:

- a. Developer Art Chapman of JMA Ventures has stated in writing that the ski area and related amenities will be closed to the general public. This is unacceptable. Non-Homewood residents and guests must be allowed to ski, hike, and bike on Homewood lands, and enjoy the approved amenities.
- b. TRPA has approved initial development in a mountain modern architectural style. This is unacceptable. The originally approved plan specified a classic old Tahoe lodge architectural style.
- c. Regulator discussions with developers have not been as transparent to the public as they should be.

In addition, the approved plans for workforce housing and traffic mitigation are outdated and insufficient. TRPA and Placer County should require a replan addressing these.

I and my neighbors will be monitoring progress on this project. Please add me to any public communications or lists related to this matter.

Thank you!

Best Regards,
Sheyla Aquise
7205 Third Ave., Tahoma, CA

From: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Sent: 2/10/2023 9:00:39 AM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: FW: [BULK] Homewood Development

From: Kim Conant <kim@conant.org>
Sent: Thursday, February 9, 2023 9:57 AM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Subject: [BULK] Homewood Development

Dear Mr. Paul Nielsen,

Mr. Nielsen, Mr. Buelna and Ms Gustafson:

I am writing to express my concerns with the current direction of the Homewood Mountain Resort.

Homewood Resort developers' publicly stated plans for the property differ in material ways from the Master Plan previously approved by TRPA. Specifically:

1. Developer Art Chapman of JMA Ventures has stated in writing that the ski area and related amenities will be closed to the general public. This is unacceptable. Non-Homewood residents and guests must be allowed to ski, hike, and bike on Homewood lands, and enjoy the approved amenities. This is now forcing West Shore residents to drive substantial distances to enjoy these activities which causes environmental harm to Lake Tahoe.
2. TRPA and Placer County have approved initial development in a "mountain modern" architectural style. This is unacceptable. The originally approved plan specified a "classic old Tahoe lodge" architectural style.
3. Regulator discussions with developers have not been as transparent to the public as they should be.

In addition, the approved plans for workforce housing and traffic mitigation are outdated and insufficient. TRPA and Placer County should require a re-plan addressing these.

My neighbors and I will be monitoring the progress of this project. Please add me to any public communications or lists related to this matter.

Thank you -

Kind regards,

Kim Conant

6245 Flicker Ave., Homewood, CA

From: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Sent: 2/10/2023 5:54:09 PM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: FW: [BULK] Homewood development

From: claire Norton <clairellen40@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, February 10, 2023 4:35 PM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Subject: [BULK] Homewood development

This letter is for the purpose of asking you to consider seriously the needs of west shore residents. The privatization of homewood ski resort will promote more traffic to ski at northstar, palisades, alpine, to the environmental detriment.

Homewood Resort developers' publicly stated plans for the property differ in material ways from the Master Plan previously approved by TRPA. Specifically:

1. Developer Art Chapman of JMA Ventures has stated in writing that the ski area and related amenities will be closed to the general public. This is unacceptable. Non-Homewood residents and guests must be allowed to ski, hike, and bike on Homewood lands, and enjoy the approved amenities. This is now forcing West Shore residents to drive substantial distances to enjoy these activities which causes environmental harm to Lake Tahoe.
2. TRPA and Placer County have approved initial development in a "mountain modern" architectural style. This is unacceptable. The originally approved plan specified a "classic old Tahoe lodge" architectural style.
3. Regulator discussions with developers have not been as transparent to the public as they should be.

In addition, the approved plans for workforce housing and traffic mitigation are outdated and insufficient. TRPA and Placer County should require a re-plan addressing these.

My neighbors and I will be monitoring the progress of this project. Please add me to any public communications or lists related to this matter.

Thank you, Claire norton , 430 snowbird loop, homewood, ca

From: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Sent: 2/10/2023 9:16:24 AM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: FW: [BULK] Homewood Development
Attachments: [Planned Homewood Ski Resort.docx](#)

From: Steve Becker <stbecker@aol.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 9, 2023 2:10 PM
Subject: [BULK] Homewood Development

While we cannot make the meeting tonight, please hear us loud and clear that we are adamantly opposed to the privatization of the Homewood resort and the changes to the 2011 approved plan. See our 2022 letter. Thank you for listening.

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: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Sent: 2/10/2023 3:00:20 PM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: FW: [BULK] Homewood Master Plan Reference PLN22-00534

From: David LaMar <davidlamar650@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 9, 2023 5:43 PM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>; Steve Buelna <sbuelna@placer.ca.gov>; supervisor@supervisors@placer.ca.gov
Subject: [BULK] Homewood Master Plan Reference PLN22-00534

Mr. Nielsen, Mr. Buelna and Ms Gustafson:

I am writing to express my concerns with the current direction of the Homewood Mountain Resort.

Homewood Resort developers' publicly stated plans for the property differ in material ways from the Master Plan that was previously approved by TRPA. Specifically:

1. Developer Art Chapman of JMA Ventures has stated in writing that the ski area and related amenities will be closed to the general public. This is unacceptable. Non-Homewood residents and guests should be allowed access to ski, hike, and bike on Homewood lands, and enjoy the approved amenities. This is now forcing West Shore residents to drive substantial distances to enjoy these activities which causes environmental harm to Lake Tahoe.
2. TRPA and Placer County have approved initial development in a "mountain modern" architectural style. This is unacceptable. The originally approved plan specified a "classic old Tahoe lodge" architectural style.
3. Regulator discussions with developers have not been as transparent to the public as they should be.

In addition, the approved plans for workforce housing and traffic mitigation are outdated and insufficient. TRPA and Placer County should require a re-plan addressing these.

My neighbors and I will be monitoring the progress of this project. Please add me to any public communications or lists related to this matter.

Thank you -

David LaMar
5565 Lagoon
Homewood

From: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Sent: 2/10/2023 3:03:31 PM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: FW: [BULK] Homewood Mountain Resort

From: Rod Johnstone <rodbobj@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, February 10, 2023 10:51 AM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>; Steve Buelna <sbuelna@placer.ca.gov>; supervisor.gustafson@placer.ca.gov
Subject: [BULK] Homewood Mountain Resort

Mr. Nielsen, Mr. Buelna and Ms Gustafson:

I am writing to express my concerns with the current direction of the Homewood Mountain Resort.

Homewood Resort developers' publicly stated plans for the property differ in material ways from the Master Plan previously approved by TRPA. Specifically:

1. Developer Art Chapman of JMA Ventures has stated in writing that the ski area and related amenities will be closed to the general public. This is unacceptable. Non-Homewood residents and guests must be allowed to ski, hike, and bike on Homewood lands, and enjoy the approved amenities. This is now forcing West Shore residents to drive substantial distances to enjoy these activities which causes environmental harm to Lake Tahoe.
2. TRPA and Placer County have approved initial development in a "mountain modern" architectural style. This is unacceptable. The originally approved plan specified a "classic old Tahoe lodge" architectural style.
3. Regulator discussions with developers have not been as transparent to the public as they should be.

In addition, the approved plans for workforce housing and traffic mitigation are outdated and insufficient. TRPA and Placer County should require a re-plan addressing these.

My neighbors and I will be monitoring the progress of this project. Please add me to any public communications or lists related to this matter.

Thank you

Rod Johnstone

Owner 310 Snowbird Loop, Tahoma

From: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Sent: 2/10/2023 2:56:43 PM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: FW: [BULK] Homewood

From: Karen Hillman <karenannine@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 9, 2023 3:55 PM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Subject: [BULK] Homewood
Importance: High

Paul

I am writing to express my concerns with the current direction of the Homewood Mountain Resort.

Homewood Resort developers' publicly stated plans for the property differ in material ways from the [Master Plan](#) previously approved by TRPA. Specifically:

1. Developer Art Chapman of JMA Ventures has stated in writing that the ski area and related amenities will be closed to the general public. This is unacceptable. Homewood & Non-Homewood residents and guests must be allowed to ski, hike, and bike on Homewood lands, and enjoy the approved amenities. This is now forcing West Shore residents to drive substantial distances to enjoy these activities which causes environmental harm to Lake Tahoe. Our family has used this ski area for years, and it's so close to home. It's an amenity that swayed in the decision to buy on the West Shore.
2. TRPA and Placer County have approved initial development in a "mountain modern" architectural style. This is unacceptable. The originally approved plan specified a "classic old Tahoe lodge" architectural style. The classic old Tahoe lodge design is more in keeping with the mountain environment and beauty we all enjoy.
3. Regulator discussions with developers have not been as transparent to the public as they should be.

In addition, the approved plans for workforce housing and traffic mitigation are outdated and insufficient. TRPA and Placer County needs a re-plan addressing these.

My neighbors and I will be monitoring the progress of this project. Please add me to any public communications or lists related to this matter.

Please consider the concerns of so many long time Tahoe residents and visitors. This is not an improvement to the West Shore.

Sincerely,
Karen U Hillman
6245 Flicker, Homewood

From: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Sent: 2/10/2023 9:07:41 AM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: FW: Concern on Material Deviations from Previously Approved Homewood Mountain Resort Master Plan

From: Lisa Stewart <lstewartinca@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Thursday, February 9, 2023 12:39 PM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>; Steve Buelna <sbuelna@placer.ca.gov>; supervisor@supervisors@placer.ca.gov
Subject: Concern on Material Deviations from Previously Approved Homewood Mountain Resort Master Plan

Mr. Nielsen, Mr. Buelna, and Ms. Gustafson:

I am writing to express my concerns with the current direction of the Homewood Mountain Resort.

Homewood Resort developers' publicly stated plans for the property differ in material ways from the Master Plan previously approved by TRPA. Specifically:

- a. Developer Art Chapman of JMA Ventures has stated in writing that the ski area and related amenities will be closed to the general public. This is unacceptable. Non-Homewood residents and guests must be allowed to ski, hike, and bike on Homewood lands, and enjoy the approved amenities.
- b. TRPA has approved initial development in a mountain modern architectural style. This is unacceptable. The originally approved plan specified a classic old Tahoe lodge architectural style.
- c. Regulator discussions with developers have not been as transparent to the public as they should be.

In addition, the approved plans for workforce housing and traffic mitigation are outdated and insufficient. TRPA and Placer County should require a replan addressing these.

I and my neighbors will be monitoring progress on this project. Please add me to any public communications or lists related to this matter.

Thank you!

Best Regards,
Lisa Stewart
PO Box 368
Tahoma Ca 96142

From: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Sent: 2/10/2023 5:53:53 PM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: FW: Concern over Homewood Mountain and Lake Club

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

From: Linda Kislingbury
Sent: Friday, February 10, 2023 4:08 PM
To: Paul Nielsen ; sbulna@placer.ca.gov; supervisor.gustafson@placer.ca.gov
Subject: Concern over Homewood Mountain and Lake Club

I am very disappointed to hear that the TRPA is allowing Homewood to build a private luxury club, when the original plans were presented and approved by the community and TRPA to serve the the whole community. This 180 degree change raises many concerns about the impact on the whole west shore and to the benefit of only the very wealthy.

Homewood and the west shore have been a special place to my family and many others for close to 100 years. My grandparents and mother camped at Meeks Bay for many years starting in 1934. I had my first birthday there. I have spent every summer of my life here on the west shore (74 years to be exact). My kids grew up coming to the west shore every summer. I learned to ski at the little red ski house at Homewood and my kids learned to ski there as well. I was hoping my two little grandsons would ski there too. Now my understanding is locals will only have the opportunity to ski on off times (not Xmas vacation, ski week and spring) when kids can ski. We bought our home in 2008 so we could be close to Homewood, Chambers and Meeks Bay. Now we are hearing this wonderful place will be only for the very wealthy. The design is showy and not in keeping with the original plans that came out a few years ago. The west shore is real Tahoe. I wonder how this huge plan can be approved considering the environmental impact on our precious Lake.

I feel like this new direction is showing no consideration to the local community.

Please in the spirit of protecting Tahoe do not let this project go forward and certainly not without requiring any new resort be open to the public.

Linda Kislingbury
313 Talon Street
Homewood, Ca
Sent from my iPad

From: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Sent: 2/10/2023 9:16:07 AM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: FW: Concerns of Homewood privatization - PLN22-00534

From: Paul Lewenberg <paul.lewenberg@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 9, 2023 1:59 PM
Subject: Concerns of Homewood privatization - PLN22-00534

To whom it may concern,

I am reaching out to voice my concerns about the privatization of Homewood Mountain Resort ("Homewood").

I am a full time resident of Tahoma, CA, and a passholder at Homewood. In the time I have spent recreating at Homewood, it has stuck out as a family-oriented, safe, and overall fun place to ski.

I am concerned that with the privatization of Homewood, this enjoyment will be taken from the local residents in order to serve a "higher end" (aka, wealthy, elite) clientele. This will make the ever expanding overreach of corporate interest in the ski industry that much more obtuse.

The West Shore is a sought out destination. The recent improvements in accessibility, including the rotaries in Tahoe City, have improved accessibility to Homewood from Tahoe City. **I rode the chairlift with someone visiting from San Diego this past weekend.** They were staying in Tahoe City. He said that at the intersection with 89, the traffic to Palisades Tahoe and Alpine Meadows were backed up through town, back to Carnelian Bay. He had sat in this 5 minutes of traffic, and turned left at the Savemart light, and then was on the road by himself having turned southbound to Homewood. **The issues to be solved around accessibility to Homewood should be borne by the resorts creating the traffic, not by further isolating Homewood to a wealthy subset of the population.**

Please feel free to contact me at paul.lewenberg@gmail.com with any questions you may have.

Thank you

From: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Sent: 2/10/2023 9:07:51 AM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: FW: Homewood Development

From: Ryan Benson <rbenson23@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 9, 2023 12:55 PM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>; sbulna@placer.ca.gov; supervisor@placer.ca.gov
Subject: Homewood Development

Mr. Nielsen, Mr. Buelna and Ms Gustafson:

I am writing to express my concerns with the current direction of the Homewood Mountain Resort. Homewood Resort developers publicly stated plans for the property differ in material ways from the Master Plan (<https://www.skihomewood.com/wpcontent/uploads/Homewood-Mountain-Resort-Ski-Area-Master-Plan-DetailsUpdated-10-04-20112.pdf>) previously approved by TRPA. Specifically:

a. Developer Art Chapman of JMA Ventures has stated in writing that the ski area and related amenities will be closed to the general public. This is unacceptable. Non-Homewood residents and guests must be allowed to ski, hike, and bike on Homewood lands, and enjoy the approved amenities.
b. TRPA has approved initial development in a mountain modern architectural style. This is unacceptable. The originally approved plan specified a classic old Tahoe lodge architectural style. c. Regulator discussions with developers have not been as transparent to the public as they should be. In addition, the approved plans for workforce housing and traffic mitigation are outdated and insufficient. TRPA and Placer County should require a replan addressing these. I and my neighbors will be monitoring progress on this project. Please add me to any public communications or lists related to this matter.

Thanks,
Ryan Benson
7065 8th Avenue
Tahoma, CA 96142

From: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Sent: 2/10/2023 3:00:32 PM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: FW: Homewood Mountain Resort

From: Barbara Moran <barb.flavors@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 9, 2023 6:29 PM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Cc: sbulna@placer.ca.gov; supervisor.gustafson@placer.ca.gov
Subject: Homewood Mountain Resort

Mr. Nielsen, Mr. Buelna and Ms Gustafson:

I am writing to express my concerns with the current direction of the Homewood Mountain Resort.

Homewood Resort developers' publicly stated plans for the property differ in material ways from the Master Plan (<https://www.skihomewood.com/wpcontent/uploads/Homewood-Mountain-Resort-Ski-Area-Master-Plan-DetailsUpdated-10-04-20112.pdf>) previously approved by TRPA. Specifically:

- a. Developer Art Chapman of JMA Ventures has stated in writing that the ski area and related amenities will be closed to the general public. This is unacceptable. Non-Homewood residents and guests must be allowed to ski, hike, and bike on Homewood lands, and enjoy the approved amenities.
- b. TRPA has approved initial development in a mountain modern architectural style. This is unacceptable. The originally approved plan specified a classic old Tahoe lodge architectural style.
- c. Regulator discussions with developers have not been as transparent to the public as they should be.

In addition, the approved plans for workforce housing and traffic mitigation are outdated and insufficient. TRPA and Placer County should require a replan addressing these. I and my neighbors will be monitoring progress on this project. Please add me to any public communications or lists related to this matter.

Thank you -
Barbara Moran
6687 El Dorado St.
Tahoma, CA 96142

From: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Sent: 2/10/2023 9:08:06 AM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: FW: Homewood Resort Reference PLN22-00534

From: JOAN BATTAINI <joanbattaini@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Thursday, February 9, 2023 12:57 PM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Cc: Steve Buelna <sbuelna@placer.ca.gov>; supervisorjustafson@placer.ca.gov
Subject: re: Homewood Resort Reference PLN22-00534

Mr. Nielsen, Mr. Buelna and Ms Gustafson:

I am writing to express my concerns with the current direction of the Homewood Mountain Resort. Homewood Resort developers' publicly stated plans for the property differ in significant ways from the Master Plan previously approved by TRPA. Specifically:

1. Developer Art Chapman of JMA Ventures has stated in writing that the ski area and related amenities will be closed to the general public. This is unacceptable. Non-Homewood residents and guests must be allowed to ski, hike, and bike on Homewood lands, at no cost and enjoy the approved amenities. This is now forcing West Shore residents to drive substantial distances to enjoy these activities which causes environmental harm to Lake Tahoe. To live and vacation in Tahoe is to enjoy activities that are "outside our front door." It is a selfish plan.
2. TRPA and Placer County have approved initial development in a "mountain modern" architectural style. This is unacceptable. The originally approved plan specified a "classic old Tahoe lodge" architectural style.
3. Regulator discussions with developers have not been transparent to the public, those that consider Homewood home!

In addition, the approved plans for workforce housing and traffic mitigation are outdated and insufficient. TRPA and Placer County should require a re-plan addressing these issues, concentrating on peak as well as nonpeak seasons.

My neighbors and I will be monitoring the progress of this project. Please add me to any public communications or lists related to this matter.

Thank you -

Sincerely
Joan Battaini
100 Snowbird Loop
Joanbattaini@sbcglobal.net

From: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Sent: 2/10/2023 2:59:58 PM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: FW: Homewood Resort

From: anne wagner <awagner132@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 9, 2023 5:29 PM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Subject: Homewood Resort

Mr. Nielsen,

I am writing to express my concerns with the current direction of the Homewood Mountain Resort.

To begin, I want to thank you and all previous TRPA board members and staff for your years of service to protect Tahoe and the Basin. I am sure you have encountered your share of push back on efforts to curb public enthusiasm for Fun at Tahoe. But your efforts have gone a long way to arrive where we are today. Builders, homeowners and the industry now play the "TRPA Game". We all display our Keep Tahoe Blue stickers.

For this reason, I am baffled that you would consider such a development and ignore all of us who have followed your example to date! In one decision, you risk alienating and making a mockery of all the measures you/we have all adopted.

The following brief statements pulled from JMA and developers say it all:

- * "The ski area and related amenities will be closed to the general public."
- * West shore residents will commute a far greater distance to recreate as they have historically.

My questions:

How does this development enhance the Lake Tahoe experience, environment and community?

How would this approval support all the years of community cooperation and involvement?

Sincerely,

Anne Wagner

Homewood, ca

From: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Sent: 2/10/2023 2:56:57 PM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: FW: Homewood resort

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

From: Graham Davis
Sent: Thursday, February 9, 2023 4:02 PM
To: Paul Nielsen
Subject: Homewood resort

Hi Paul,

Wanted to voice my support for Homewood remaining a publicly available ski resort option. The west shore is already too insular. Making Homewood an exclusive resort would be a loss to the community.

Thanks,
Graham

From: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Sent: 2/10/2023 2:57:44 PM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: FW: Homewood ski area proposed development

From: Nate Roach <nroach@gradexconstruction.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 9, 2023 4:31 PM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>; sbulna@placer.ca.gov
Subject: Homewood ski area proposed development

Sirs, My wife Nancy and I live at 7270 TimberWolf Dr. in Tahoma. We have followed the various discussions in recent years regarding the proposed changes to the Homewood ski area and the surrounding property. We are saddened by what appears to be a plan that would exclude we locals from skiing and hiking on the ski area property. We are further concerned about the loss of the "old Tahoe" look and feel which would result from the construction of the new buildings in the proposed designs. Please consider the concerns of long time neighbors like us as you decide how this development proceeds. Thank you, Nathan Roach

From: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Sent: 2/10/2023 9:10:30 AM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: FW: Homewood Ski project. Ref PLN22-00534

From: Eileen Eileen <eaicardi@pacbell.net>
Sent: Thursday, February 9, 2023 1:35 PM
To: Steve Buelna <sbuelna@placer.ca.gov>; supervisororgustafson@placer.ca.gov; Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Subject: Homewood Ski project. Ref PLN22-00534

Mr. Nielsen, Mr. Buelna and Ms Gustafson:

I am writing to express my concerns with the current direction of the Homewood Mountain Resort.

Homewood Resort developers' publicly stated plans for the property differ in material ways from the Master Plan previously approved by TRPA. Specifically:

1. Developer Art Chapman of JMA Ventures has stated in writing that the ski area and related amenities will be closed to the general public. This is unacceptable. Non-Homewood residents and guests must be allowed to ski, hike, and bike on Homewood lands, and enjoy the approved amenities. This is now forcing West Shore residents to drive substantial distances to enjoy these activities which causes environmental harm to Lake Tahoe.
2. TRPA and Placer County have approved initial development in a "mountain modern" architectural style. This is unacceptable. The originally approved plan specified a "classic old Tahoe lodge" architectural style.
3. Regulator discussions with developers have not been as transparent to the public as they should be.

In addition, the approved plans for workforce housing and traffic mitigation are outdated and insufficient. TRPA and Placer County should require a re-plan addressing these.

My neighbors and I will be monitoring the progress of this project. Please add me to any public communications or lists related to this matter.

Thank you -

Eileen and Dennis Aicardi.

490 Chukar, Chamberland

From: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Sent: 2/10/2023 9:01:30 AM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: FW: Homewood Ski Resort (reference #PLN22-00534)

From: Skipkniesche <skipkniesche@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 9, 2023 10:08 AM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>; Steve Buelna <sbuelna@placer.ca.gov>; supervisor@placer.ca.gov
Subject: Homewood Ski Resort (reference #PLN22-00534)

Mr. Nielsen, Mr. Buelna and Ms Gustafson:

I am writing to express my concerns with the current direction of the Homewood Mountain Resort.

Homewood Resort developers' publicly stated plans for the property differ in material ways from the Master Plan previously approved by TRPA. Specifically:

1. Developer Art Chapman of JMA Ventures has stated in writing that the ski area and related amenities will be closed to the general public. This is unacceptable. Non-Homewood residents and guests must be allowed to ski, hike, and bike on Homewood lands, and enjoy the approved amenities. This is now forcing West Shore residents to drive substantial distances to enjoy these activities which causes environmental harm to Lake Tahoe.
2. TRPA and Placer County have approved initial development in a "mountain modern" architectural style. This is unacceptable. The originally approved plan specified a "classic old Tahoe lodge" architectural style.
3. Regulator discussions with developers have not been as transparent to the public as they should be.

In addition, the approved plans for workforce housing and traffic mitigation are outdated and insufficient. TRPA and Placer County should require a re-plan addressing these.

My neighbors and I will be monitoring the progress of this project. Please add me to any public communications or lists related to this matter.

Thank you -

Skip Kniesche

275 Snowbird Loop, Chamberlands, Homewood

Sent from my iPad

From: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Sent: 2/10/2023 2:54:55 PM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: FW: Leave Homewood alone!

From: Lynn Huddleston <lynniebin@prodigy.net>
Sent: Thursday, February 9, 2023 3:24 PM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>; sbulna@placer.ca.gov; supervisor@placer.ca.gov
Subject: Leave Homewood alone!

Mr. Nielsen, Mr. Buelna and Ms Gustafson: I am writing to express my concerns with the current direction of the Homewood Mountain Resort. Homewood Resort developers publicly stated plans for the property differ in material ways from the Master Plan (<https://www.skihomewood.com/wpcontent/uploads/Homewood-Mountain-Resort-Ski-Area-Master-Plan-DetailsUpdated-10-04-20112.pdf>) previously approved by TRPA. Specifically: a. Developer Art Chapman of JMA Ventures has stated in writing that the ski area and related amenities will be closed to the general public. This is unacceptable. Non-Homewood residents and guests must be allowed to ski, hike, and bike on Homewood lands, and enjoy the approved amenities. b. TRPA has approved initial development in a mountain modern architectural style. This is unacceptable. The originally approved plan specified a classic old Tahoe lodge architectural style. c. Regulator discussions with developers have not been as transparent to the public as they should be. In addition, the approved plans for workforce housing and traffic mitigation are outdated and insufficient. TRPA and Placer County should require a replan addressing these. I and my neighbors will be monitoring progress on this project. Please add me to any public communications or lists related to this matter.

And to add this...My husband and I are 74 years old. We learned how to ski at Homewood. We taught our children how to ski on the same slopes there. And we have taught our grandchildren there. That whole ski area and land should be kept open for our future generations to learn and enjoy. Please do not keep it for only the rich people. Something just isn't fair about that. Thank you.

Lynn and Tom Huddleston and our children and our grandchildren and soon to be great grandchildren,
7072 8th Ave, Tahoma, California

From: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Sent: 2/10/2023 9:04:48 AM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: FW: Oppose Homewood Ski Resort Privatization Plans (Placer County Reference PLN22-00534)

From: Joshua Switzky <jswitzky@hotmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 9, 2023 11:01 AM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>; sbulna@placer.ca.gov; supervisor@placer.ca.gov
Cc: sm.fs.paltbmu@usda.gov
Subject: [BULK] Oppose Homewood Ski Resort Privatization Plans (Placer County Reference PLN22-00534)

Dear TRPA, Placer County, Supervisor Gustafson, and USFS Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit,

As a second home owner in Tahoma, very frequent visitor, and former full-time resident of the Tahoe area, I am writing to express my deep opposition to the proposal by JMA Ventures to fully privatize Homewood Ski Resort and turn it into an exclusive membership-based resort that does not provide for access to the general public. I relish having Homewood Ski Resort as part of the West Shore community, as a real low-key, accessible and relatively affordable option for locals, visitors, and families to share the love of skiing and the beauty of Lake Tahoe. It is only through ski areas like these that offer people new to skiing an affordable and approachable option to get into the sport and access the mountains of the Tahoe Basin. Indeed, it was at Homewood that I first put my two kids on skis when they were 2 years old, and it is has been at Homewood that we send our friends and visitors who haven't or can't committed to season passes to the big resorts. We supported Homewood's master plan and investment vision to upgrade the facilities, but the new proposed privatization of the resort and removal of public access is simply completely antithetical to the master plan and vision of Homewood as a continued part of the West Shore community and must be stopped. I should also mention that part of Homewood Ski Resort (eg Quail Face area) is on USFS public land and the USFS should not permit Homewood to keep it as part of their lease and use area if the resort and its facilities (ie chairlifts/lift tickets) is not fully open to the public.

I would like to point out that the approve [Homewood Master Plan](#) contains the following two key values:

- *Restore Homewood as the **community center of the west shore** of Lake Tahoe*
- *Preserve HMR reputation as a small, no-crowds-on-the-slopes, **family friendly enclave that can be enjoyed equally by local residents and visitors alike***

These core values are not consistent in any way with the proposal to turn Homewood Ski Resort into an exclusive members-only resort. The concept is just not consistent with these values and vision, it is the opposite.

Please consider these perspectives and do what is best not just for the community and Tahoe Basin and broader sport and economy of skiing.

Thank you.

Joshua Switzky
7218 6th Ave
Tahoma, CA 94162

671 4th Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94118

From: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Sent: 2/10/2023 2:57:12 PM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: FW: Privatizing Homewood

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

From: Jonah G Simoneaux
Sent: Thursday, February 9, 2023 4:13 PM
To: Paul Nielsen
Subject: Privatizing Homewood

To whom this may concern,

We are beyond upset and worried to hear about the rumors of Homewood ski resort becoming a private resort. We have two young children and a house in Tahoma and enjoy Homewood as our local and favorite mountain. The proximity to our house as well as our season passes make it a wonderful place for our young children to learn to ski and snowboard as well as a longtime favorite. We have no desire to battle traffic and go to mega- resorts Squaw and Alpine (Palisades) which are packed to the brim with millennials. We grew up going to Homewood and are loyal to it!

The west shore is one of the only places in tahoe that is not super developed and modernized and that is why it is so charming and special.

It would be a huge loss to the west shore hoa members to loose access to this amazing place. We hope and pray this does not happen. Keep Tahoe True .

Sincerely,
Jonah and Sophia Simoneaux
7295 7th Avenue
Tahoma

Sent from my iPhone

From: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Sent: 2/10/2023 9:11:14 AM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: FW: Reference PLN22-00534

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

From: Garreth Slevin
Sent: Thursday, February 9, 2023 1:49 PM
To: Paul Nielsen ; sbulna@placer.ca.gov
Subject: Recall: Reference PLN22-00534

Garreth Slevin would like to recall the message, "Reference PLN22-00534".

From: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Sent: 2/10/2023 9:10:56 AM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: FW: Reference PLN22-00534

From: Garreth Slevin <GSlevin@worldstaraviation.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 9, 2023 1:43 PM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>; sbulna@placer.ca.gov
Subject: Reference PLN22-00534

Gina,

Send this email to pnielsen@trpa.gov and sbulna@placer.ca.gov
You don't need to print or sign..

Make sure the "Reference PLN22-00534" is in the subject line

February 9, 2023
From: Gina Oliveira, 233 Pine Street, Tahoma.

Mr. Nielsen, Mr. Buelna and Ms Gustafson:

I am writing to express my concerns with the current direction of the Homewood Mountain Resort.

Homewood Resort developers publicly stated plans for the property differ in material ways from the Master Plan (<https://www.skihomewood.com/wpcontent/uploads/Homewood-Mountain-Resort-Ski-Area-Master-Plan-DetailsUpdated-10-04-20112.pdf>) previously approved by TRPA. Specifically:

- a. Developer Art Chapman of JMA Ventures has stated in writing that the ski area and related amenities will be closed to the general public. This is unacceptable. Non-Homewood residents and guests must be allowed to ski, hike, and bike on Homewood lands, and enjoy the approved amenities.
- b. TRPA has approved initial development in a mountain modern architectural style. This is unacceptable. The originally approved plan specified a classic old Tahoe lodge architectural style.
- c. Regulator discussions with developers have not been as transparent to the public as they should be.

In addition, the approved plans for workforce housing and traffic mitigation are outdated and insufficient. TRPA and Placer County should require a replan addressing these.

I also am aghast that the regulators and TRPA would consider a plan to allow a conversion of Homewood which is a huge element of the West Shore Tahoe culture for 60 years into a private resort for the benefit of billionaires that don't have tolerance to ski with average people. How can any Tahoe agency allow a footprint so big to serve so few people, its literally anti-Tahoe and anti-family? Generations of families have had their kids learn to ski at Homewood and have built family and neighbor traditions where skiing Homewood in family groups with friends and neighbors is what the West Shore of Tahoe is all about.

West Shore Tahoe should not be a place where a very small # of people come up to their mountain home 2 times a year from the bay area to ski with a handful of other very rich people, it literally makes no sense.

Why can't Art Chapman realize his return requirements by offering to make Homewood a resort for all homeowners from Tahoe City to South Lake Tahoe? He will probably do a lot better money-wise and he will preserve Homewood History for generations to come.

West Shore business will fail if this private club plan goes ahead as there will be no people skiing Homewood, no people in restaurants and retain as the private club will provide everything for the 150 members, it's a shocking concept to think that 150 members are more important to the regulators and TRPA then the population of homeowners and also non Tahoe residents, that will forever never be able to day ski.

Skiing is not about showing massive wealth, it's about enjoying a mountain and the snow with people from all walks of life that are on the mountain, on the chairlift with you, it's about seeing people dressed funnily, with music playing, people learning to ski and people helping each other have a really fun time.

Are we really going to let all of this culture, family and friendly atmosphere that Homewood is be replaced with perhaps only 50 people on a weekend day? I am surprised that a project as big as this would be considered for the benefit of such a small # of people, it's shameful and almost disgusting, it reminds me of a visit we did as a family to the Palace of Versailles last year.

I and my neighbors will be monitoring progress on this project. Please add me to any public communications or lists related to this matter.

Thank you for reading my submission and I hope that a better plan for a everyone could be considered, I as a Tahoe resident / homeowner would welcome a resort plan that required commitment from me to support the resort for the long term and to keep the resort open for all residents and the public to, we are an inclusive society, Art Chapman's plan is not inclusive, it is everything the opposite of inclusive.

Gina Oliveira.
233 Pine Street, Tahoma

From: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Sent: 2/10/2023 9:16:37 AM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: FW: Reference PLN22-00534

From: Gina Oliveira <ginaoliveira1@hotmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 9, 2023 2:13 PM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>; Petition Homewood <sbulna@placer.ca.gov>
Subject: Fwd: Reference PLN22-00534

>

Subject: Reference PLN22-00534

February 9, 2023
From: Gina Oliveira, 233 Pine Street, Tahoma.

Mr. Nielsen, Mr. Buelna and Ms Gustafson:

I am writing to express my concerns with the current direction of the Homewood Mountain Resort.

Homewood Resort developers publicly stated plans for the property differ in material ways from the Master Plan

(<https://www.skihomewood.com/wpcontent/uploads/Homewood-Mountain-Resort-Ski-Area-Master-Plan-DetailsUpdated-10-04-20112.pdf>) previously approved by TRPA. Specifically:

a. Developer Art Chapman of JMA Ventures has stated in writing that the ski area and related amenities will be closed to the general public. This is unacceptable. Non-Homewood residents and guests must be allowed to ski, hike, and bike on Homewood lands, and enjoy the approved amenities.

b. TRPA has approved initial development in a mountain modern architectural style. This is unacceptable. The originally approved plan specified a classic old Tahoe lodge architectural style.

c. Regulator discussions with developers have not been as transparent to the public as they should be.

In addition, the approved plans for workforce housing and traffic mitigation are outdated and insufficient. TRPA and Placer County should require a replan addressing these.

I also am aghast that the regulators and TRPA would consider a plan to allow a conversion of Homewood which is a huge element of the West Shore Tahoe culture for 60 years into a private resort for the benefit of billionaires that don't have tolerance to ski with average people. How can any Tahoe agency allow a footprint so big to serve so few people, its literally anti-Tahoe and anti-family? Generations of families have had their kids learn to ski at Homewood and have built family and neighbor traditions where skiing Homewood in family groups with friends and neighbors is what the West Shore of Tahoe is all about.

West Shore Tahoe should not be a place where a very small # of people come up to their mountain home 2 times a year from the bay area to ski with a handful of other very rich people, it literally makes no sense.

Why can't Art Chapman realize his return requirements by offering to make Homewood a resort for all homeowners from Tahoe City to South Lake Tahoe? He will probably do a lot better money-wise and he will preserve Homewood History for generations to come.

West Shore business will fail if this private club plan goes ahead as there will be no people skiing Homewood, no people in restaurants and retain as the private club will provide everything for the 150 members, it's a shocking concept to think that 150 members are more important to the regulators and TRPA then the population of homeowners and also non Tahoe residents, that will forever never be able to day ski.

Skiing is not about showing massive wealth, it's about enjoying a mountain and the snow with people from all walks of life that are on the mountain, on the chairlift with you, it's about seeing people dressed funnily, with music playing, people learning to ski and people helping each other have a really fun time.

Are we really going to let all of this culture, family and friendly atmosphere that Homewood is be replaced with perhaps only 50 people on a weekend day? I am surprised that a project as big as this would be considered for the benefit of such a small # of people, it's shameful and almost disgusting, it reminds me of a visit we did as a family to the Palace of Versailles last year.

I and my neighbors will be monitoring progress on this project. Please add me to any public communications or lists related to this matter.

Thank you for reading my submission and I hope that a better plan for a everyone could be considered, I as a Tahoe resident / homeowner would welcome a resort plan that required commitment from me to support the resort for the long term and to keep the resort open for all residents and the public to, we are an inclusive society, Art Chapman's plan is not inclusive, it is everything the opposite of inclusive.

Gina Oliveira.
233 Pine Street, Tahoma

From: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Sent: 2/10/2023 2:58:48 PM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: FW: Reference PLN22-00534

From: Garreth Slevin <GSlevin@worldstaraviation.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 9, 2023 4:59 PM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>; sbulna@placer.ca.gov
Subject: RE: Reference PLN22-00534

February 9, 2023
From: Garreth Slevin, 233 Pine Street, Tahoma.

Mr. Nielsen, Mr. Buelna and Ms Gustafson:

I am writing to express my concerns with the current direction of the Homewood Mountain Resort.

Homewood Resort developers publicly stated plans for the property differ in material ways from the Master Plan (<https://www.skihomewood.com/wpcontent/uploads/Homewood-Mountain-Resort-Ski-Area-Master-Plan-DetailsUpdated-10-04-20112.pdf>) previously approved by TRPA. Specifically:

- a. Developer Art Chapman of JMA Ventures has stated in writing that the ski area and related amenities will be closed to the general public. This is unacceptable. Non-Homewood residents and guests must be allowed to ski, hike, and bike on Homewood lands, and enjoy the approved amenities.
- b. TRPA has approved initial development in a mountain modern architectural style. This is unacceptable. The originally approved plan specified a classic old Tahoe lodge architectural style.
- c. Regulator discussions with developers have not been as transparent to the public as they should be.

In addition, the approved plans for workforce housing and traffic mitigation are outdated and insufficient. TRPA and Placer County should require a replan addressing these.

I also am aghast that the regulators and TRPA would consider a plan to allow a conversion of Homewood which is a huge element of the West Shore Tahoe culture for 60 years into a private resort for the benefit of billionaires that don't have tolerance to ski with average people. How can any Tahoe agency allow a footprint so big to serve so few people, its literally anti-Tahoe and anti-family? Generations of families have had their kids learn to ski at Homewood and have built family and neighbor traditions where skiing Homewood in family groups with friends and neighbors is what the West Shore of Tahoe is all about.

West Shore Tahoe should not be a place where a very small # of people come up to their mountain home 2 times a year from the bay area to ski with a handful of other very rich people, it literally makes no sense.

Why can't Art Chapman realize his return requirements by offering to make Homewood a resort for all homeowners from Tahoe City to South Lake Tahoe? He will probably do a lot better money-wise and he will preserve Homewood History for generations to come.

West Shore business will fail if this private club plan goes ahead as there will be no people skiing Homewood, no people in restaurants and retain as the private club will provide everything for the 150 members, it's a shocking concept to think that 150 members are more important to the regulators and TRPA then the population of homeowners and also non Tahoe residents, that will forever never be able to day ski.

Skiing is not about showing massive wealth, it's about enjoying a mountain and the snow with people from all walks of life that are on the mountain, on the chairlift with you, it's about seeing people dressed funnily, with music playing, people learning to ski and people helping each other have a really fun time.

Are we really going to let all of this culture, family and friendly atmosphere that Homewood is be replaced with perhaps only 50 people on a weekend day? I am surprised that a project as big as this would be considered for the benefit of such a small # of people, it's shameful and almost disgusting, it reminds me of a visit we did as a family to the Palace of Versailles last year.

I and my neighbors will be monitoring progress on this project. Please add me to any public communications or lists related to this matter.

Thank you for reading my submission and I hope that a better plan for a everyone could be considered, I as a Tahoe resident / homeowner would welcome a resort plan that required commitment from me to support the resort for the long term and to keep the resort open for all residents and the public to, we are an inclusive society, Art Chapman's plan is not inclusive, it is everything the opposite of inclusive.

Garreth Slevin.
233 Pine Street, Tahoma

From: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Sent: 2/10/2023 9:11:31 AM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: FW: Reference PLN22-00534

From: Garreth Slevin <GSlevin@worldstaraviation.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 9, 2023 1:49 PM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>; sbulna@placer.ca.gov
Subject: Reference PLN22-00534

February 9, 2023
From: Garreth Slevin, 233 Pine Street, Tahoma.

Mr. Nielsen, Mr. Buelna and Ms Gustafson:

I am writing to express my concerns with the current direction of the Homewood Mountain Resort.

Homewood Resort developers publicly stated plans for the property differ in material ways from the Master Plan (<https://www.skihomewood.com/wpcontent/uploads/Homewood-Mountain-Resort-Ski-Area-Master-Plan-DetailsUpdated-10-04-20112.pdf>) previously approved by TRPA. Specifically:

- a. Developer Art Chapman of JMA Ventures has stated in writing that the ski area and related amenities will be closed to the general public. This is unacceptable. Non-Homewood residents and guests must be allowed to ski, hike, and bike on Homewood lands, and enjoy the approved amenities.
- b. TRPA has approved initial development in a mountain modern architectural style. This is unacceptable. The originally approved plan specified a classic old Tahoe lodge architectural style.
- c. Regulator discussions with developers have not been as transparent to the public as they should be.

In addition, the approved plans for workforce housing and traffic mitigation are outdated and insufficient. TRPA and Placer County should require a replan addressing these.

I also am aghast that the regulators and TRPA would consider a plan to allow a conversion of Homewood which is a huge element of the West Shore Tahoe culture for 60 years into a private resort for the benefit of billionaires that don't have tolerance to ski with average people. How can any Tahoe agency allow a footprint so big to serve so few people, its literally anti-Tahoe and anti-family? Generations of families have had their kids learn to ski at Homewood and have built family and neighbor traditions where skiing Homewood in family groups with friends and neighbors is what the West Shore of Tahoe is all about.

West Shore Tahoe should not be a place where a very small # of people come up to their mountain home 2 times a year from the bay area to ski with a handful of other very rich people, it literally makes no sense.

Why can't Art Chapman realize his return requirements by offering to make Homewood a resort for all homeowners from Tahoe City to South Lake Tahoe? He will probably do a lot better money-wise and he will preserve Homewood History for generations to come.

West Shore business will fail if this private club plan goes ahead as there will be no people skiing Homewood, no people in restaurants and retain as the private club will provide everything for the 150 members, it's a shocking concept to think that 150 members are more important to the regulators and TRPA then the population of homeowners and also non Tahoe residents, that will forever never be able to day ski.

Skiing is not about showing massive wealth, it's about enjoying a mountain and the snow with people from all walks of life that are on the mountain, on the chairlift with you, it's about seeing people dressed funnily, with music playing, people learning to ski and people helping each other have a really fun time.

Are we really going to let all of this culture, family and friendly atmosphere that Homewood is be replaced with perhaps only 50 people on a weekend day? I am surprised that a project as big as this would be considered for the benefit of such a small # of people, it's shameful and almost disgusting, it reminds me of a visit we did as a family to the Palace of Versailles last year.

I and my neighbors will be monitoring progress on this project. Please add me to any public communications or lists related to this matter.

Thank you for reading my submission and I hope that a better plan for a everyone could be considered, I as a Tahoe resident / homeowner would welcome a resort plan that required commitment from me to support the resort for the long term and to keep the resort open for all residents and the public to, we are an inclusive society, Art Chapman's plan is not inclusive, it is everything the opposite of inclusive.

Garreth Slevin.
233 Pine Street, Tahoma

From: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Sent: 2/10/2023 9:10:45 AM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: FW: Reference PLN22-00534: Homewood Development

From: Ryan Chaney <rpchaney@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 9, 2023 1:37 PM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>; sbulna@placer.ca.gov; supervisororgustafson@placer.ca.gov
Subject: Reference PLN22-00534: Homewood Development

Mr. Nielsen, Mr. Buelna and Ms Gustafson:

Like many others, my family has been a member of the West Shore (Tahoma and Rubicon) communities for a couple of generations now. My wife and I were fortunate enough to buy our own place in Tahoma a while back (a few blocks from her childhood cabin) so that we could give our kids access to the same wonderful things Tahoe afforded us in our youth.

Homewood is a foundational member of the West Shore community; any potential changes to the resort must ensure access is maintained to all homeowners/community members. Restricting access to a smaller group of luxury properties (which will almost certainly be occupied by an endless churn of online renters who have no true ties, commitment, or responsibility to the area), is unacceptable and only further exacerbates the issues that are currently plaguing the basin.

If these plans move forward, I commit to not supporting any of their businesses.

Furthermore, Homewood Resort developers publicly stated plans for the property differ in material ways from the Master Plan previously approved by TRPA. Specifically:

- Developer Art Chapman of JMA Ventures has stated in writing that the ski area and related amenities will be closed to the general public. This is unacceptable. Non-Homewood residents and guests must be allowed to ski, hike, and bike on Homewood lands, and enjoy the approved amenities.
- TRPA has approved initial development in a mountain modern architectural style. This is unacceptable. The originally approved plan specified a classic old Tahoe lodge architectural style.
- Regulator discussions with developers have not been as transparent to the public as they should be.

In addition, the approved plans for workforce housing and traffic mitigation are outdated and insufficient. TRPA and Placer County should require a re-plan addressing these failings.

Please add me to any public communications or lists related to this matter.

Thank you,

Ryan Chaney
7185 Ninth Ave, Tahoma

From: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Sent: 2/10/2023 2:57:35 PM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: FW: TCPOA Letter regarding Homewood Development Project
Attachments: [TCPOA Homewood Letter.docx](#)

From: lindsay mcglenon <lmcglenon@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 9, 2023 4:29 PM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>; sbulna@placer.ca.gov; supervisorgustafson@placer.ca.gov
Subject: TCPOA Letter regarding Homewood Development Project

Dear Paul, Steve (PLN22-00534) and Cindy-

I respectfully submit my deep concerns for this Homewood Development in the letter attached. Reach out if I can be of service in any way. I appreciate your time and consideration.

Lindsay

February 9, 2023

Mr. Nielsen, Mr. Buelna and Ms Gustafson:

I am writing to express my concerns with the current direction of the Homewood Mountain Resort.

Homewood Resort developers' publicly stated plans for the property differ in material ways from the [Master Plan](https://www.skihomewood.com/wp-content/uploads/Homewood-Mountain-Resort-Ski-Area-Master-Plan-Details-Updated-10-04-20112.pdf) (<https://www.skihomewood.com/wp-content/uploads/Homewood-Mountain-Resort-Ski-Area-Master-Plan-Details-Updated-10-04-20112.pdf>) previously approved by TRPA. Specifically:

- a. Developer Art Chapman of JMA Ventures has stated in writing that the ski area and related amenities will be closed to the general public. This is unacceptable. Non-Homewood residents and guests must be allowed to ski, hike, and bike on Homewood lands, and enjoy the approved amenities.
- b. TRPA has approved initial development in a "mountain modern" architectural style. This is unacceptable. The originally approved plan specified a "classic old Tahoe lodge" architectural style.
- c. Regulator discussions with developers have not been as transparent to the public as they should be.

In addition, the approved plans for workforce housing and traffic mitigation are outdated and insufficient. TRPA and Placer County should require a re- plan addressing these. I also believe that the unintended consequences of this immense project on homeowners, visitors, small business owners, wildlife and their natural habitat will be detrimental to our ability to thrive in the West Shore. The effect a major development will have on the well being of this community overall, will be a negative one with long lasting and dangerous effects.

As a community, we will be monitoring progress on this project. Please add me to any public communications or lists related to this matter.

Thank you for your consideration–
Lindsay & Michael Nieri
420 Deer Avenue, Tahoma, CA.
Lmcglenon@yahoo.com

From: Steve Balsiger <stevebalsiger@gmail.com>
Sent: 2/10/2023 8:29:43 PM
To: Jeff Cowen <jcowen@trpa.gov>
Cc: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>;
Subject: Re: Homewood Master Plan Comments

Thank you Jeff! This email is very encouraging. I really appreciate it.

Steve

On Feb 10, 2023, at 2:36 PM, Jeff Cowen <jcowen@trpa.gov> wrote:

Thank you for your email about Homewood Mountain Resort. Your comment has been received and understood and will be part of the record.

Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA) planners are currently working to determine what the process, timeline, and public input opportunities will be for the proposed changes to be considered.

In anticipation of a process, we have opened a [Homewood Mountain Resort page](#) on our website where your comment letters and other documents and information will remain posted to ensure an open dialogue continues. We understand the Homewood resort means a great deal to the community and to Lake Tahoe's cultural heritage. Once the agency receives more information, planners will consider what impact the proposed changes might have on the resort Master Plan and the Tahoe Basin. As part of the process, TRPA will ensure community input is gathered and collaboration with partner agencies and organizations continues.

We appreciate your input and the time you have taken to reach out to us. Please continue to use homewoodplan@trpa.gov to contact us and watch for emails with updates and possible opportunities for your input.

Regards,

Jeff Cowen (he/his)
Public Information Officer
775.589.5278
<image001.jpg>
[trpa.gov](#)[facebook](#)[twitter](#)[instagram](#)

From: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Sent: 2/14/2023 9:00:09 AM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: FW: Homewood Mountain Resort

From: judy@judyfields.com <judy@judyfields.com>
Sent: Monday, February 13, 2023 4:47 PM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Cc: sbulna@placer.ca.gov; supervisorgustafson@placer.ca.gov; jimwfields@gmail.com
Subject: Homewood Mountain Resort

Feb. 13, 2023

Dear Mr. Neilsen, Mr. Buelna and Ms. Gustafson,

We are writing to express our concerns with the current direction of the Homewood Mountain Resort. The developers' have stated that the plans for the property differ in material ways from the Master Plan previously approved by TRPA.

The closing of the ski area and related amenities to the general public is unacceptable. Non-Homewood residents and guests must be allowed to use the lands. A mountain modern style is also not acceptable. The plans for managing traffic and workforce housing are insufficient.

We will be monitoring the progress on this project.

Thank you,

Jim and Judy Fields
7307 7th Ave
Tahoma, CA 96142

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10

From: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Sent: 2/14/2023 9:27:19 AM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: FW: Homewood Privatization

From: Richard Keller <rakinc@yahoo.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 11, 2023 10:22 PM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>; Steve Buelna <sbuelna@placer.ca.gov>; supervisororgustafson@placer.ca.gov
Subject: Homewood Privatization

Mr. Nielsen, Mr. Buelna and Ms Gustafson:

I am writing to express my concerns with the current direction of the Homewood Mountain Resort.

Homewood Resort developers' publicly stated plans for the property differ in material ways from the Master Plan previously approved by TRPA. Specifically:

1. Developer Art Chapman of JMA Ventures has stated in writing that the ski area and related amenities will be closed to the general public. This is unacceptable. Non-Homewood residents and guests must be allowed to ski, hike, and bike on Homewood lands, and enjoy the approved amenities. This is now forcing West Shore residents to drive substantial distances to enjoy these activities which causes environmental harm to Lake Tahoe.
2. TRPA and Placer County have approved initial development in a "mountain modern" architectural style. This is unacceptable. The originally approved plan specified a "classic old Tahoe lodge" architectural style.
3. Regulator discussions with developers have not been as transparent to the public as they should be.

In addition, the approved plans for workforce housing and traffic mitigation are outdated and insufficient. TRPA and Placer County should require a re-plan addressing these.

My neighbors and I will be monitoring the progress of this project. Please add me to any public communications or lists related to this matter.

Thank you -

Richard and Sheryl Keller
390 Snowbird Loop
Homewood CA

From: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Sent: 2/14/2023 9:05:37 AM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: FW: Plans for Homewood Mountain Ski Resort

From: Razukas, Peter M. <peter.razukas@dolby.com>
Sent: Monday, February 13, 2023 1:48 PM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>; sbulna@placer.ca.gov; supervisororgustafson@placer.ca.gov
Subject: Plans for Homewood Mountain Ski Resort

Dear Mr. Nielsen, Mr. Buelna and Ms Gustafson:

I am writing to express my concerns with the current direction of the Homewood Mountain Resort.

On a personal level, we love the west shore and Homewood mountain. It reminds me of skiing when I was young, pure fun and enjoyment without a lot of headache or exorbitant costs. For us, it is one of the few remaining charming ski resorts to exist in the basin. While the terrain is more exciting at Palisades (and I do love a good day there), we find ourselves gravitating to the mellow vibes and relaxed atmosphere on Homewood. I get anxious at the notion that my family may no longer be able to enjoy our time and spread positivity there.

In terms of our specific complaints, they relate to the Homewood Resort developers publicly stated plans for the property differing in material ways from the Master Plan (<https://www.skihomewood.com/wpcontent/uploads/Homewood-Mountain-Resort-Ski-Area-Master-Plan-DetailsUpdated-10-04-20112.pdf>) previously approved by TRPA.

Including, but not limited to:

- a. Developer Art Chapman of JMA Ventures has stated in writing that the ski area and related amenities will be closed to the general public. This is unacceptable. Non-Homewood residents and guests must be allowed to ski, hike, and bike on Homewood lands, and enjoy the approved amenities.
- b. TRPA has approved initial development in a mountain modern architectural style. This is unacceptable. The originally approved plan specified a classic old Tahoe lodge architectural style.
- c. Regulator discussions with developers have not been as transparent to the public as they should be.

In addition, the approved plans for workforce housing and traffic mitigation are outdated and insufficient. TRPA and Placer County should require a replan addressing these. We have seen the gridlock havoc that can occur without proper planning via examples such as Palisades Tahoe.

We and our neighbors will be monitoring progress on this project.

Please add me to any public communications or lists related to this matter.

Thank you!

Peter, Heather, Riley and Owen Razukas
7279 3rd Ave, Tahoma CA 96142

From: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Sent: 2/14/2023 9:14:05 AM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: FW: Reference PLN22-00534

From: Jennifer Hyman <jennhyman@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, February 13, 2023 10:04 AM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>; supervisor<gustafson@placer.ca.gov>; sbulna@placer.ca.gov
Cc: David Ackerly <david.ackerly@gmail.com>
Subject: Reference PLN22-00534

Dear Mr. Nielsen, Mr. Buelna and Ms Gustafson:

I am a homeowner in Tahoma who purchases a season ski pass to Homewood every other year and I am writing to express my concerns with the current direction of the Homewood Mountain Resort. Homewood Resort developers publicly stated plans for the property differ in material ways from the Master Plan previously approved by TRPA. Specifically:

- a. Developer Art Chapman of JMA Ventures has stated in writing that the ski area and related amenities will be closed to the general public. This is unacceptable. Non-Homewood residents and their friends must be allowed to downhill ski on Homewood lands. I have skied in Montana near the Yellowstone Club and it is possible to have non-residents ski on the same mountain with a separate, smaller lodge for outsiders. Homewood already has 2 base lodges so this seems easily doable.
- b. TRPA has approved initial development in a mountain modern architectural style. This is unacceptable. The originally approved plan specified a classic old Tahoe lodge architectural style. Modern architecture does not fit with the local architecture and mountain scenery and will be an eyesore. One only needs to look at the casinos in South Lake Tahoe or the all-glass Resort at Squaw Creek for examples of ugly modern architecture. The Villages at Pallisades are attractive however, with exposed wood beams and rock chimneys and I hope you will will enforce this more attractive requirement.

I appreciate TRPA and Placer County considering these concerns. Please add me to any public communications or lists related to this matter.

Thank you -

Jenn Hyman, PE
Tahoma, CA
831-251-3626

From: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Sent: 2/14/2023 9:26:31 AM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: FW: save the west shore

From: Kristen Fiore <kristen@kristenelizabethdesign.com>
Sent: Sunday, February 12, 2023 10:03 PM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Subject: save the west shore

Dear Mr. Nielson,

I write in support of saving the West Shore against the proposed privatization of Homewood ski resort.

The exclusivity and elitism that will prevail throughout the community is in complete opposition to the community that is present. It will isolate residents and create a further divide in real estate entry that is already at a prohibitive level.

Please consider the traffic impact, water resources, fire risk and overall burden such an initiative will have on the local landscape. Please consider the gem of the West Shore and this opportunity to truly preserve vs isolate and exclude. Profits should not be the only thing that drive development.

Thank you for your help in preserving the environment.

With best wishes,

Kristen



Kristen Fiore
Principal. 916.775.3746

KRISTEN ELIZABETH
DESIGN

From: Robert Tolin <oceantolin@gmail.com>
Sent: 2/14/2023 3:42:50 PM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>; Steve Buelna <sbuelna@placer.ca.gov>
Subject: Homewood's privatization

Greetings all,

I am a local homeowner in Meeks B, 386 Sunnyview Drive. Our family has skied Homewood Mountain Resort many times over the years. However lately due to drought conditions there had been a lack of suitable snow coverage on the mountain. A representative from Homewood Mountain Resort emailed me describing their need to upgrade infrastructure and how costly it is to do that, which I do not dispute. He also cited declining attendance at the resort due to the IKON passes at other resorts as the reason for the decline in attendance. He failed to mention the drought and lack of snow at his lower elevation resort.

As a local homeowner we would not be in favor of privatization and exclusivity of use of the Homewood Mountain Resort as it would preclude locals such as us from recreation there. In fact it would cause us to drive in excess of 20 miles each way to recreate in one of the other ski areas, which will exacerbate traffic problems, and contribute to more global warming.

I therefore humbly request that any elements of the Homewood Mountain Resort that excludes locals from participating in skiing activities at the resort be stricken from their permit and instead allow for locals and other visitors to recreate at Homewood Mountain Resort.

Respectfully,
Robert K Tolin

From: Alicia Brewer <alicia.brewer21@gmail.com>
Sent: 2/16/2023 5:57:47 PM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: NO to Homewood Development Plans

Hello,
I have been a west shore local for 30+ years and this new Elite plan would be disastrous for the West Shore. This new plan was also NOT what was agreed upon 2012 and is in violation of the 2012 agreement.

Locals cannot even find housing.

Please reconsider this plan and think about how it would affect the locals of the West Shore and vote NO on this plan.

Best,
Alicia Brewer (Rubicon Bay)

From: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Sent: 2/17/2023 2:55:56 PM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: FW: Referred by Cindy Gustafson's office

From: Kevin Foster <kevinfoster3489@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 1, 2023 1:55 PM
To: Marja Ambler <mambler@trpa.gov>
Subject: Referred by Cindy Gustafson's office

Hello,

I would like to insure that I am aware of any scheduled activity or discussions regarding Homewood Mountain development. The situation has changed significantly since the approval of 2011 and all of the community is very concerned.

Sophie Fox from Cindy's office suggested I contact you to insure we are aware of the schedule.

Kevin Foster
925-788-9481

From: Rodney R. Eales <reales@e3-invest.com>
Sent: 2/17/2023 5:46:57 PM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: Homewood Development

It has come to my attention that the Discovery Group is changing the original Homewood Development plans. There have been no public announce/notices to let the community voice their opinion!
I am very concerned that the ski resort may go private! That would be very detrimental to the Tahoe regional community!
Also the planned development is not in keeping with the original Tahoe construction style!
Please do not allow these changes to go forward!
Thank you,
Rodney Eales
5614 Lagoon Rd
Homewood, CA 96141

From: Max Alcorn <maxalcorn@gmail.com>
Sent: 2/17/2023 4:35:42 PM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: Homewood Resort Plans

Hi,

I am a Tahoma resident and loyal season passholder at Homewood Resort. I am writing in opposition of the newly unveiled privatization plan of the resort which greatly differs from the previously approved master plan that was intended to equally benefit the local community and visitors.

Art Chapman vehemently attributes Homewood's lack of financial success due to the proliferation of Ikon/Epic passes and traffic on Highway 89. The fact of the matter is - the ski industry is a capital intensive business and JMA Ventures has not invested in its infrastructure to provide a good skier experience and to ensure the ski area's success. Art claims the resort has invested \$10 million since it was purchased... well that was over a 15 year period, which implies a \$500k annual maintenance capex budget which is significantly less than comparable resorts. The South Lodge was suspiciously burned down years ago and was never replaced, the bathrooms at the South Base are portable toilets in the parking lots, and the bathroom at the mid-mountain area is a disgusting hole in the ground. Homewood's single day walk-up lift ticket hit \$279 this season, the highest in the nation, for a resort with one high-speed quad and minimal on-mountain amenities. JMA is intentionally running the resort into the ground via excessive pricing and minimal marketing to maintain its dialogue that the current business model is not sustainable from declining skier visits.

It is worth highlighting that countless independent ski resorts have been thriving the last few years as skiers seek less crowded alternatives to the mega-pass Ikon/Epic resorts. An article from Jason Blevins of the Colorado Sun in April 2022 notes that Colorado independent ski resorts such as Arapahoe Basin, Echo Mountain, Loveland, Monarch, Powderhorn, Ski Granby, Silverton Mountain and Wolf Creek all reported record visits and revenues in the last two seasons. Mt Rose in Tahoe has seen record skier visits and pass sales and recently opened a new \$7.5 million Lakeview Express chairlift, equivalent to 75% of Homewood's cumulative 15-year capital expenditure budget.

JMA Ventures has said the privatization business model is the only option for the resort to continue operations which is not true. JMA clearly has the capital base to invest in the resort - JMA was recently working on a multibillion dollar proposal for the redevelopment of the Tampa Bay Rays baseball district in Florida as well as made several acquisitions in Colorado and St. Lucia over the past two years. The company could also easily sell the resort to deep-pocketed operators such as Alterra or Vail who are looking for more capacity in Northern California, or another established and knowledgeable operator that would invest for the resort's success.

Additionally, removing local ski access to Homewood would put hundreds of more cars on the already congested roads to Palisades or Northstar, further exacerbating the traffic and deteriorating the ski experience of local residents.

The current privatization plans do not align with the previously approved 2011 master plan which included the following language:

- **A central goal of that plan is to restore Homewood as a key gathering center for Lake Tahoe's West Shore and to maintain the heritage of a ski resort that can be enjoyed equally by local residents and visitors.**
- **The following goals shaped the current master planning efforts and will continue to guide HMR as it strives to become a model for responsible land use and community planning:**
 - Restore Homewood as the community center of the west shore of Lake Tahoe
 - Preserve the character of Homewood by developing new facilities that reflect the existing architectural quality and scale of the community
 - Preserve HMR reputation as a small, no-crowds-on-the-slopes, family friendly enclave that can be enjoyed equally by local residents and visitors alike.
- **Homewood Mountain Resort is an important winter recreation amenity to the residents, second homeowners, and visitors of the West Shore of Lake Tahoe. It has been considered the locals' ski hill for several decades.**

These points all need to be addressed by JMA Ventures and clearly articulated to the public prior to any TRPA decision. Art Chapman's concession for local ski days a few times per month on weekdays clearly differs from the previous project approval's goal of serving as a key gathering center for the West Shore used equally by residents and visitors.

I think there is a positive middleground option which still maintains consistent access to the ski resort for locals via season passes and lift tickets for associated guests, while also including some benefits to the new resident members. Other clubs such as Tahoe Mountain Club/Schaffer's Mill/Martis Camp have on-site member-only lounges or clubhouses at Northstar while still maintaining public ski access. The recently announced Marcella Club in Park City will still allow public ski access to the new Mayflower Mountain and Deer Valley, while providing some special amenities such as lounges/restaurants/locker rooms/etc. to the new members.

I look forward to your response in addressing these issues and making sure the intended project will actually benefit the local community.

Best,
Max Alcorn

From: Patrick Parsel <pvparsel@gmail.com>
Sent: 2/17/2023 1:30:06 PM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: Please add me to email list

Hello,

I would like to stay up to date regarding this proposal, so please add me to the email list.

Thank you!

From: Steve Balsiger <stevebalsiger@gmail.com>
Sent: 2/17/2023 4:56:06 PM
To: Jeff Cowen <jcowen@trpa.gov>; Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Cc: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>;
Subject: Re: New Homewood Documents Posted - No Hearing Scheduled
Attachments: [image001.jpg](#)

Paul and Jeff, I very much appreciate your response back to Art from JMA dated 2/4. Exactly what needed to be said and I feel very much represent what I and other residents feel regarding this "bait and switch" from JMA. I'll be honest, many years ago I thought TRPA was not representative of the thoughts and feelings of west shore residents. I was wrong. Thank you for what you're doing! I know Art will crap all over this and say it's the only economically viable solution but please help us hold them to what was originally agreed to or to modifications that we all can agree to.

Take care

Steve Balsiger
Rubicon home owner

On Feb 17, 2023, at 3:04 PM, Jeff Cowen <jcowen@trpa.gov> wrote:

Thank you for your input and requesting to be updated on the Homewood Mountain Resort Master Plan. Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA) staff has posted the most recent correspondence with Homewood management on trpa.gov's [Homewood Master Plan](#) webpage, and continues to post emails, letters, and comments received as part of the record.

Staff will continue to keep that page updated as additional information and an application come forward. No meetings have been scheduled regarding Homewood's proposal to amend the 2011 resort master plan.

Please note this item is not on the February TRPA Governing Board agenda and will not be discussed by board members. Members of the public are welcome to comment on items not on the agenda during the Public Interest Comments item, which occurs at the end of the meeting either online or in person. The agenda is attached here for your reference. The Governing Board cannot discuss issues raised by the public that are not listed on the agenda.

We appreciate the time you have taken to reach out to us about Homewood and will continue to keep you informed and share opportunities to further engage TRPA and the Governing Board.

TRPA Staff
Paul Nielsen
pnielsen@trpa.gov
Special Projects Manager

Jeff Cowen
jcowen@trpa.gov
Public Information Officer



[trpa.gov](#)[facebook](#)[twitter](#)[instagram](#)

<February-22-Governing-Board-Agenda.pdf>



**TAHOE
REGIONAL
PLANNING
AGENCY**

P.O. Box 5310
Stateline, NV 89449

775-588-4547

www.trpa.gov

From: Maryann Ibrahim <maryannibrahim@gmail.com>
Sent: 2/18/2023 4:50:03 PM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>; Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Subject: [BULK] Homewood Mountain Resort Plans

Hello TRPA,

I am writing to express my concerns with how the Homewood Mountain Resort approved plans from 2011 are not being enforced.

Developers JMA Ventures, Mohari Hospitality, and Discovery Land Company are attempting a bait and switch. **Their publicly stated plans are very different from the [Master Plan](#) approved by TRPA and the local community in 2011.**

Specifically:

- Homes are already being built in a “mountain modern” architectural style on the land. The originally approved plan specified a “classic old Tahoe lodge” architectural style
- Developer Art Chapman of JMA Ventures states that the ski area and related amenities will only be open to the general public one or two days a month. This is unacceptable as the originally approved Master Plan envisioned a resort that would be open to the public.
- Regulator discussions with developers have not been as transparent to the public as they should be.

This is really disappointing that Developers JMA Ventures, Mohari Hospitality, and Discovery Land Companies feel they are above the law and can just do this bait and switch without any accountability. If they have decided to revise their business plans they should go through the right channels again - that is the right thing to do.

I and my neighbors will be monitoring progress on this project. Please add me to any public communications or lists related to this matter.

Thank you in advance.

Maryann Ibrahim
6230 Chamberland Drive

From: Steven Smith <sbs9600@gmail.com>
Sent: 2/18/2023 10:48:18 AM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: Homewood master plan - please add me to your list

Hello,

I would like to be added to your email list for updates on the Homewood master plan.
I am a resident of Tahoma.

Thank you.
Steven Smith

From: Hannah Glass <hannahmtl@gmail.com>
Sent: 2/18/2023 9:01:49 PM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: Homewood updates

Please add me to the list to receive homewood updates

Hannah

From: Scott MacLeod <scottmacleod5@yahoo.com>
Sent: 2/19/2023 10:25:17 AM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>; HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>; Jeff Cowen <jcowen@trpa.gov>
Subject: Kudos to TRPA on Homewood Mountain Resort Response

Paul,

With all the anger and frustration being sent your way about the Homewood development proposal, I wanted to give you kudos for your letter dated Feb.4 sent in response to JMA's proposal. It is direct, reasoned, and it captures the main elements of the major differences versus the 2011 plan.

I also want to commend you for your polite and restrained tone. You must have worked hard to maintain your professionalism given that it's clear JMA expected a brief "updated" plan would sail through TRPA despite the fact it was so obviously in direct conflict with what you approved previously. Further, given the community's response you've received, it's clear that JMA's claim that their community outreach effort showed the community was "generally very positive" is false, and most probably deceptive.

Thank you for being great watchdogs in protection of the West Shore and the Lake overall.

Scott MacLeod
Talon St.
Homewood

From: Pat Lindquist <pblindquist@gmail.com>
Sent: 2/19/2023 4:19:47 PM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>; Steve Buelna <sbuelna@placer.ca.gov>
Cc: Pat Lindquist <pblindquist@gmail.com>;
Subject: Privatizing Homewood Ski Resort with the New Resort Master Plan

To: All TRPA Board Members, Steve Buelna
From: Brown Family members
Re: Recently Proposed Changes to Homewood Mountain Resort Master Plan
Reference: PLN22-00534

The proposed changes to Homewood Mountain Resort's Master Plan, making use of this very desirable Westshore recreational area exclusive to members only is a short sighted decision which will have long term negative effects on quality of life for all concerned.

The initial negative impacts will be to the local residents who will lose a major recreational asset, will experience more traffic congestion, and likely will also experience rising rents and home prices as a side effect of having an exclusive resort in the neighborhood.

The secondary impacts will be loss of the laboring class of residents as they will no longer be able to afford living in the Homewood area, thus will move on to less expensive areas. This has a ripple effect as even local property and business owners who can afford to stay, will have no access to workers to do repairs/workers to staff businesses. The necessary balance of residents with varying skills will be greatly skewed.

These two major effects will undermine sustainable vitality of Westshore communities. This issue obviously is one which impacts the Lake Tahoe basin as a whole https://apple.news/Atdg1jPyURuW5rZl7m_D1Pw, but as a family of homeowners/taxpayers on the Westshore of Lake Tahoe for the **past 64 years** we are specifically raising our voices to ask TRPA NOT to approve these changes to the Homewood Mountain Resort Master Plan, as the short term gains will not serve the community now and in the future.

TRPA has the responsibility to manage the 'big picture' of Lake Tahoe's natural and economic resources. Please turn down this plan to privatize Homewood Mountain Resort – the short term gains to a few are not worth the long term losses to many.

Sincerely,

Pat Brown Lindquist
3205 Ann Road
Homewood, CA

From: Gayle Peterson <longdrun@surewest.net>
Sent: 2/20/2023 11:57:51 AM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: Fwd: Homewood

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Gayle Peterson <longdrun@surewest.net>
Date: February 20, 2023 at 11:55:17 AM PST
To: sbuelna@placer.ca.gov
Subject: Homewood

I would like to express that we are not in favor of Homewood becoming private. It has served the Tahoe area for years allowing many to come to a smaller resort and pay smaller prices. We have raised our kids using Homewood and are now seniors in the area and we are still 💎💎! This should remain a ski resort for all to enjoy. The master plan should not be changed. The area has never been a "modern" feel. It's alpine and cozy and warm. If condos must be built let the architecture blend in with our mountain chalet style, not big city modern! It just doesn't fit here. Thank you. Dennis and Gayle Peterson. 256 Cedar Ridge Dr. Tahoma.

Sent from my iPhone

From: Yahoo Messenger <davidkleinerman@yahoo.com>
Sent: 2/20/2023 3:12:15 PM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>; Steve Buelna <sbuelna@placer.ca.gov>
Subject: Reference PLN22-00534

To whom it may concern,

We as full time residents of Tahoma have concerns regarding the impact of the Homewood development on our safety and environment as well as access to our local mountain. As you are well aware, since your decade old environmental review, the severity of fire has increased exponentially in the last few years leading to evacuations and mortality with the Paradise and Caldor fires. A development in an area already stressed by drought and potential fire causes great concern over the ability to safely evacuate. Homewood mountain and surrounding forest already has many dead and diseased trees and drought impacted environment.

Having several hundred more cars will put a strain on our already overburdened single lane highway. We are concerned about the impact that the development will have on the stream environment and runoff into Lake Tahoe affecting it's already diminished clarity.

How does this privatization project work with the California access for all plan?

Why is the burden for profit at the expense of the local residents safety and ability to access their neighborhood mountain.

We do not support the current plan to over build this sensitive area at the possible expense of our lives.

Lisa and David Kleinerman

[Sent from Yahoo Mail for iPhone](#)

From: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Sent: 2/21/2023 9:52:51 AM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: FW: [BULK] [BULK] New Concern From Hans Wissler

From: Steve Sweet <ssweet@trpa.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, February 21, 2023 9:45 AM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>; Wendy Jepson <wjepson@trpa.gov>
Subject: FW: [BULK] [BULK] New Concern From Hans Wissler

FYI

From: Tahoe Regional Planning Agency — TRPA <webmaster@trpa.org>
Sent: Sunday, February 19, 2023 7:58 PM
To: Steve Sweet <ssweet@trpa.gov>
Subject: [BULK] [BULK] New Concern From Hans Wissler

Hi, I've been a long time employee at Homewood ski area since 1999 and have some concerns about recent plans to privatize the resort. I'm currently employed at the westshore Café however since the plans to privatize with the Discovery Land Company the hotel and restaurant has been closed to the public and I've been demoted from full time employment to on call which has only been about two weeks of work this whole winter so far. Over the years of JMA's management of the resort I've seen a lack of concern about the integrity of operations and safety measures. It seems as if they actually try and make the resort a less enjoyable experience for customers over the years and especially with their recent announcement of going private. It's not secret that ski areas in Tahoe and other resort communities rely on J1's to fill the positions that locals are not able to simply because they aren't there due to cost of living. This has also allowed resorts to keep wages low. It's a façade the ski area like to put up that they are giving people in poorer countries opportunity but most all J1's coming to Tahoe are from privileged families and it's kind of like their parents sending their college students to a summer camp. My first year at homewood in 1999 was the only year there we not J1's working. I really don't mind them as I've made a lot of friends in South America counties but I feel they are being exploited and locals are not getting the chance to earn a living wage because of it. I have many gripes about how poorly managed the resort is, everything from illegal construction (which i reported to the building department) to the poorly maintained composting toilets at the mid mountain warming hut which are a health hazard. Homewood continues to raise its lift ticket prices and provides a worse experience. The food court has gone severely downhill as well. All this makes me wonder if they are trying to not make money with the place so they can justify going private. I also believe discovery land company is a bit of a scam. I think they are overvaluing their company similar to Uber or Tesla and selling a sort of pie in the sky preposition to JMA. They have filed for bankruptcy twice and recently lost some of their high profile members. Also their properties don't actually turn a profit. They seem shady to me and I'm willing to bet that in the future more will be revealed about the hustle they're pushing.

If you would like to have a chat please feel free to call me as I know TRPA probably has concerns about the development and the direction it will move the westshore community. Thanks for hearing me out. Have a great day!

-Hans Wissler (hanzal@live.com)

From: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Sent: 2/21/2023 4:12:02 PM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: FW: [BULK] Refer: PLN22-00534

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

From: Jennifer Allen-Barker
Sent: Tuesday, February 21, 2023 3:09 PM
To: supervisorgustafson@placer.ca.gov
Cc: Paul Nielsen ; sbulna@placer.ca.gov
Subject: [BULK] Refer: PLN22-00534

Mr. Nielsen, Mr. Buelna and Ms Gustafson:

I am writing to express my concerns with the current direction of the Homewood Mountain Resort.

Homewood Resort developers' publicly stated plans for the property differ in material ways from the Master Plan ([https://www.skihomewood.com/wp-content/uploads/Homewood-Mountain-Resort-Ski-Area-Master-Plan-Details- Updated-10-04-20112.pdf](https://www.skihomewood.com/wp-content/uploads/Homewood-Mountain-Resort-Ski-Area-Master-Plan-Details-Updated-10-04-20112.pdf)) previously approved by TRPA.

Specifically:

- a. Developer Art Chapman of JMA Ventures has stated in writing that the ski area and related amenities will be closed to the general public. This is unacceptable. Non-Homewood residents and guests must be allowed to ski, hike, and bike on Homewood lands, and enjoy the approved amenities.
- b. TRPA has approved initial development in a mountain modern architectural style. This is unacceptable. The originally approved plan specified a classic old Tahoe lodge architectural style.
- c. Regulator discussions with developers have not been as transparent to the public as they should be.

In addition, the approved plans for workforce housing and traffic mitigation are outdated and insufficient. TRPA and Placer County should require a re- plan addressing these. This is especially important, as current workforce housing / cost of living cannot meet current needs in the Tahoe basin. Additionally, traffic along the west shore, including through Homewood, is already severely problematic, so any deveopment which increases traffic needs to include mitigation plans, this should include contributions to expand and improve local public transportation services.

I am eager to be informed on the progress of this project. Please add me to any public communications or lists related to this matter.

Thank you -
Jennifer Allen-Barker
7266 5th Ave.
Tahoma, CA, 96142

Sent from my iPad

From: Paul Nielsen <pnelsen@trpa.gov>
Sent: 2/21/2023 9:27:26 AM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: FW: [EXTERNAL] Re: Homewood Master Plan not approved?
Attachments: [image001.png](#) , [image002.png](#)

From: Julie Regan <jregan@trpa.gov>
Sent: Saturday, February 18, 2023 4:48 PM
To: Jeff Cowen <jcowen@trpa.gov>; Sarah Underhill <sunderhill@trpa.gov>
Cc: Paul Nielsen <pnelsen@trpa.gov>
Subject: FW: [EXTERNAL] Re: Homewood Master Plan not approved?

fyi

—
Julie W. Regan,
Executive Director
775.589.5237

From: Cindy Gustafson <cindygustafson@placer.ca.gov>
Date: Saturday, February 18, 2023 at 9:33 AM
To: Renee Koiiane <rkoijane@gmail.com>
Cc: Mayumi Elegado <mayumi@moonshineink.com>, Katherine Hill <publisher@tahoethisweek.com>, Megan Chillemi <megan@chillemi.com>, JULIE REGAN <jregan@trpa.gov>, Kathy Astromoff <kathy.astromoff@gmail.com>
Subject: RE: [EXTERNAL] Re: Homewood Master Plan not approved?

Good morning Renee (and all) - hope you are enjoying a beautiful weekend! I apologize for the delay, County counsel provided technical responses early this week and I am obviously just now catching up on my emails.

Please see the responses below and let me know if you have further questions.

In service,

1. Why did Placer not approve that master plan?

The County did approve the project entitled "Homewood Mountain Resort Ski Area Project" ("Project"). Specifically, on December 6, 2011, the Board of Supervisors approved the "Homewood Mountain Resort Ski Area Project". This included the certification of the EIR, conditional use permit, planned development permit and vesting tentative subdivision map. https://www.placer.ca.gov/DocumentCenter/View/10678/boss_111206-HTML he Project is discussed in the EIR/EIS and in the November 15, 2011 staff report to the Board:

*PROJECT DESCRIPTION The Homewood Mountain Resort Ski Area **Master Plan** is a mixed-use project developed under the TRPA Community Enhancement Program (CEP) guidelines adopted in August 2007. Placer County, as the lead agency under CEQA, jointly prepared an EIR/EIS for the project with TRPA. In its entirety, the documents consist of the January 2011 Draft EIR/EIS and the October 2011 Final EIR/EIS (State Clearinghouse No. 2008092008). The EIR/EIS prepared for the Project is both a program and project EIR. The EIR/EIS addresses the environmental impacts associated with adoption of the Homewood Mountain Resort Ski Area Master Plan covering the approximately 1,253- acres within the County.*

(Emphasis added.) <https://www.placer.ca.gov/DocumentCenter/View/10691/COMMUNITY-DEVELOPMENT-RESOURCE-AGENCY-PLANNING-PDF>

The project was challenged in a CEQA law suit and it settled. As a result, there was no requirement for the Board to reconsider the project.

Therefore, the Project was approved in 2011 by the County, remains an approved project and the fact that the title of the Project doesn't include "master plan" is irrelevant to the substance of the Project approvals.

2. When did you first learn that Placer County did not approve that master plan?

Not accurate. Please see response to #1.

3. When did JMA begin discussions with Placer County legal counsel regarding their new operational plan?

Placer County Counsel has had no discussions with JMA. Please see further response to #4.

4. Has Placer County legal counsel been offering JMA advice knowing that a master plan was not approved?

Placer County Counsel does not represent private parties. JMA has its own counsel. As a result, County Counsel has not, nor have they ever, "offered JMA" legal advice. As discussed above the "master plan project" was approved by the Board of Supervisors on 12/6/11.

5. How did the conditional use permit transpire for use by JMA?

Please see response to #1.

6. Did Placer County legal or anyone with TRPA advise JMA to use a phased design review process for their new plan?

Please see response to #4. Placer County cannot respond for or on behalf of TRPA.

In addition, this project has always been intended as a phased project:

Master Plan Phasing

The project applicant anticipates a ten-year time frame for the build out of the Ski Area Master Plan. The following outlines the anticipated development phasing. Phase 1 - North Base area - Implementation in years 1 through 5: 1a. Mid-Mountain Day Lodge and accessory structures (two 250,000-gallon water tanks and Gondola terminal), Mid Mountain Learn to Ski Lift, Mid-Mountain Maintenance Facility, Gondola, North Base Amphitheater, North Base Hotel/Lodge (Building B), North Base Day Skier Services Building and Residential Units (Building A), North Base Commercial and Residential Units (Building C) and Landscape/Ice Pond Area, North Base Employee/Workforce Housing and Day Skier Parking Structure (Building P), TCPUD bike trail extension, and LEED Commissioning; 1 b. North Base Residential Building Adjacent to Highway 89 (Building D); and 1 c. North Base Residential Building Adjacent to Highway 89 (Building E). A Phase 1 construction staging and parking plan will be prepared at the beginning of Master Plan implementation. HMR plans to shut down the entire North Base area for Phase 1 construction and utilize the existing parking areas according to a detailed construction logistics plan. The selected general contractor would be required to put such a logistics plan together as one of their first tasks. The focus of the first phase 1 a would be the hotel, day skier facility, and parking/workforce housing structure, which would leave the existing paved parking area fronting Highway 89 open and available for staging of materials and construction parking. During Phase 1 a construction, winter ski operations would continue to operate out of the South Base area. Phase 2 - South Base - Implementation in years 6 through 10: 2a. Culvert Removal, Tahoe Ski Bowl Way road realignment and SEZ Restoration; South Base Residential Buildings A and A1 (southern buildings) (under Alternative 1A, Building A1 is replaced with Chalets A1-1 to A1-9); 2b. South Base Residential Building B (northern building) (under Alternative 1A, Building B is replaced with Chalets B 1 to B 15); and 2c. Tahoe Ski Bowl Way roadway extension and Townhouses (located above North Base area, but accessed from the South Base area). Additional project-level environmental review is required prior to acquiring project entitlements to complete this phase. (Final EIR/EIS, pp. 3-53 to 3-54.)

<https://www.placer.ca.gov/DocumentCenter/View/10691/COMMUNITY-DEVELOPMENT-RESOURCE-AGENCY-PLANNING-PDF>

7. Can you please place this item on the next NTRAC agenda for discussion?

Email response provided by Supervisor Gustafson on February 9, 2023

Cindy Gustafson

Supervisor - District Five
Board of Supervisors
cindygustafson@placer.ca.gov



From: Renee Kojane <rkojane@gmail.com>

Sent: Friday, February 17, 2023 3:36 PM

To: Cindy Gustafson <cindygustafson@placer.ca.gov>

Cc: Mayumi Elegado <mayumi@moonshineink.com>; Katherine Hill <publisher@tahoethisweek.com>; Megan Chillemi <megan@chillemi.com>; jregan@trpa.gov; Kathy Astromoff <kathy.astromoff@gmail.com>

Subject: Re: [EXTERNAL] Re: Homewood Master Plan not approved?

Hi Cindy,

I'm circling back per this last email correspondence. It's been over a week and hopefully you've had time to get some clarity from your staff about the below questions. I've also copied fellow West Shore resident Kathy Astromoff who is also interested as well.

Thank you for your time.

Renee

On Wed, Feb 8, 2023 at 4:03 PM Cindy Gustafson <cindygustafson@placer.ca.gov> wrote:

Hi Renee et al!

TRPA and Placer County have different processes but one thing they have in common is that the Boards of both organizations rely on staff to follow the appropriate processes and procedures with regard to project applications. Much of the history of project approvals predates my time on either Board. I will ask staff to provide responses to your questions.

In service,

Cindy Gustafson

Supervisor - District Five
Board of Supervisors
cindygustafson@placer.ca.gov



From: Renee Kojane <rkojane@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, February 8, 2023 1:44 PM

To: Cindy Gustafson <cindygustafson@placer.ca.gov>

Cc: Mayumi Elegado <mayumi@moonshineink.com>; Katherine Hill <publisher@tahoethisweek.com>; Megan Chillemi <megan@chillemi.com>; jregan@trpa.gov

Subject: [EXTERNAL] Re: Homewood Master Plan not approved?

Hi again Cindy,

It occurred to me that given your position as TRPA Board Chair, you could really help us ALL understand the situation wearing both your hats. So I'm including TRPA Executive Director, Julie Regan, in this email. I've also added a few more questions.

Any clarity you can provide will be much appreciated by the public at large.

See my original email below.

Regards,
Renee Kojane

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

From: **Renee Kojane** <rkojane@gmail.com>

Date: Wed, Feb 8, 2023 at 12:09 PM

Subject: Homewood Master Plan not approved?

To: Cindy Gustafson <cindygustafson@placer.ca.gov>

Cc: Mayumi Elegado <mayumi@moonshineink.com>, Katherine Hill <publisher@tahoethisweek.com>, Megan Chillemi <megan@chillemi.com>

Hello Cindy,

I've just learned today through my conversation with TRPA that Placer County never approved Homewood's Master Plan. And that lawyers are now looking into that. (Thankfully, TRPA did approve the master plan).

Can you please answer these questions, as I know the public is interested in a better understanding of all this from Placer County's perspective? I've copied Mayumi with Moonshine and NTRAC members as well.

- 1) Why did Placer not approve that master plan?
- 2) When did you first learn that Placer County did not approve that master plan?
- 3) When did JMA begin discussions with Placer County legal counsel regarding their new operational plan?
- 4) Has Placer County legal counsel been offering JMA advice knowing that a master plan was not approved?
- 5) How did the conditional use permit transpire for use by JMA?

6) Did Placer County legal or anyone with TRPA advise JMA to use a phased design review process for their new plan?

7) Can you please place this item on the next NTRAC agenda for discussion?

Thank you,

Renee Kojane
Homewood resident

Disclaimer

The information contained in this communication from the sender is confidential. It is intended solely for use by the recipient and others authorized to receive it. If you are not the recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, distribution or taking action in relation of the contents of this information is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful.

This email has been scanned for viruses and malware, and may have been automatically archived by **Mimecast Ltd**, an innovator in Software as a Service (SaaS) for business. Providing a **safer** and **more useful** place for your human generated data. Specializing in; Security, archiving and compliance. To find out more [Click Here](#).

--
~Renee
www.reneekojaneart.com





From: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Sent: 2/21/2023 9:11:14 AM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: FW: Taking Homewood Resorts private ...

From: Charles Murray <cmur9@aol.com>
Sent: Monday, February 20, 2023 6:48 PM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>; Jeff Cowen <jcowen@trpa.gov>
Subject: Taking Homewood Resorts private ...

Sirs,

As 63+ year property owners in Homewood my family has seen many changes.

For instance we remember when the High & Dry “marina” added the “marina” to their boat store.
The substantial fines incurred for not having required permits and approvals were considered just a “cost of doing business”.

When the same owner also got approval to “improve” the ski area south of Madden creek the erosion mitigation requirements were ignored. Madden creek ran brown with mud for years. Again the significant fines were simply tossed off as a “cost of doing business”.

It would be nice if the TRPA et al did a better job this time.

Long time residents, property owners, tax payers, et al, just might not take kindly to being deprived of the use of what are mostly public lands that comprise most of the ski area for the use of a private club of “outsiders”.

Allowing the peasants inside the gates on uncertain unprofitable dates is insulting at best.

We were quite satisfied with the relatively “undeveloped” state of the area then and would not mind or even prefer a return to that state.

Sincerely,

C. Murray

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

From: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Sent: 2/21/2023 9:12:39 AM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: FW: TRPA Please Publicly Review CEP Homewood Resort's Privatization
Attachments: [image002.png](#)

From: Marja Ambler <mambler@trpa.gov>
Sent: Monday, February 20, 2023 4:07 PM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Subject: FW: TRPA Please Publicly Review CEP Homewood Resort's Privatization

Hi Paul,
I don't think I sent this one to you.
Marja

From: Ann Nichols <preserve@ntpac.org>
Sent: Sunday, January 8, 2023 11:02 AM
To: Marja Ambler <mambler@trpa.gov>
Subject: TRPA Please Publicly Review CEP Homewood Resort's Privatization

**Please distribute to Governing Board,
Thank you**

Homewood Mountain Resort Shell Game

Which cup is the Homewood Mountain development under?

In 2011, the Placer County Board of Supervisors approved the Homewood Mountain Resort Ski Area Master. The privatization of the Homewood project is coming before the TRPA, tomorrow 1/9/2023. The public isn't invited. Privatization is different from the final approved proposal. But how different? It's not what was approved.. In order to gain community support, the developer guaranteed perpetual public access to the ski area.

We all know developers are interested in making money and in the current real estate market a private ski area for the uber wealthy would make the most dough and keep the riff raff out.

JMA, the developer, claims traffic is so bad on SR 89 no one can get to the ski resort...he's forced to go private. Interestingly, the project's claim in 2011 was that a densified/destination resort would reduce traffic.

What about the settlement with California Clean Energy Committee (CCEC) on fire evacuation in Homewood? Is Homewood playing with fire? The settlement agreement agreed to mitigations suggested in a North Lake Tahoe Fire report, "2016 Life and Safety Plan" which required a new west shore fire station, manpower and equipment. Is TRPA reviewing this safety condition?

What about the boarded up "Tahoe Inn" in Kings Beach? It's been 11+ years. The 100 units at the Tahoe Inn are being transferred to Homewood Mountain Resort to increase density. Since the developers have all their entitlements, the Tahoe Inn was supposed to be razed once the Homewood project starts. In the meantime, the "Tahoe Inn" continues to sit derelict with mold, hanging plastic and tagging. There is no mention of this disposition of this abandoned eyesore. It would be nice if Homewood did these things before we are all in the grave. How many decades will it take?

TRPA protect Lake Tahoe citizens and require a public review, updated traffic study, and that the Tahoe Inn is demolished before any new development.
Which cup is the Homewood Resort under?



North Tahoe Preservation Alliance

P.O. Box 4
Crystal Bay, Nv. 89402
preserve@ntpac.org
775-831-0625
www.ntpac.org
"Helping preserve the natural beauty and rural character of North Lake Tahoe"

TikTok Video: https://www.tiktok.com/@northtahoepreservation?_t=8XCElbNFbSt&_r=1

Instagram Video: <https://www.instagram.com/northtahoepreservation/>



From: Denise Incerpi <dincerpi@gmail.com>
Sent: 2/21/2023 3:21:12 PM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: Fwd: Drivers frustrated with North Lake Tahoe ski season traffic

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

From: **Denise Incerpi** <dincerpi@gmail.com>
Date: Tue, Feb 21, 2023, 1:50 PM
Subject: Drivers frustrated with North Lake Tahoe ski season traffic
To: Denise Incerpi <dincerpi@gmail.com>

<https://www.kcra.com/article/drivers-frustrated-north-lake-tahoe-ski-season-traffic/42998484>

From: Dan Copenhagen <dcopenhagen@comcast.net>
Sent: 2/21/2023 11:17:46 AM
To: Jeff Cowen <jcowen@trpa.gov>
Cc: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>;
Subject: Re: New Homewood Documents Posted - No Hearing Scheduled

Hi Jeff-

I am hoping to make comments during the public interest comments portion of the meeting tomorrow. I understand it is limited to 3 minutes, and the board will not respond. What is the process to do that if I'm attending virtually?

Thanks
Dan Copenhagen

On Feb 17, 2023, at 3:04 PM, Jeff Cowen <jcowen@trpa.gov> wrote:

Thank you for your input and requesting to be updated on the Homewood Mountain Resort Master Plan. Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA) staff has posted the most recent correspondence with Homewood management on trpa.gov's [Homewood Master Plan](#) webpage, and continues to post emails, letters, and comments received as part of the record.

Staff will continue to keep that page updated as additional information and an application come forward. No meetings have been scheduled regarding Homewood's proposal to amend the 2011 resort master plan.

Please note this item is not on the February TRPA Governing Board agenda and will not be discussed by board members. Members of the public are welcome to comment on items not on the agenda during the Public Interest Comments item, which occurs at the end of the meeting either online or in person. The agenda is attached here for your reference. The Governing Board cannot discuss issues raised by the public that are not listed on the agenda.

We appreciate the time you have taken to reach out to us about Homewood and will continue to keep you informed and share opportunities to further engage TRPA and the Governing Board.

TRPA Staff
Paul Nielsen
pnielsen@trpa.gov
Special Projects Manager

Jeff Cowen
jcowen@trpa.gov
Public Information Officer

<image001.jpg>

[trpa.gov/facebook](#) | [twitter](#) | [instagram](#)

<February-22-Governing-Board-Agenda.pdf>

From: Lisa Purze <lola321@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: 2/22/2023 3:09:24 PM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: [BULK] Homewood Development

I am writing to express my concerns with the proposed direction for the Homewood Mountain Resort.

Developers JMA Ventures, Mohari Hospitality, and Discovery Land Company are attempting a bait and switch. Their publicly stated plans are very different from the [Master Plan](#) approved by TRPA and the local community in 2011. Specifically:

- Developer Art Chapman of JMA Ventures states that the ski area and related amenities will only be open to the general public one or two days a month. This is unacceptable. Non-Homewood residents and guests must be allowed to ski, hike, and bike on Homewood lands year-round, as originally envisioned in the approved Master Plan.
- Homes are already being built in a "mountain modern" architectural style. This is unacceptable. The originally approved plan specified a "classic old Tahoe lodge" architectural style.
- Art Chapman of JMA Ventures claims the Homewood ski area is no longer a viable business - despite charging the highest lift ticket prices in North America while investing next to nothing in aging equipment. What are JMA Ventures, Mohari Hospitality, and Discovery Land Ventures doing with their money?
- Regulator discussions with developers have not been as transparent to the public as they should be.

In addition, the approved plans for workforce housing and traffic mitigation are outdated and should be re-planned. If the resort is privatized, the already-congested West Shore/resort triangle will see even worse traffic, as employees commute from Truckee or Reno, and former Homewood skiers and boarders drive to Palisades or Northstar. TRPA and Placer County should require a re-plan addressing these issues.

I and my neighbors will be monitoring progress on this project. Please add me to any public communications or lists related to this matter.

Thank you -
Lisa Purze
409 Sierra Dr
Tahoma, Ca

From: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Sent: 2/22/2023 12:46:10 PM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: FW: Homewood Development Plan Alteration

From: Marja Ambler <mambler@trpa.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, February 22, 2023 12:24 PM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Subject: FW: Homewood Development Plan Alteration

From: Randy Boteler <botfam4@ameritech.net>
Sent: Wednesday, February 22, 2023 8:51 AM
To: Marja Ambler <mambler@trpa.gov>
Subject: Homewood Development Plan Alteration

To the TRPA Representatives and Governing Board:

As a recent new property owner at Water's Edge in Tahoma, I am dismayed at the duplicitous and cavalier treatment that JMA Ventures is displaying toward the general public and existing property owners of the Homewood and broader Tahoe West Shore area.

Developers JMA Ventures, Mohari Hospitality, and Discovery Land Company are attempting a bait and switch at Homewood Mountain Resort. Their publicly stated plans are very different from the Master Plan approved by TRPA and the local community in 2011.

Specifically:
Developer Art Chapman of JMA Ventures states that the ski area and related amenities will only be open to the general public one or two days a month. This is unacceptable. Non-Homewood residents and guests must be allowed to ski, hike, and bike on Homewood lands year-round, as originally envisioned in the approved Master Plan.

Homes are already being built in a "mountain modern" architectural style. This is unacceptable. The originally approved plan specified a low-rise "classic old Tahoe lodge" architectural style. The 'mountain modern' buildings envisioned could be as high as 70ft! That's a monstrosity that will forever scar the beautiful west shore of Lake Tahoe.

Art Chapman of JMA Ventures claims the Homewood ski area is no longer a viable business - despite charging the highest lift ticket prices in North America while investing next to nothing in aging equipment. Meanwhile, they invested millions of dollars into purchasing the new properties Of the West Shore Cafe in 2010 and the High and Dry Marina in 2016, both well before the advent of the Ikon pass that is supposedly caused their economic distress, clearly another false statement to justify the alteration of the Homewood Master Plan. What are JMA Ventures, Mohari Hospitality, and Discovery Land Ventures doing with their money?

Regulator discussions with developers have not been as transparent to the public as they should be. Whose interests are they serving? Why did Placer County Staff report on Dec 7, 2022 that Placer legal counsel was engaged in ongoing discussions with JMA regarding their privatization plans while Cindy Gustafson emailed on Feb 20, 2023 that no discussions have been held? Are the public meeting laws being violated by JMA and Placer County? If not, why the difference in stories within the same agency.

In addition, the approved plans for workforce housing and traffic mitigation are outdated and should be re-planned. The previously approved master plan stated 180 NEW EMPLOYEES for Homewood Mountain Resort - WHERE WILL THEY ALL LIVE? One response is already obvious, JMA has recently purchased the decades old Tahoe accommodations at Tahoma Meadows Bed & Breakfast to use for employees. What will that look like when completed? Likely not at all in keeping with our tranquil west shore old Tahoe building styles given the 'mountain modern' being contemplated elsewhere. If the resort is privatized, the already-congested West Shore/resort triangle will see even worse traffic, as employees commute from Truckee and Reno, and former Homewood skiers and boarders drive to Palisades or Northstar. TRPA and Placer County should require a re-plan addressing these issues.

Please do not allow Art Chapman and JMA to continue to flout the previously approved Homewood Master Plan wit(these alterations that will forever scar and change Lake Tahoe's beautiful and tranquil west shore area.

Thank you,
Randy Boteler
Water's Edge

From: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Sent: 2/22/2023 12:37:59 PM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: FW: Homewood Privatization Plans

From: Stew Ward <psward57@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 21, 2023 10:19 PM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Subject: Homewood Privatization Plans

Seems to me that any privatization plans need, at a minimum, provide for reasonably priced full season access to the ski area available for Tahoe locals who have supported the various ownership groups for years and will in many ways bear the burdens of traffic disruption during construction and increased long-term congestion etc associated with the new residential and commercial developments.

From: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Sent: 2/22/2023 12:39:38 PM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: FW: Oppose Homewood development changes

From: david cooper <hartcooperd@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 22, 2023 9:26 AM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Subject: Oppose Homewood development changes

This is a CC of what I sent to the TRPA Board

TRPA Board:

This email is intended as a placeholder for further input on the revised development proposal for Homewood Ski Area. My family has had a cabin at 8797 Williams Lane south of Meek's Bay since 1980. I only recently became aware of the proposed changes and object strenuously. From the professional viewpoint of a planner and architect (three decades of work in Colorado on large scale projects, including Telluride, Vail, Aspen, Steamboat Springs), I strongly oppose the bulk of the proposed changes to Homewood. The proposal privatizes the benefits for a select few and makes the community bear the brunt of the impacts. While economic conditions and developer goals have changed since the original master plan was developed, the environment and community have not. The agreed-upon goals, concepts and mitigations should stay in place. This is not an isolated, fringe development similar to Yellowstone Club, but the heart of the West Tahoe community. I urge you to maintain the current master plan.

Sincerely,

David Cooper
8797 Williams Lane
Tahoma, CA

David G. Cooper
720-800-2121

From: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Sent: 2/22/2023 12:23:01 PM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: Homewood Comments and New Documents Posted
Attachments: [image001.jpg](#)

Thank you for your input and requesting to be updated on the Homewood Mountain Resort Master Plan. Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA) staff has posted our correspondence with Homewood management on trpa.gov's [Homewood Mountain Resort page](#), and continues to post emails, letters, and comments received as part of the record.

TRPA planners are currently working to determine what the process, timeline, and public input opportunities will be for the proposed changes to be considered. We understand the Homewood resort means a great deal to the community and to Lake Tahoe's cultural heritage. Once the agency receives more information, planners will consider what impact the proposed changes might have on the resort Master Plan and the Tahoe Basin. As part of the process, TRPA will ensure community input is gathered and collaboration with partner agencies and organizations continues.

For your information, Phase 1A of the current Homewood Master Plan residential projects is on the agenda of the [Placer County Design Review Committee next Tuesday](#), February 28. This Placer County application process is not an application for a change in resort operations. The project to construct 34 residential units in four buildings at the resort's north base is an approved project in the current Homewood Master Plan. As Homewood owners proceed with approved phases of the current Master Plan, construction permits and other application processes may be required by TRPA and/or Placer County for those individual projects. In 2021, TRPA and Placer County approved another portion of Phase 1 for the construction of seven residential units to the south of the north base. Those units are currently under construction.

We appreciate your input and the time you have taken to reach out to us. Please continue to contact us at homewoodplan@trpa.gov and watch for emails from us with updates and possible opportunities for your input.

Regards,

Jeff Cowen (he/his)
Public Information Officer
775.589.5278



[trpa.gov](#)[facebook](#)[twitter](#)[instagram](#)

From: claire Norton <clairellen40@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, February 10, 2023 4:35 PM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Subject: [BULK] Homewood development

This letter is for the purpose of asking you to consider seriously the needs of west shore residents. The privatization of homewood ski resort will promote more traffic to ski at northstar, palisades, alpine, to the environmental detriment.

Homewood Resort developers' publicly stated plans for the property differ in material ways from the [Master Plan](#) previously approved by TRPA. Specifically:

1. Developer Art Chapman of JMA Ventures has stated in writing that the ski area and related amenities will be closed to the general public. This is unacceptable. Non-Homewood residents and guests must be allowed to ski, hike, and bike on Homewood lands, and enjoy the approved amenities. This is now forcing West Shore residents to drive substantial distances to enjoy these activities which causes environmental harm to Lake Tahoe.
2. TRPA and Placer County have approved initial development in a "mountain modern" architectural style. This is unacceptable. The originally approved plan specified a "classic old Tahoe lodge" architectural style.
3. Regulator discussions with developers have not been as transparent to the public as they should be.

In addition, the approved plans for workforce housing and traffic mitigation are outdated and insufficient. TRPA and Placer County should require a re-plan addressing these.

My neighbors and I will be monitoring the progress of this project. Please add me to any public communications or lists related to this matter.

Thank you, Claire Norton, 430 snowbird loop, homewood, ca



**TAHOE
REGIONAL
PLANNING
AGENCY**

P.O. Box 5310
Stateline, NV 89449

775-588-4547

www.trpa.gov

From: Dennis Neeley <daneeley516@gmail.com>
Sent: 2/22/2023 12:34:29 PM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: Homewood Mountain Resort Privatization

Date: February 22, 2023
To: Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
From: Dennis Neeley
Re: Homewood Mountain Resort

I am writing as a long term homeowner and part time resident of Meeks Bay about the recent proposal by Homewood Mountain Resort/Mohari. When Art Chapman of JMA Development hosted a meeting some years ago in the Homewood lodge with the intent of educating the locals about what he was proposing, I was there with maybe 200 other residents.

The crux of his talk was that he grew up skiing at Homewood, loved it and needed our buy-in on the proposed project in order to economically support the ski area. He claimed that unless he was able to develop his proposed project of over 300 units the ski area would not survive and would certainly close. His whole approach was "don't object to my project or you will lose your beloved Homewood ski area, but he was there to save it". Fast forward to today and of course he got his requested entitlements for a project that is vastly oversized and out of scale for the area. His project if built will exacerbate traffic on the west shore, degrade the quality of the lake, put demands on water supply and create unwanted traffic in the case of a catastrophic wildfire on the West shore. But, since he has his approvals, let's focus on the proposal to take the area private.

I feel (as do many others) that Homewood Mountain Resort is a West shore amenity that is privately owned and has to be financially sustainable, but excluding the people that he appealed to in order to "save Homewood" is fundamentally wrong. This concept you may know bankrupted the Yellowstone Club that had some things going for it that this location doesn't. Why the current ownership thinks a private facility will work is beyond me. I have a real estate development background and there is a common saying: "No proforma ever proposes a project to fail", meaning you can make any assumption you want on income expenses but it doesn't make it realty. What we don't need is a shuttered ski resort on the West Shore.

Please reject the concept of taking Homewood Mountain Resort private.

Regards,

Dennis Neeley

From: Barbara Cooper <cooperbarb518@gmail.com>
Sent: 2/22/2023 1:01:11 PM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: Homewood Mountain Resort

I am opposed to the "revised" development proposal for Homewood Mountain Resort. This "bait and switch" is very different from the approved Master Plan of 2011.

My family has been coming to Tahoe since we first camped at Meeks Bay in the 1960's. In 1980 our family won the Lottery and built a small cabin on Williams Lane. We skied at Homewood and our children learned to ski at Homewood.

I encourage you to not go through with this revised plan. It's a bad plan. Sincerely,
Barbara Cooper

From: Ben Benson <bbenson1098@gmail.com>
Sent: 2/22/2023 1:07:07 AM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: Homewood plan updates - please send me all new information on plans

Thanks,
bbenson1098@gmail.com

Sent from my iPhone

From: david cooper <hartcooperd@gmail.com>
Sent: 2/22/2023 9:22:11 AM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: Opposed to Homewood Plan change

TRPA Board

This email is intended as placeholder for further input on the revised development proposal for Homewood Ski Area. My family has had a cabin at 8797 Williams Lane south of Meek's Bay since 1980. I only recently became aware of the proposed changes and object strenuously. From the professional viewpoint of a planner and architect (three decades of work in Colorado on large scale projects, including Telluride, Vail, Aspen, Steamboat Springs), I strongly oppose the bulk of the proposed changes to Homewood. The proposal privatizes the benefits for a select few and makes the community bear the brunt of the impacts. While economic conditions and developer goals have changed since the original master plan was developed, the environment and community have not. The agreed-upon goals, concepts and mitigations should stay in place. This is not an isolated, fringe development similar to Yellowstone Club, but the heart of the West Tahoe community. I urge you to maintain the current master plan.

Sincerely,

David Cooper
8797 Williams Lane
Tahoma, CA

David G. Cooper
720-800-2121

From: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Sent: 2/23/2023 12:10:08 PM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: FW: Homewood development and privatization

From: rose healion <rosehealion@hotmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 23, 2023 10:54 AM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Subject: Homewood development and privatization

Hello, Paul,

As a 35 year resident of the Lake Tahoe area and a homeowner in Tahoma, I would like to express my deep opposition to Homewood's plans for privatization AND I further OPPOSE the construction of extensive housing in the Homewood area. WE MUST preserve what we can (what is LEFT) of Lake Tahoe and the surrounding environment. Please don't let them further destroy this precious place in pursuit of profits. Profits are temporary. Destruction of the environment and quality of life lasts forever.

Sincerely,

Rose Healion
8869 View Circle
Tahoma, CA

From: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Sent: 2/23/2023 5:37:31 PM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: FW: Homewood Mountain Resort Master Plan

From: victoria gustafson <gustafson.victoria@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 22, 2023 1:54 PM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>; Jeff Cowen <jcowen@trpa.gov>; Julie Regan <jregan@trpa.gov>; Wendy Jepson <wjepson@trpa.gov>
Subject: Homewood Mountain Resort Master Plan

February 22, 2023

Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
128 Market Street
PO Box 5310
Stateline, NV 89449
ATTN: Governing Board / Paul Nielsen, Special Projects Manager

RE: Homewood Mountain Resort Master Plan

Dear Governing Board Members and Mr. Nielsen,

I am writing to express my concern about the proposed revisions to the Homewood Mountain Resort (HMR) development plan. I have been a local west shore resident, tax payer and pass holder at HMR for the past 20 years and deeply care about what happens in our community. I was an active participant in the initial plan development - providing input and attending community sessions to help shape the outcome(s). The revised plan contains significant changes that will negatively affect the West Shore Community and its residents.

Throughout the initial plan creation process, HMR representatives touted the numerous benefits the community would receive if they (HMR) were allowed to move forward with the proposed project [see *Master Plan Excerpt section below*]. Both sides made concessions for the greater good and came up with a plan that was (mostly) agreeable to all parties involved - ultimately gaining approval from TRPA to move forward - 10 years ago. Had privatization been proposed, the community would never have agreed to the proposal.

Both the developer's proposed changes (design and use) and significant changes to the basin itself, should trigger a re-evaluation of the plan to ensure compliance with the approved plan and benefits to all parties involved:

1. Increase in Basin Visitors and Residents seeking recreational access to lands
2. Increased Fire Risk
3. Concerns for Emergency Egress
4. Degraded forest health [% of Dead Trees in the basin and on the west shore is alarming]
5. Climate Change, drought conditions and lake clarity (runoff impacts)
6. Lack of affordable housing
7. Increased Traffic

I urge the TRPA to require JMA Ventures, Homewood Mountain Resorts (et al) 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.

Regards,
Victoria Gustafson
7015 Gray Ave.
Tahoma, Ca 96142
530-448-0164

Master Plan Excerpt:

1. "A central goal of that plan is to restore Homewood as a key gathering center for Lake Tahoe's West Shore and to maintain the heritage of a ski resort that can be enjoyed equally by local residents and visitors." [page 2]
2. "If Homewood is to remain as a **viable public recreational amenity**, a new plan must emerge that limits peak skier visits, attracts visitors who will stay at the resort for several days, thereby reducing daily traffic, **and continues to offer a convenient and quality skiing experience to local, west shore residents**. The purpose of the HMR Master Plan is to set the course for improvements at the resort necessary to support and achieve the goals for the future resort." [page 2]
3. The following goals shaped the current master planning efforts and will continue to guide HMR as it strives to become a model for responsible land use and community planning:
 - Restore Homewood as the community center of the west shore of Lake Tahoe
 - Preserve the character of Homewood by developing new facilities that reflect the existing architectural quality and scale of the community
 - Preserve HMR reputation as a small, no-crowds-on-the-slopes, family friendly enclave that can be enjoyed equally by local residents and visitors alike [page 2]
4. "Homewood Mountain Resort is an important winter recreation amenity to the residents, second homeowners and visitors of the West Shore of Lake Tahoe. It has been considered the locals ski hill for several decades." [page 8]
5. "Enhanced day skier amenities and services at the North Base o Community input expressed a long-standing desire for upgraded and expanded skier facilities at the North Base, which is exactly what the proposed master plan includes." [page 6]
6. "Additional Recreation: A new outdoor earthen amphitheater is proposed for hosting outdoor concert events during the summer season. A cross-country ski connection, which is an extension of the old Olympic course, is proposed at the South Base. Existing downhill skiing and snowboarding, fishing, and five miles of hiking trails will continue to be available. Proposed recreation includes ice skating, a community swimming pool, biking, and a miniature golf course during the summer months where the ice pond is located." [page 7]
7. Mid-Mountain Day Lodge - While great beginner terrain does not exist at the base area, it does exist at a mid-mountain location adjacent to the partially constructed warming facility on the Upper Madden site. The land below the top terminal of the Madden chair has a 10 percent slope and is the perfect environment to teach beginning skiers. One beginner lift is reflected in the proposed plan, below the proposed gondola terminal and the mountain restaurant for beginner skiers and snowboarders. This is a strategic site in that it also offers the opportunity for on-mountain activities, and could serve as an activity hub for the resort. Potential uses include both night operations with on-mountain dining and a scenic gondola ride and summer operations for special events such as weddings, limited conferencing, and meetings. This site could accommodate the addition of terrain park features and host special exhibitions, such as big air or half pipe events, should adequate land be available the construction of a half pipe for both

snowboarders and twin tip skiers. **This facility is planned to be open to the general public.”**

8. “The North Base will be transformed to include a base lodge as well as a small neighborhood village to be used by Homewood and West Shore residents and visitors’ [page 27]

9. “Social Opportunities The sustainability of the social environment at Homewood is part of the three tiered approach to the redevelopment of the site. The consideration and respect for those who live and work at the resort as well as those who visit is a key element of the principles behind a socially responsible development. The community of Homewood plays a vital role in the success of this project. By locating mixed-use buildings along State Route 89 South, the architecture of the Resort establishes a vibrant commercial and residential presence. The resort will act as the ‘Village Core’ for the greater community. Neighborhood serving businesses, such as a small market and hardware store will welcome locals and visitors alike. “

10. Master Plan Implementation Phasing - HMR anticipates a ten (10) year time frame for the build out of their master plan

11. Recreational Policy Statement: “It shall be the policy of the TRPA Governing Board in development of the Regional Plan to preserve and enhance the high quality recreational experience including preservation of high-quality undeveloped shorezone and other natural areas. In developing the Regional Plan, the staff and Governing Board shall consider provisions for additional access, where lawful and feasible, to the shorezone and high quality undeveloped areas for low density recreational uses. It shall be the policy of the TRPA Governing Board in development of the Regional Plan to establish and ensure a fair share of the total Basin capacity for outdoor recreation is available to the general public”. In other words, environmental capacity was to be reserved for outdoor recreation in terms of water supply, land coverage, and air and water quality. The concern arose that the more rapidly occurring private residential and commercial development might outpace recreation development, jeopardizing the potential to reserve a minimal “fair share” of environmental capacity for recreation. [page 40]

TRPA Articles:

- (5) Increasing urbanization is threatening the ecological values of the region and threatening the public opportunities for use of the public lands.
- (6) Maintenance of the social and economic health of the region depends on maintaining the significant scenic, recreational, educational, scientific, natural and public health values provided by the Lake Tahoe Basin.
- (7) There is a public interest in protecting, preserving and enhancing these values for the residents of the region and for visitors to the region.
- (8) Responsibilities for providing recreational and scientific opportunities, preserving scenic and natural areas, and safeguarding the public who live, work and play in or visit the region are divided among local governments, regional agencies, the States of California and Nevada, and the Federal Government.
- (9) In recognition of the public investment and multistate and national significance of the recreational values, the Federal Government has an interest in the acquisition of recreational property and the management of resources in the region to preserve environmental and recreational values, and the Federal Government should assist the States in fulfilling their responsibilities.

From: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Sent: 2/23/2023 5:38:01 PM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: FW: Homewood Resort Master Plan Comment

From: joelynych jtldev.com <joelynych@jtldev.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 22, 2023 1:14 PM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Subject: FW: Homewood Resort Master Plan Comment

Hi Paul:

I want you to be aware of how I and so many in our community feel about the changes being proposed for the Homewood Resort. I would hope you and all others involved with approving this project will realize none of these changes can be done under the present Master Plan.

I would encourage you and others involved in the approval process to recommend to the Developer that they stay with the Master Plan approved.

Thank you,

Joe Lynch

805-338-6500

385 Lakeview Drive

Tahoma, CA 96142

From: joelynych jtldev.com
Sent: Monday, February 20, 2023 2:48 PM
To: swydra@placer.ca.gov
Cc: sbuelna@placer.ca.gov
Subject: Homewood Resort Master Plan Comment

Hi Stacy:

I have written previously about the above Master Plan. I originally spoke in favor of this project as they promised and you approved a first-class ski resort available to all within our community and the Lake Tahoe area. You approved their beautiful mountain architecture for the village and homes within this Master Plan. Our community supported those amenities and attractive design because we were promised access to the ski resort, village, the hotel, swimming pool and other attractive amenities. We were told and you took into account the communities access and support for this Master Plan.

Now the developer is seeking to submit changes that are significantly different from their Master Plan. The architecture is totally different from what was approved. I would expect that the County will reject their submission as varying significantly from the approved Master Plan. I understand they also want to make the ski resort private to their homeowners and not make it generally available to the community. I also understand that other amenities in the land plan will not be generally available to the public like the hotel and swimming pool. I understood that the ski resort and village would be Part of Phase One. All of this is a significant variance to the Master Plan.

I would expect the County will advise the developer and the public that they need to substantially comply with the Master Plan or file a new Master Plan. I and I'm sure most residents on the west shore will oppose a new Master Plan for this site.

Respectfully submitted,

Joe Lynch

385 Lakeview Drive

Tahoma, CA 96142

From: Christi Taylor <lannion93@gmail.com>
Sent: 2/23/2023 11:30:37 AM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: Homewood Mountain Resort

Thursday
February 23, 2023

We are writing to express our concerns with the proposed direction of the Homewood Mountain Resort and the impact of the project on the Lake Tahoe basin and more specifically, Lake Tahoe's west shore.

Our family has a small cabin at 8693 King George Drive, Rubicon Estates. The cabin has been in our family since 1968 and are in the fourth generation of family enjoying our piece of paradise. We have seen years of bounty and drought, no growth, slow growth and in some cases, apparent unrestricted or unmonitored growth. The result has been more people and traffic vying for the already limited availability and affordability of goods and services.

The pandemic that began in 2020 has stretched the resilience of the basin's ability to accommodate the need for the necessary workforce to support the service industry that keeps the economy healthy. The influx of "remote workers" who are able to do their job anywhere they can get an Internet signal has taken housing stock off the market that was formerly used by the seasonal workforce who were keeping the restaurants, shops, inns, hotels and other services open and affordable. The housing stock that is available is priced beyond the means of the individuals who are the backbone of the local economy and are making minimum wage. The result of this has been business closures or business owners relying on a workforce commuting from outside the area into the basin, further stressing the Tahoe basin infrastructure. Any plan for workforce housing and traffic mitigation that was undertaken prior to 2020 should be revisited and updated to reflect our new post-pandemic reality.

With regard to the Homewood Mountain Resort project, it appears that the plans as stated publicly by JMA Ventures, Mohari Hospitality and Discovery Land Company are very different from the Master Plan approved by the TRPA and local community in 2011 as described below:

- Art Chapman of JMA Ventures states that the ski area and related amenities will only be open to the general public one or two days per month. The approved Master Plan envisioned that non-Homewood Mountain Resort residents would be able to ski, hike and bike on the property year-round. Restricting access would appear to be contrary to the intent of the Master Plan.
- Homes are already being built in a "mountain modern" architectural style. The originally approved plan specified a "classic old Tahoe lodge" architectural style. The Developers actions appear to be contrary to the Master Plan.
- Discussions between regulatory entities and developers have not been as transparent to the public as they should be.

A project that will have as much impact on not just the immediate Homewood area but the entire Lake Tahoe basin should have regulatory oversight commensurate with the magnitude of the impact on the greater area. This developer isn't just trying to replace a deck damaged by snow (I could fill a page trying to describe the hoops our family went through to replace, in kind, a deck that was demolished by snow that slid off the roof of our cabin) but is undertaking a project that will change the look and feel of the basin in ways that go beyond whether or not the public has access to amenities on the Homewood Mountain Resort project. We would like to know how this project improves the quality of life in the Lake Tahoe basin and what is in it for us.

Our homeowners association as well as other neighbors around the Lake will be monitoring progress on this project. Please add our names to any public communications or list related to this project.

Thank you,

Christi and Ken Taylor
8693 King George Drive
Rubicon Estates

Email:
Christi - lannion93@gmail.com
Ken - ktayl@yahoo.com

From: Katy Repp <kaylynnrepp@gmail.com>
Sent: 2/23/2023 9:51:37 PM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: Homewood, our home

"What makes Homewood Ski Teams so special?"

You! The community, parents, youth, staff, and volunteers that participate year after year are the driving force that makes our program so unique. The community-driven atmosphere separates our ski team from others and we're as excited as ever to soon begin another year. In addition, we're proud to provide parents and their children more flexibility within the program itself including its structure, activities and group events. Outside of epic powder days on-mountain, we offer a platform for families to socialize, engage, and enjoy every aspect of the skiing lifestyle that we enjoy on the West Shore of Lake Tahoe.

Personalized Instruction with Smaller Team Sizes

The size and intimacy of our teams programs provide a connection between the coaches, parents and participants that cannot be matched. Your athlete will be paired with the same coach and class throughout the season, their individual progress will be monitored and skills training will be tailored to fit their needs and interests. Parents are encouraged to interact in their student's growth and coaches provide updates on progress throughout the winter."

The above is taken from the Homewood Ski Team page. This thriving community is what is at stake. This thriving community of committed adults, coaches, and local kids is what is at stake here. A group of wealthy investors want to take this away from our community. Our community, "The West Shore is the Best Shore", is on the verge of being overtaken, stripped down and gutted. A group of wealthy investors think people will come from afar to ski every year at Homewood? Wealthy skiers don't choose Homewood now, what makes anyone think charging people exorbitant fees to ski at Homewood will change that?

Ask yourself if YOU really want to be part of greenlighting this project that will disenfranchise families and kids for years to come. Ask yourself what this really looks like 10 years down the road. This investment company will have taken its dollars elsewhere by then and you will have allowed Homewood to be gutted. Do you want to be part of destroying the West Shore? This Get Rich Quick scheme, and you know that's what this is, will be destructive and abandoned in years to come. We all know this. Homewood Ski Resort is special to those of us who love the west shore. Homewood Ski Resort is not special to people who prefer status. This plan is not sustainable in the long run simply because these people will eventually flock to ski-and-be-seen resorts. Eventually Homewood will reopen to the public, but a generation of kids and families will lose out because of you. Don't be that person. Be the person who looks into the future and who supports the community.

Sincerely,

Katy Repp

7004 10th Ave

Tahoma

From: rose healion <rosehealion@hotmail.com>
Sent: 2/23/2023 10:47:49 AM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: Homewood

As a 35 year resident of the Lake Tahoe area ns a homeowner in Tahoma, I would like to express my deep opposition to Homewood's plans of being i "private" resort and to AND further development of housing in this area. WE MUST preserve what we can (what is LEFT) of Lake Tahoe and the surrounding environment. Please don't let them further destroy this precious plan in pursuit of profits. "

Sincerely,

Rose Healion
8869 View Circle
Tahoma, CA

From: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Sent: 2/24/2023 2:09:06 PM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: FW: Homewood developement

From: TRPA <trpa@trpa.gov>
Sent: Friday, February 24, 2023 2:05 PM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Subject: Fw: Homewood developement

Hey Paul,

A Homewood public comment below.

Best,
Ally

From: Allyn Bondan <rubicon5mom@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, February 24, 2023 8:35 AM
To: TRPA <trpa@trpa.gov>
Subject: Homewood developement

Dear TRPA

I wish to express my disappointment in your approval of the Homewood development. As a home owner for 50 years it is disconcerting that you approve our neighborhood ski resort to only the wealthy. This is a jewel on the west shore where generations of people have brought their families for a day of skiing and enjoyment. To exclude the working man is discrimination. It has nothing to do with traffic it's pure wealth and entitlement. It will be a huge impact on the West Shore and Years of traffic caused by constant building . This is not what most of the people who actually live there want. We don't want an Aspen or Telluride or Vail. Please reconsider this approval.

Allyn Bondan
Sent from my iPad

From: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Sent: 2/24/2023 8:45:33 AM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: FW: Homewood Ski Resort

From: Michael Hillman <michael@mjamesstudio.com>
Sent: Friday, February 24, 2023 6:55 AM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Subject: Homewood Ski Resort

Dear Paul Nielsen,

My name is Michael Hillman. I am a part-time resident of the Chamberlands subdivision, adjacent to Homewood Ski Resort and the previously approved Homewood Master Plan. My grandfather first purchased our home in 1972 and it has been the centerpoint of my family gatherings and important events in our life. To say the least, our home and the land that we all SHARE, is SACRED. The Homewood ski resort has been a part of my family since I can always remember, and I would hope that my children could enjoy that as well.

This was largely acknowledged as a central goal of the master plan, the "restore Homewood as a key gathering center of Lake Tahoe's West Shore and to maintain the heritage of a ski resort that can be enjoyed equally by local residences and visitors." However, the proposed change disregards much of it's proposed intention and circumvents the local legacy in the area.

This change is major and something that will have far greater consequences on the landscape than any of the planners I believe can comprehend. The prior approval does not address this major change. If the applicant wishes to pursue this path, we believe they must seek a new project approval, including a new EIR/EIS in accordance with CEQA and TRPA regulations.

Sincerely,
Michael James Hillman

--

Michael James Hillman
Portfolio 714.336.5906

From: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Sent: 2/24/2023 1:45:32 PM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: FW: Placer County PLN22-00534
Attachments: [Homewood Mountain Resort Letter.2.24.23.docx](#)

From: Judy Fields <judy@judyfields.com>
Sent: Friday, February 24, 2023 10:59 AM
To: swydra@placer.ca.gov
Cc: supervisorgustafson@placer.ca.gov; Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Subject: Placer County PLN22-00534

Thank you for your attention to this important matter.

Jim and Judy Fields

Feb. 24, 2023

I am writing to express my concerns with the proposed direction for the Homewood Mountain Resort.

Developers JMA Ventures, Mohari Hospitality, and Discovery Land Company are pulling off a bait and switch at Homewood Mountain Resort.

- (1) They are restricting public access thru paid memberships—cost not revealed as of yet.
- (2) As opposed to the goal of making Homewood a gathering place for the West Shore, their plan is to open the area to residents only multiple times per month and not on holidays or weekends.
- (3) They claim their plan will reduce traffic, however since West Shore skiers and boarders driving to Palisades or Northstar, plus resort employees commuting from Truckee or Reno, will worsen already-congested Resort Triangle traffic.
- (4) The resort design was to retain the alpine village community, yet they have already started building homes in a modern mountain style in the South Base Area.

I am grateful for TRPA's request for JMA Ventures to provide additional information on how their changes will fit within the Master Plan.

As next steps, we demand:

An immediate stop to the non-conforming construction underway at the South Lodge;

A final determination from the TRPA Governing Board that JMA Ventures, Mohari Hospitality, and Discovery Land Company's proposal to privatize Homewood Mountain Resort is NOT consistent with the 2011 Master Plan;

A complete re-plan for Homewood Mountain Resort, following the same publicly accountable processes that resulted in the 2011 Master Plan, including environmental review.

Thank you –

Jim and Judy Fields
7307 7th Ave
Tahoma, CA 96142

From: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Sent: 2/24/2023 9:20:44 AM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: FW: Support For Homewood Resort

From: Josh Pickles <joshua.a.pickles@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, February 24, 2023 9:19 AM
Subject: Support For Homewood Resort

Hello - I am writing in support of the Homewood Mountain Resort plans with 2 caveats. The resort in its current state is heading towards a state of disrepair and understandably, the sheer costs to modernize will far outweigh revenue. While I empathize with those who have been going to the resort for years, decades and generations, the current trajectory is clearly not sustainable.

With that in mind, I do believe, so long as environmental standards for construction and operation are met, the revitalization of the Homewood resort is a positive thing for the West Shore so long as 1) employee housing is considered as part of the requirement and 2) neighboring HOAs are given the opportunity to join via a membership program. I have no doubt that residents will also see a rise in property values given the access to join, which will be a pull through benefit for years to come.

Thank you for your consideration
josh

From: NL Johnson <nancyjlj383@att.net>
Sent: 2/24/2023 8:44:13 AM
To: supervisororgustafson@placer.ca.govTRPA <supervisororgustafson@placer.ca.govTRPA>; HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: Homewood Mountain Resort

I am writing to express my concerns with the proposed direction for the Homewood Mountain Resort.

Developers JMA Ventures, Mohari Hospitality, and Discovery Land Company are pulling off a bait and switch at Homewood Mountain Resort.

Instead of “maintaining the heritage of a ski resort that can be enjoyed equally by local residents and visitors[1],” developers JMA Ventures, Mohari Hospitality, and Discovery Land Company are severely restricting public access to Homewood Mountain Resort through paid memberships, at not-yet-revealed cost.

Despite the 2011 Master Plan’s “central goal” to “restore Homewood as a key gathering center for Lake Tahoe’s West Shore1,” developers JMA Ventures, Mohari Hospitality, and Discovery Land Company will only “open the area to residents multiple times each month (no holidays or weekends)[2].”

Developers JMA Ventures, Mohari Hospitality, and Discovery Land Company claim their new plan will reduce traffic (“Vehicle Miles Traveled”) compared to the original plan2. This is hard to believe; West Shore skiers and boarders driving to Palisades or Northstar, plus resort employees commuting from Truckee or Reno, will worsen already-congested Resort Triangle traffic.

Contradicting the 2011 Master Plan, in which “the new Homewood Resort design is conceived as an alpine village community in the architectural style of the classic old Tahoe lodges,” JMA Ventures, Mohari Hospitality, and Discovery Land Company have already begun building homes in a “mountain modern” architectural style in the South Base Area.

Responding to the vehement objections of 300+ concerned residents, TRPA has asked JMA Ventures to provide additional information on how the proposed changes “fit within the vision and goals of the Master Plan.1” We share TRPA’s concerns and thank them for their letter.

As next steps, we demand:

An immediate stop to the non-conforming construction underway at the South Lodge;

A final determination from the TRPA Governing Board that JMA Ventures, Mohari Hospitality, and Discovery Land Company’s proposal to privatize Homewood Mountain Resort is NOT consistent with the 2011 Master Plan;

A complete re-plan for Homewood Mountain Resort, following the same publicly accountable processes that resulted in the 2011 Master Plan, including environmental review.

Thank you -

Nancy L. Johnson
7235 2nd Ave
Tahoma CA

[1] TRPA response to Homewood Mountain Resort’s Master Plan Update Proposal, 2-4-23

[2] Homewood Mountain Resort’s Master Plan Update Proposal, 11-8-22

From: Tom Ward <tomaward@yahoo.com>
Sent: 2/24/2023 12:40:14 PM
To: swydra@placer.ca.gov <swydra@placer.ca.gov>; supervisororgustafson@placer.ca.gov <supervisororgustafson@placer.ca.gov>; Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>; HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: PLN22-00534

Dear Stacy,

I am writing to express my concerns with the NEW proposed direction for the Homewood Mountain Resort.
First, JMA Ventures has spent nothing to make much needed improvements to the Homewood Ski Resort while steadily increasing prices. Their business is down because they are not providing a good value for customers and not marketing the ski mountain.
Second, whatever story JMA Ventures is spinning now, this project will surely end up being an ultra-exclusive private resort not open to the public.
Third, JMA Ventures is now floating the idea that annual family ski memberships for locals will be made available at a price of \$75,000 with an annual fee of \$15,000. Again, I doubt very much that in the end that such an offer will be available and only a very few locals could even afford it.
The Placer Planning Commission and TRPA must demand from JMA Ventures a revised plan for the Homewood Resort, an EIR and a publicly accountable process.
Don't let the Billions behind JMA Ventures, Mohari Hospitality and Discovery Land Co prevent you from conducting a proper and thorough government review.
Thanks for your consideration.

Tom Ward
24 year 2nd home resident of Tahoma

From: Pete <peteuehlin@yahoo.com>
Sent: 2/24/2023 8:24:03 AM
To: swydra@placer.ca.gov <swydra@placer.ca.gov>; supervisorgustafson@placer.ca.gov <supervisorgustafson@placer.ca.gov>; HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>; Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Subject: PLN22-00534

Dear Members:

I am writing to express my concerns with the proposed direction for the Homewood Mountain Resort.

Developers JMA Ventures, Mohari Hospitality, and Discovery Land Company are pulling off a bait and switch at Homewood Mountain Resort.

Instead of “maintaining the heritage of a ski resort that can be enjoyed equally by local residents and visitors,” developers JMA Ventures, Mohari Hospitality, and Discovery Land Company are **severely restricting public access to Homewood Mountain Resort** through paid memberships, at not-yet-revealed cost.

Despite the 2011 Master Plan’s “central goal” to “restore Homewood as a key gathering center for Lake Tahoe’s West Shore¹,” developers JMA Ventures, Mohari Hospitality, and Discovery Land Company will only “**open the area to residents multiple times each month (no holidays or weekends).**”

Developers JMA Ventures, Mohari Hospitality, and Discovery Land Company claim their new plan will reduce traffic (“Vehicle Miles Traveled”) compared to the original plan². This is hard to believe; **West Shore skiers and boarders driving to Palisades or Northstar, plus resort employees commuting from Truckee or Reno, will worsen already-congested Resort Triangle traffic.**

Contradicting the 2011 Master Plan, in which “the new Homewood Resort design is conceived as an alpine village community in the architectural style of the classic old Tahoe lodges,” JMA Ventures, Mohari Hospitality, and Discovery Land Company have **already begun building homes in a “mountain modern” architectural style** in the South Base Area.

Responding to the vehement objections of 300+ concerned residents, **TRPA has asked JMA Ventures to provide additional information** on how the proposed changes “fit within the vision and goals of the Master Plan.”¹ We share TRPA’s concerns and thank them for their letter.

As next steps, we demand:

An immediate stop to the non-conforming construction underway at the South Lodge;

A final determination from the TRPA Governing Board that **JMA Ventures, Mohari Hospitality, and Discovery Land Company’s proposal to privatize Homewood Mountain Resort is NOT consistent with the 2011 Master Plan;**

A complete re-plan for Homewood Mountain Resort, following the same publicly accountable processes that resulted in the 2011 Master Plan, including environmental review.

Thank you,
Peter Uehlin
7091 Ninth Ave.
Tahoma

From: Josh Pickles <joshua.a.pickles@gmail.com>

Sent: 2/24/2023 9:18:34 AM

Subject: Support For Homewood Resort

Hello - I am writing in support of the Homewood Mountain Resort plans with 2 caveats. The resort in its current state is heading towards a state of disrepair and understandably, the sheer costs to modernize will far outweigh revenue. While I empathize with those who have been going to the resort for years, decades and generations, the current trajectory is clearly not sustainable.

With that in mind, I do believe, so long as environmental standards for construction and operation are met, the revitalization of the Homewood resort is a positive thing for the West Shore so long as 1) employee housing is considered as part of the requirement and 2) neighboring HOAs are given the opportunity to join via a membership program. I have no doubt that residents will also see a rise in property values given the access to join, which will be a pull through benefit for years to come.

Thank you for your consideration
josh

From: Tyler Thomas <rthomastyler@yahoo.com>
Sent: 2/26/2023 11:08:47 AM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: Bait and switch

This is a horrible plan for the west shore.
Screw the bait and switch. Nothing good will come out of this. Keep homewood public!

Sent from my iPhone

From: Michelle <michellemb@gmail.com>
Sent: 2/26/2023 4:01:25 PM
To: swydra@placer.ca.gov <swydra@placer.ca.gov>; HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>; Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>; supervisor@placer.ca.gov <supervisor@placer.ca.gov>
Subject: Concerns about changed Homewood Plans PLN22-00534

Hello,

I am writing to express my concerns with the current direction of the Homewood Mountain Resort.

Homewood Resort developers publicly stated plans for the property differ in material ways from the Master Plan (<https://www.skihomewood.com/wp-content/uploads/Homewood-Mountain-Resort-Ski-Area-Master-Plan-Details-Updated-10-04-20112.pdf>) previously approved by TRPA. Specifically:

- a. Developer Art Chapman of JMA Ventures has stated in writing that the ski area and related amenities will be closed to the general public. This is unacceptable. Non-Homewood residents and guests must be allowed to ski, hike, and bike on Homewood lands, and enjoy the approved amenities.
- b. TRPA has approved initial development in a "mountain modern" architecture style. This is unacceptable. The originally approved plan specified a classic "old Tahoe lodge" architectural style.
- c. Regulator discussions with developers have not been as transparent to the public as they should be.

In addition, the approved plans for workforce housing and traffic mitigation are outdated and insufficient. TRPA and Placer County should require a re-plan addressing these.

My neighbors and I will be monitoring progress on this project. Please add me to any public communications or lists related to this matter.

We have personally been skiing Homewood for generations and absolutely adore the West Shore. Last year I made a lifetime dream come true by purchasing a modest, rustic cabin in Tahoma. I am a proud full time resident here now. A main purpose of this dream is to be able to raise our family skiing at our beloved Homewood. Please don't allow this dream to be taken away from our community due to corporate greed. All eyes are on you and the choices you make.

Thank you for your attention to this important matter.

Best,
Michelle Blondin
Antelope Way, Tahoma, CA

From: marian.l.jelinek@gmail.com <marian.l.jelinek@gmail.com>
Sent: 2/26/2023 8:36:40 PM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>; swydra@placer.ca.gov <swydra@placer.ca.gov>
Subject: Homewood Mountain - Community Feedback

To: Tahoe Basin Design Committee

My name is Marian Jelinek and my family and I live in Tahoma. We are extremely concerned about the plan for Homewood Mountain Resort Phase II. This plan will significantly impact the local community changing the entire Tahoe basin by increasing traffic, pollution, runoff to the lake which already is experiencing significant algae blooms, removing public access, and negatively impacting the environment.

I urge the commission to reevaluate the entire Project as it is materially changed from over ten years ago. It is concerning that the design review and approval from ten years ago would remain in place given the changes over the past couple years. The Tahoe basin is under incredible environmental threat with the Caldor fire less than two years ago, increased pollution to the Lake, and significant tree die off from climate change. By approving this project, it further jeopardizes the Tahoe Basin a national treasure. The Tahoe keys has been noted as one of the largest environmental disasters in United States history; I hope the development of Homewood Mountain Resort doesn't become the second largest environmental disaster.

Thank you for your time and we urge you to reject this plan.

Thanks

Marian

Sent from my iPhone

From: Tom Urban <tomurban@me.com>
Sent: 2/26/2023 4:10:27 PM
To: Tom Urban <urbantom@gmail.com>
Subject: Homewood Mountain Development update - Reference PLN22-00534

I am writing to express my concerns with the proposed direction for the Homewood Mountain Resort in Homewood, California

Developers JMA Ventures, Mohari Hospitality, and Discovery Land Company are breaking their promise to make Homewood Mountain Resort a community center; Instead of "maintaining the heritage of a ski resort that can be enjoyed equally by local residents and visitors," developers JMA Ventures, Mohari Hospitality, and Discovery Land Company are severely restricting public access to Homewood Mountain Resort through paid memberships, at not-yet-revealed cost.

Despite the 2011 Master Plan's "central goal" to "restore Homewood as a key gathering center for Lake Tahoe's West Shore¹," developers JMA Ventures, Mohari Hospitality, and Discovery Land Company will only "open the area to residents multiple times each month (no holidays or weekends)."

Developers JMA Ventures, Mohari Hospitality, and Discovery Land Company claim their new plan will reduce traffic ("Vehicle Miles Traveled") compared to the original plan². This is hard to believe; West Shore skiers and boarders driving to Palisades or Northstar, plus resort employees commuting from Truckee or Reno, will worsen already-congested Resort Triangle traffic.

Contradicting the 2011 Master Plan, in which "the new Homewood Resort design is conceived as an alpine village community in the architectural style of the classic old Tahoe lodges," JMA Ventures, Mohari Hospitality, and Discovery Land Company have already begun building homes in a "mountain modern" architectural style in the South Base Area.

Responding to the vehement objections of 300+ concerned residents, TRPA has asked JMA Ventures to provide additional information on how the proposed changes "fit within the vision and goals of the Master Plan.¹" We share TRPA's concerns and thank them for their letter.

As next steps, we would like to request:

- An immediate stop to the non-conforming construction underway at the South Lodge;
- A final determination from the TRPA Governing Board that JMA Ventures, Mohari Hospitality, and Discovery Land Company's proposal to privatize Homewood Mountain Resort is NOT consistent with the 2011 Master Plan;
- A complete re-plan for Homewood Mountain Resort, following the same publicly accountable processes that resulted in the 2011 Master Plan, including environmental review.

Thank you -

Thomas Urban
6320 Flicker Avenue
Tahoma, CA 96142

From: Heather Razukas <hrazukas@gmail.com>
Sent: 2/26/2023 4:37:45 PM
To: swydra@placer.ca.gov <swydra@placer.ca.gov>; supervisorgustafson@placer.ca.gov <supervisorgustafson@placer.ca.gov>; HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>; Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Subject: Homewood Mountain Resort Concerns

I am writing to express my concerns with the proposed direction for the Homewood Mountain Resort.

Developers JMA Ventures, Mohari Hospitality, and Discovery Land Company are pulling off a bait and switch at Homewood Mountain Resort.

Instead of “maintaining the heritage of a ski resort that can be enjoyed equally by local residents and visitors”^[1], developers JMA Ventures, Mohari Hospitality, and Discovery Land Company are **severely restricting public access to Homewood Mountain Resort** through paid memberships, at not-yet-revealed cost.

Despite the 2011 Master Plan’s “central goal” to “restore Homewood as a key gathering center for Lake Tahoe’s West Shore”¹, developers JMA Ventures, Mohari Hospitality, and Discovery Land Company will only “**open the area to residents multiple times each month (no holidays or weekends)**”^[2].

Developers JMA Ventures, Mohari Hospitality, and Discovery Land Company claim their new plan will reduce traffic (“Vehicle Miles Traveled”) compared to the original plan². This is hard to believe; **West Shore skiers and boarders driving to Palisades or Northstar, plus resort employees commuting from Truckee or Reno, will worsen already-congested Resort Triangle traffic.**

Contradicting the 2011 Master Plan, in which “the new Homewood Resort design is conceived as an alpine village community in the architectural style of the classic old Tahoe lodges,” JMA Ventures, Mohari Hospitality, and Discovery Land Company have **already begun building homes in a “mountain modern” architectural style** in the South Base Area.

Responding to the vehement objections of 300+ concerned residents, **TRPA has asked JMA Ventures to provide additional information** on how the proposed changes “fit within the vision and goals of the Master Plan.”¹ We share TRPA’s concerns and thank them for their letter.

As next steps, we demand:

An immediate stop to the non-conforming construction underway at the South Lodge;

A final determination from the TRPA Governing Board that **JMA Ventures, Mohari Hospitality, and Discovery Land Company’s proposal to privatize Homewood Mountain Resort is NOT consistent with the 2011 Master Plan**;

A complete re-plan for Homewood Mountain Resort, following the same publicly accountable processes that resulted in the 2011 Master Plan, including environmental review.

Thank you,
Heather & Peter Razukas
7279 Third Avenue, Tahoma

[1] [TRPA response to Homewood Mountain Resort’s Master Plan Update Proposal](#), 2-4-23

[2] [Homewood Mountain Resort’s Master Plan Update Proposal](#), 11-8-22

From: Robert La Mar <rlamar@pobox.com>
Sent: 2/26/2023 7:44:18 PM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: Homewood Mountain Resort Master Plan

To whom it may concern,

I am writing to you to express my opposition to the proposed changes to the approved Master Plan for the development of the Homewood Mountain Resort.

My family has been seasonal residents of Homewood at 5565 Lagoon Road for almost 50 years. We have always made a concerted effort to support the local HOAs, the local businesses and always purchased season passes at the ski area irrespective of our skiing plans each winter. As with so many of our neighbors we felt it was our responsibility ensure that the unique Homewood experience be cultivated and nourished as those that came before us did for us so we can do the same for those that follow.

While we were concerned back in 2010/2011 when we were made aware of JMA Ventures master plan for the development of Homewood Mountain Resort, we supported the plan for a number of reasons. We were told that one of the plan's goals was "... maintaining the heritage of a ski resort that can be enjoyed equally by local residents and visitors". We were also told that the central goal of their development was to "... restore Homewood as a key gathering center for Tahoe's West Shore." And, we were told, all this would be done with "... the new Homewood Resort design conceived as an alpine village community in the architectural style of the classic old Tahoe lodges." I ask you, what's not to like.

Now, in 2023, we're being told a very different story. We are told the ski area that we supported for almost 50 years through thick and thin will now be private and will only "... open the area to residents multiple times each month (no holidays or weekends)." We're also told that instead of a design conceived as an alpine village community in the architectural style of classic Tahoe lodges we will have to do with "Mountain Modern". I have to assume that with these changes the stated goal to restore Homewood as a key gathering center for Tahoe's West Shore is no longer valid. After all, how is that possible with "no holidays or weekends".

My family feels as if we were simply duped. If I had only known JMA's and their partner's eventual self serving plans I would never have signed with my approval of the development. I can only hope that a final determination from the TRPA Governing Board that JMA Ventures, Mehari Hospitality, and Discovery Land Company's proposal to privatize Homewood Mountain Resort is not consistent with the 2011 Master Plan and either revert to the approved plan or start the process all over again.

Sincerely,

Robert La Mar Family
5565 Lagoon Road
Homewood, CA
Local: 530-525-6698
Bay Area: 650-726-6894
Cell/text: 650-465-5354
Email: rlamar@pobox.com

From: Greg Fibiger <westshore7@gmail.com>
Sent: 2/26/2023 5:01:00 PM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: Homewood Mountain Resort

Dear TRPA,

As a resident of Tahoma, California, on the west shore of Lake Tahoe, I need to declare my major opposition to the future plans for HOMEWOOD MOUNTAIN RESORT.

The owners - JMA Ventures, Mohari Hospitality, and Discovery Land Company - had a plan that was approved in 2011. That plan held the community as partners and was beneficial for everyone residing in and visiting the west shore. In the 12 years since then, the plan has now completely changed to privatize our quaint ski hill into luxury properties and members only access. With these major changes, this plan needs to be FULLY reassessed, including input from the community.

My family has been skiing Homewood for generations and absolutely adores the West Shore. We made a lifetime dream come true by purchasing a modest, rustic cabin in Tahoma. A main purpose of this dream is to be able to raise our family skiing at our beloved Homewood. Please don't allow this dream to be taken away from our community due to corporate greed.

Please help and do right by your constituents and neighbors!

Sincerely,
Greg Fibiger

7281 Antelope Way
Tahoma, CA 96142

From: margaret campos <margaretm1@att.net>
Sent: 2/26/2023 4:04:36 PM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: Homewood Mountain Resort

I am writing to express concern about the proposed direction for the Homewood Mountain Resort. Instead of retaining the architectural integrity of the West Shore, maintaining an inclusive recreational area with equitable, reasonably priced access for the whole community - tourists as well as local families - it appears that JMA Ventures, Mohari Hospitality and Discovery land Company is trying to create exclusivity through restricted paid memberships and altering the landscape with modern architecture. This form of architecture conflicts with the originally approved plan so it is hard to understand how County planners are allowing this to happen.

Further, I am very concerned that the traffic situation that exists near other area ski areas will be replicated in Homewood - still without a meaningful plan by the Counties involved to address public safety in the event of emergency egress.

It is extremely hard to understand how individual homeowners are held to strict building constrictions yet this large real estate investment firm is able to evade oversight, approved master plans and the spirit of the west side of the Tahoe Basin.

As such, I believe you should require this real estate investment group to immediately stop all non-conforming construction, initiate an honest re-plan for the Homewood Mountain Resort, including a full TRPA Governing Board and environmental impact review.

Thank you,
Margaret Campos
Homeowner
7170 Antelope Way
Tahoma, CA 96142

margaretm1@att.net
AJ6LP

From: claire Norton <clairellen40@gmail.com>
Sent: 2/26/2023 4:32:32 PM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>; Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>; supervisororgustafson@placer.ca.gov <supervisororgustafson@placer.ca.gov>; swydra@placer.ca.gov <swydra@placer.ca.gov>
Subject: Homewood privatization

This is an area dear to our hearts! We bought our cabin in 1995, mainly for its proximity to Homewood ski, for winter and summer sports. We've now grown to a family of 20, plus friends and extended family. We don't rent!!!! We all love using our home to hike, ski, enjoy our beautiful outdoors. Homewood ski has been a treasure for all of us.

I am writing to express my concerns with the proposed direction for the Homewood Mountain Resort.

Developers JMA Ventures, Mohari Hospitality, and Discovery Land Company are breaking their promise to make Homewood Mountain Resort a community center. This is a bait-and-switch!

Instead of "maintaining the heritage of a ski resort that can be enjoyed equally by local residents and visitors," developers JMA Ventures, Mohari Hospitality, and Discovery Land Company are severely restricting public access to Homewood Mountain Resort through paid memberships, at not-yet-revealed cost.

Despite the 2011 Master Plan's "central goal" to "restore Homewood as a key gathering center for Lake Tahoe's West Shore¹," developers JMA Ventures, Mohari Hospitality, and Discovery Land Company will only "open the area to residents multiple times each month (no holidays or weekends)."

Developers JMA Ventures, Mohari Hospitality, and Discovery Land Company claim their new plan will reduce traffic ("Vehicle Miles Traveled") compared to the original plan². This is hard to believe; West Shore skiers and boarders driving to Palisades or Northstar, plus resort employees commuting from Truckee or Reno, will worsen already-congested Resort Triangle traffic.

Contradicting the 2011 Master Plan, in which "the new Homewood Resort design is conceived as an alpine village community in the architectural style of the classic old Tahoe lodges," JMA Ventures, Mohari Hospitality, and Discovery Land Company have already begun building homes in a "mountain modern" architectural style in the South Base Area.

Responding to the vehement objections of 300+ concerned residents, TRPA has asked JMA Ventures to provide additional information on how the proposed changes "fit within the vision and goals of the Master Plan."¹ We share TRPA's concerns and thank them for their letter.

As next steps, we demand:

An immediate stop to the non-conforming construction underway at the South Lodge;

A final determination from the TRPA Governing Board that JMA Ventures, Mohari Hospitality, and Discovery Land Company's proposal to privatize Homewood Mountain Resort is NOT consistent with the 2011 Master Plan;

A complete re-plan for Homewood Mountain Resort, following the same publicly accountable processes that resulted in the 2011 Master Plan, including environmental review.

Thanks for hearing us! I can now ski free at alpine and palisades, but I love the holiness and closeness of Homewood. Please listen and try to help.

Claire Norton family; 430 Snowbird Loop, Homewood, CA

From: Jennifer McCausland <mccausland4@yahoo.com>
Sent: 2/26/2023 3:28:30 PM
To: swydra@placer.ca.gov <swydra@placer.ca.gov>; supervisorgustafson@placer.ca.gov <supervisorgustafson@placer.ca.gov>; HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>; Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>; assemblymember.dahle@assembly.ca.gov <assemblymember.dahle@assembly.ca.gov>; Senator.Dahle@senate.ca.gov <Senator.Dahle@senate.ca.gov>; senator.alvarado-gil@senate.ca.gov <senator.alvarado-gil@senate.ca.gov>; Senator.Feinstein@senate.ca.gov <Senator.Feinstein@senate.ca.gov>; Assemblymember.Kiley@assembly.ca.gov <Assemblymember.Kiley@assembly.ca.gov>; Senator.Padilla@senate.ca.gov <Senator.Padilla@senate.ca.gov>
Subject: Homewood project bait and switch - Reference PLN22-00534

Hello,

I have been a resident of Homewood my entire life. My grandparents and my parents have been residents for over fifty years. The planned redevelopment of Homewood goes against the very moral fabric of this community - taking all this beautiful forest and mountain and limiting access to only the wealthiest people who have never lived in this location and could care less about it. Allowing this project to move forward would be allowing the "bad guys" to win and take something precious away from our whole community and only allowing the privileged "few" to enjoy it. My children (and grandchildren) will no longer be able to have the same experiences I did living and enjoying this beautiful place - how terrible! How wrong! Please stop this!!! Find a solution that benefits everyone! Stop building on this lake! During my lifetime I have seen so much development and have watched the water quality decrease - we are destroying this place and further massive developments on the "quaint" Westshore will only hasten its demise.

I am writing to express my concerns with the proposed direction for the Homewood Mountain Resort.

Developers JMA Ventures, Mohari Hospitality, and Discovery Land Company are breaking their promise to make Homewood Mountain Resort a community center. This is a bait-and-switch!

Instead of "maintaining the heritage of a ski resort that can be enjoyed equally by local residents and visitors," developers JMA Ventures, Mohari Hospitality, and Discovery Land Company are severely restricting public access to Homewood Mountain Resort through paid memberships, at not-yet-revealed cost.

Despite the 2011 Master Plan's "central goal" to "restore Homewood as a key gathering center for Lake Tahoe's West Shore¹," developers JMA Ventures, Mohari Hospitality, and Discovery Land Company will only "open the area to residents multiple times each month (no holidays or weekends)."

Developers JMA Ventures, Mohari Hospitality, and Discovery Land Company claim their new plan will reduce traffic ("Vehicle Miles Traveled") compared to the original plan². This is hard to believe; West Shore skiers and boarders driving to Palisades or Northstar, plus resort employees commuting from Truckee or Reno, will worsen already-congested Resort Triangle traffic.

Contradicting the 2011 Master Plan, in which "the new Homewood Resort design is conceived as an alpine village community in the architectural style of the classic old Tahoe lodges," JMA Ventures, Mohari Hospitality, and Discovery Land Company have already begun building homes in a "mountain modern" architectural style in the South Base Area.

Responding to the vehement objections of 300+ concerned residents, TRPA has asked JMA Ventures to provide additional information on how the proposed changes "fit within the vision and goals of the Master Plan.¹" We share TRPA's concerns and thank them for their letter.

As next steps, we demand:

An immediate stop to the non-conforming construction underway at the South Lodge;

A final determination from the TRPA Governing Board that JMA Ventures, Mohari Hospitality, and Discovery Land Company's proposal to privatize Homewood Mountain Resort is NOT consistent with the 2011 Master Plan;

A complete re-plan for Homewood Mountain Resort, following the same publicly accountable processes that resulted in the 2011 Master Plan, including environmental review.

Thank you - Jennifer Pierce
6190 Flicker

[Sent from Yahoo Mail for iPhone](#)

From: David Riegels <dave@riegelslaw.com>
Sent: 2/26/2023 6:13:06 PM
To: swydra@placer.ca.gov <swydra@placer.ca.gov>; supervisorgustafson@placer.ca.gov <supervisorgustafson@placer.ca.gov>; HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Cc: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>;
Subject: Homewood Protest Letter Reference PLN22-00534
Attachments: [12923 LT TRPA.pdf](#)

As this January 29th letter does not appear to be included in the TRPA documents, I am re-sending it for your consideration.

David A. Riegels
PO Box 977
Homewood, CA 96141

January 29, 2023

Mr. Paul Nielson
Special Projects Manager
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
PO Box 5310
Stateline, NV 89449

Dear Mr. Nielson:

I write in response to TRPA's notice that it "is currently evaluating the correct approach to reviewing a new proposal from Homewood Mountain Resort to make changes to its 2011 master plan."

As best I understand the "new proposal," it is to convert the existing ski area and other Homewood controlled amenities into a private club, the Homewood Mountain and Lake Club, thereby excluding members of the public from their use. This proposal is apparently instigated by Mohari, which states that in March 2022 it became "the main equity investor in the redevelopment of Homewood in partnership with JMA Ventures and Discovery Land Company." The JMA/Discovery "Homewood Project Overview" available online, breaks the real estate parcels comprising the project into various numbered phases. According to the records available on the California Secretary of State's Business Search website, various Delaware limited liability companies were formed in late 2021-early 2022 to conduct the various project phases; with such companies including JMA Homewood Sponsor, Homewood Mountain, LLC, Homewood WSC, LLC, Homewood Lot 3 Devco, LLC, Homewood Lot 5 Devco, LLC, and Homewood Lot 6 Devco, LLC. All of these filings were purportedly signed by Todd Chapman of JMA.

The 2011 Homewood Mountain Resort Ski Area Master Plan, was submitted by JMA and approved by the TRPA under the TRPA's Community Enhancement Program (CEP) which was intended to facilitate the revitalization of previously developed property by expediting project reviews and relaxing coverage and other limitations. As described in an October 3, 2011 notice from the TRPA regarding the Homewood Mountain Resort Ski Area Master Plan, "the CEP seeks 'net gain solutions for the Lake Tahoe Basin which implement environmental improvements, enhance quality of life for residents, improve the visitor experience and contribute to the long-term economic vitality of the Region'". The notice goes on to state "The focus of the CEP is to encourage community revitalization and substantial environmental, as well as social

and economic benefits, by providing incentives for mixed-use development projects on existing disturbed or underutilized sites.”

JMA pitched the Homewood Master Plan as being essential to the economic survival of the Homewood ski area by providing hotel and residential housing that would increase the patronage of the ski area, particularly during the mid-week. Of course there were to be added community benefits such as a hardware store, an ice cream shop, a mid-mountain lodge open in the summer, and boat trailer storage. In its enclosed December 2006 *Homefront* newsletter, JMA stated that the “central goal” of its plan “is simple and straightforward: to restore Homewood to its place at the center of the West Shore, and to maintain its heritage as a ski resort that can be enjoyed equally by local residents and visitors alike.” JMA went on assert that “Homewood has always been about the local community, and we wish never to lose sight of the thoughts and concerns of those most dedicated to Homewood’s well being.

As stated in its December 14, 2011 News Release, the TRPA approved the Homewood Mountain Resort Ski Area Master Plan thinking that “Once complete, the Master Plan will revitalize a beloved local ski resort and deliver substantial environmental benefits to the Tahoe Basin.” The TRPA listed the community enhancements of the Master Plan as including “swimming pool and ice-skating rink, outdoor amphitheater for summer concerts, ski area improvements...”

The new Mohari Homewood Development “Homewood Mountain and Lake Club” plan turns all this on its head. Now “the beloved local ski resort” will become part of an exclusive gated compound offering no community enhancements whatsoever. In a word, all of the reasons upon which the TRPA approved the Homewood Mountain Resort Ski Area Master Plan in 2011, are negated in the 2022 Mohari Homewood Development.

So what is the correct approach to reviewing a new proposal from Homewood Mountain Resort to make changes to its 2011 master plan? Make the actual project applicants, those being JMA Homewood Sponsor, Homewood Mountain, LLC, Homewood WSC, LLC, Homewood Lot 3 Devco, LLC, Homewood Lot 5 Devco, LLC, and Homewood Lot 6 Devco, LLC, and the like, submit a revised master plan application under the TRPA’s Community Enhancement Program addressing (1) the manner in which they contend the revised plan satisfies the requirements of the CEP, and (2) why the substantial changes made it their “Homewood Mountain and Lake Club” plan do not necessitate a supplemental environmental impact report under California Public Resources Code Section 21166.

Respectfully submitted

David A. Riegels

From: Austin Payne <chambersdreamin@gmail.com>
Sent: 2/26/2023 7:58:25 PM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: Homewood Resort - Reference PLN22-00534

Dear TRPA,

I am writing to express my concerns with the proposed direction for the Homewood Mountain Resort.

The West Shore and specifically Homewood Resort has been an area that I started coming to as a child, 32 years ago. I have been fortunate enough to have bought a home here in this special place. My children have grown up on the lake, beaches, trails, and ski slopes all around Homewood.

The West Shore has a special feel about it. It is a place where you go and things are just as they are and should be. The people of the West Shore care about the lake, its natural surrounding, and people. This mentality is found throughout many of the homeowners and visitors to the West Shore.

Homewood Resort has always been a resort that locals ski, which helps keep traffic congestion to a minimum. If Homewood goes private it will cause more traffic congestion. The environmental impact of this alone is enough.

If you have not visited the West Shore of Lake Tahoe, you should. You will understand why there is much opposition to Privatization of Homewood.

Developers JMA Ventures, Mohari Hospitality, and Discovery Land Company are breaking their promise to make Homewood Mountain Resort a community center. This is a bait-and-switch!

Instead of "maintaining the heritage of a ski resort that can be enjoyed equally by local residents and visitors," developers JMA Ventures, Mohari Hospitality, and Discovery Land Company are severely restricting public access to Homewood Mountain Resort through paid memberships, at not-yet-revealed cost.

Despite the 2011 Master Plan's "central goal" to "restore Homewood as a key gathering center for Lake Tahoe's West Shore¹," developers JMA Ventures, Mohari Hospitality, and Discovery Land Company will only "open the area to residents multiple times each month (no holidays or weekends)."

Developers JMA Ventures, Mohari Hospitality, and Discovery Land Company claim their new plan will reduce traffic ("Vehicle Miles Traveled") compared to the original plan². This is hard to believe; West Shore skiers and boarders driving to Palisades or Northstar, plus resort employees commuting from Truckee or Reno, will worsen already-congested Resort Triangle traffic.

Contradicting the 2011 Master Plan, in which "the new Homewood Resort design is conceived as an alpine village community in the architectural style of the classic old Tahoe lodges," JMA Ventures, Mohari Hospitality, and Discovery Land Company have already begun building homes in a "mountain modern" architectural style in the South Base Area.

Responding to the vehement objections of 300+ concerned residents, TRPA has asked JMA Ventures to provide additional information on how the proposed changes "fit within the vision and goals of the Master Plan.¹" We share TRPA's concerns and thank them for their letter.

As next steps, we demand:

An immediate stop to the non-conforming construction underway at the South Lodge;

A final determination from the TRPA Governing Board that JMA Ventures, Mohari Hospitality, and Discovery Land Company's proposal to privatize Homewood Mountain Resort is NOT consistent with the 2011 Master Plan;

A complete re-plan for Homewood Mountain Resort, following the same publicly accountable processes that resulted in the 2011 Master Plan, including environmental review.

Thanks for your consideration,
Meghan Thompson
380 Tanager, Homewood, CA

From: JOAN BATTAINI <joanbattaini@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: 2/26/2023 5:24:31 PM
To: swydra@placer.ca.gov <swydra@placer.ca.gov>; Supervisor Gustafson <supervisorgustafson@placer.ca.gov>; HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>; Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>; senator.feinstein@senate.ca.gov <senator.feinstein@senate.ca.gov>; senator.dahl@senate.ca.gov <senator.dahl@senate.ca.gov>; senator.padilla@senate.ca.gov <senator.padilla@senate.ca.gov>; senator.alvarado-gill@senate.ca.gov <senator.alvarado-gill@senate.ca.gov>
Subject: Homewood Resort Proposed Plan

This letter is intended to express concerns with the proposed Homewood Mountain Resort.

It seems evident from the plans and communications that all developers involved are not transparent, are breaking the proposed agreement and are putting the health of the lake in jeopardy. TRPA regulations do not seem to apply to big developers. This will not be a community center; rather a private resort. This is a bait-and-switch.

Instead of "maintaining the heritage of a ski resort that can be enjoyed equally by local residents and visitors," developers JMA Ventures, Mohari Hospitality, and Discovery Land Company are severely restricting public access to Homewood Mountain Resort through paid memberships, at not-yet-revealed cost.

Despite the 2011 Master Plan's "central goal" to "restore Homewood as a key gathering center for Lake Tahoe's West Shore," developers JMA Ventures, Mohari Hospitality, and Discovery Land Company will only "open the area to residents multiple times each month (no holidays or weekends)." It is so patronizing, wrong and insulting!

Developers JMA Ventures, Mohari Hospitality, and Discovery Land Company claim their new plan will reduce traffic ("Vehicle Miles Traveled") compared to the original plan². This is impossible- it will clearly bring more cars and people to the area. Residents and Renters will still be commuting through the area for work as well as to get to public ski areas and it will merely worsen already-congested Resort Triangle traffic.

Contradicting the 2011 Master Plan, in which "the new Homewood Resort design is conceived as an alpine village community in the architectural style of the classic old Tahoe lodges," JMA Ventures, Mohari Hospitality, and Discovery Land Company have already begun building homes in a "mountain modern" architectural style in the South Base Area.

Responding to the vehement objections of 300+ concerned residents, TRPA has asked JMA Ventures to provide additional information on how the proposed changes "fit within the vision and goals of the Master Plan.1" We share TRPA's concerns and thank them for their letter.

As next steps, we demand:

An immediate stop to the non-conforming construction underway at the South Lodge;

A final determination from the TRPA Governing Board that JMA Ventures, Mohari Hospitality, and Discovery Land Company's proposal to privatize Homewood Mountain Resort is NOT consistent with the 2011 Master Plan;

A complete re-plan for Homewood Mountain Resort, following the same publicly accountable processes that resulted in the 2011 Master Plan, including environmental review.

Thank you.

Sincerely,
Joan Battaini
100 Snowbird Loop
Homewood
joanbattaini@sbcglobal.net

From: Evonne Revitt <vibrationtravel7@gmail.com>
Sent: 2/26/2023 8:14:09 PM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: Homewood ski area
Attachments: [image1.php](#)

TRPA,

I am writing to express my concerns with the proposed direction for the Homewood Mountain Resort.

Developers JMA Ventures, Mohari Hospitality, and Discovery Land Company are breaking their promise to make Homewood Mountain Resort a community center. This is a bait-and-switch!

Instead of “maintaining the heritage of a ski resort that can be enjoyed equally by local residents and visitors,” developers JMA Ventures, Mohari Hospitality, and Discovery Land Company are severely restricting public access to Homewood Mountain Resort through paid memberships, at not-yet-revealed cost.

Despite the 2011 Master Plan’s “central goal” to “restore Homewood as a key gathering center for Lake Tahoe’s West Shore¹,” developers JMA Ventures, Mohari Hospitality, and Discovery Land Company will only “open the area to residents multiple times each month (no holidays or weekends).”

Developers JMA Ventures, Mohari Hospitality, and Discovery Land Company claim their new plan will reduce traffic (“Vehicle Miles Traveled”) compared to the original plan². This is hard to believe; West Shore skiers and boarders driving to Palisades or Northstar, plus resort employees commuting from Truckee or Reno, will worsen already-congested Resort Triangle traffic.

Contradicting the 2011 Master Plan, in which “the new Homewood Resort design is conceived as an alpine village community in the architectural style of the classic old Tahoe lodges,” JMA Ventures, Mohari Hospitality, and Discovery Land Company have already begun building homes in a “mountain modern” architectural style in the South Base Area.

Responding to the vehement objections of 300+ concerned residents, TRPA has asked JMA Ventures to provide additional information on how the proposed changes “fit within the vision and goals of the Master Plan.¹” We share TRPA’s concerns and thank them for their letter.

As next steps, we demand:

An immediate stop to the non-conforming construction underway at the South Lodge;

A final determination from the TRPA Governing Board that JMA Ventures, Mohari Hospitality, and Discovery Land Company’s proposal to privatize Homewood Mountain Resort is NOT consistent with the 2011 Master Plan;

A complete re-plan for Homewood Mountain Resort, following the same publicly accountable processes that resulted in the 2011 Master Plan, including environmental review.

Thank you,
Evonne Revitt
Homeowner since 1965
6265 Chamberlands Drive
Homewood

Sent from my iPhone

From: Jay Laughters <jlaughters@icloud.com>
Sent: 2/26/2023 11:08:32 AM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: Homewood

Keep Homewood public. Please don't let this happen to the west shore.

Jay Laughters

From: Elizabeth Bondan Chaney <embondan@gmail.com>
Sent: 2/26/2023 10:01:01 AM
To: supervisorgustafson@placer.ca.gov <supervisorgustafson@placer.ca.gov>
Cc: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>;
Subject: Keep Homewood Public
Attachments: [image.png](#)

I am writing to express my concerns with the proposed direction for the Homewood Mountain Resort.

Developers JMA Ventures, Mohari Hospitality, and Discovery Land Company are pulling off a bait and switch at Homewood Mountain Resort.

Instead of “maintaining the heritage of a ski resort that can be enjoyed equally by local residents and visitors ,” developers JMA Ventures, Mohari Hospitality, and Discovery Land Company are severely restricting public access to Homewood Mountain Resort through paid memberships, at not-yet-revealed cost.

Despite the 2011 Master Plan’s “central goal” to “restore Homewood as a key gathering center for Lake Tahoe’s West Shore1,” developers JMA Ventures, Mohari Hospitality, and Discovery Land Company will only “open the area to residents multiple times each month (no holidays or weekends) .”

Developers JMA Ventures, Mohari Hospitality, and Discovery Land Company claim their new plan will reduce traffic (“Vehicle Miles Traveled”) compared to the original plan2. This is hard to believe; West Shore skiers and boarders driving to Palisades or Northstar, plus resort employees commuting from Truckee or Reno, will worsen already-congested Resort Triangle traffic.

Contradicting the 2011 Master Plan, in which “the new Homewood Resort design is conceived as an alpine village community in the architectural style of the classic old Tahoe lodges,” JMA Ventures, Mohari Hospitality, and Discovery Land Company have already begun building homes in a “mountain modern” architectural style in the South Base Area.

Responding to the vehement objections of 300+ concerned residents, TRPA has asked JMA Ventures to provide additional information on how the proposed changes “fit within the vision and goals of the Master Plan.1” We share TRPA’s concerns and thank them for their letter.

Like many others, my family has been a member of the West Shore (Tahoma and Rubicon) communities for a couple of generations now. My husband and I were fortunate enough to buy our own place in Tahoma a while back (a few blocks from my childhood cabin) so that we could give our kids access to the same wonderful things Tahoe afforded us in our youth.

Homewood is a foundational member of the West Shore community; any potential changes to the resort must ensure access is maintained to all homeowners/community members. Restricting access to a smaller group of luxury properties (which will almost certainly be occupied by an endless churn of online renters who have no true ties, commitment, or responsibility to the area), is unacceptable and only further exacerbates the issues that are currently plaguing the basin. I was fortunate enough to work at Homewood Mountain Resort for multiple years and I would be devastated if I cannot share this amazing place with my children. I learned to ski at Homewood and last year we were able to teach our children to ski at Homewood and we continue to ski the mountain this year. To lose this access would be so upsetting to multiple generations of our family.

As next steps, we demand:

An immediate stop to the non-conforming construction underway at the South Lodge;

A final determination from the TRPA Governing Board that JMA Ventures, Mohari Hospitality, and Discovery Land Company’s proposal to privatize Homewood Mountain Resort is NOT consistent with the 2011 Master Plan;

A complete re-plan for Homewood Mountain Resort, following the same publicly accountable processes that resulted in the 2011 Master Plan, including environmental review.

Thank you –
Elizabeth Chaney
7185 9th Ave
Tahoma, CA



Homewood Ski Resort, Feb 2023



From: Frederick Crosby <tahoecrosby@yahoo.com>
Sent: 2/26/2023 5:21:59 PM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: Objection to Homewood Resort Plan

To Whom It May Concern

I am one of many concerned with the current proposed direction for the Homewood Mountain Resort.

Developers JMA Ventures, Mohari Hospitality, and Discovery Land Company are trying to completely break the review process that has kept Tahoe the natural wonderland we have fought for year to preserve. Their latest actions seem to illustrate a view that a company with power and money can do whatever they want and try to circumvent laws and processes designed to protect Tahoe communities. What was once a promise to make the Homewood Resort area better for the community is now a plan to create a giant walled garden for a wealthy few with residents possibly get visiting days, like commoners visiting a palace. This is CLEARLY bait and switch and it seems unfathomable that the current plan can be considered approved under the original submittal.

Instead of "maintaining the heritage of a ski resort that can be enjoyed equally by local residents and visitors," developers JMA Ventures, Mohari Hospitality, and Discovery Land Company are severely restricting public access to Homewood Mountain Resort through paid memberships, at not-yet-revealed cost. To main concept of private resorts is to create exclusivity to attract a special clientele, generally by setting prices at a point where few can afford. It's unconceivable that nearby residents would have any exception to that, making any agreement to provide access local communities likely tied to prohibitive prices.

Despite the 2011 Master Plan's "central goal" to "restore Homewood as a key gathering center for Lake Tahoe's West Shore," developers JMA Ventures, Mohari Hospitality, and Discovery Land Company will only "open the area to residents multiple times each month (no holidays or weekends)." The people who will live with the noise and disruption for years from the building of the new resort will be locked out from any access except for days where they are tolerated to come inside, like a living exhibit for the members. Clearly, this is not the goal of the approved plan.

Contradicting the 2011 Master Plan, in which "the new Homewood Resort design is conceived as an alpine village community in the architectural style of the classic old Tahoe lodges," JMA Ventures, Mohari Hospitality, and Discovery Land Company have already begun building homes in a "mountain modern" architectural style in the South Base Area. I can't see any one of us being allowed to build something 100% different than an approved plan even for minor projects. Again, it appears the consortium is showing that the rules we all follow are not meant for them.

Responding to the vehement objections of 300+ concerned residents, TRPA has asked JMA Ventures to provide additional information on how the proposed changes "fit within the vision and goals of the Master Plan." We share TRPA's concerns and thank them for their letter.

As next steps, we, as a united Tahoe community, demand:

- An immediate stop to the non-conforming construction underway at the South Lodge;
- A final determination from the TRPA Governing Board that JMA Ventures, Mohari Hospitality, and Discovery Land Company's proposal to privatize Homewood Mountain Resort is NOT consistent with the 2011 Master Plan;
- A complete re-plan for Homewood Mountain Resort, following the same publicly accountable processes that resulted in the 2011 Master Plan, including environmental review.

Thank you,

Frederick Crosby and Sophie Decker
160 Tahoe Ski Bowl Way, Homewood CA

From: Carolyn Selig <carolyn.selig@gmail.com>
Sent: 2/26/2023 1:20:53 PM
To: swydra@placer.ca.gov <swydra@placer.ca.gov>; supervisorgustafson@placer.ca.gov <supervisorgustafson@placer.ca.gov>; HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>; Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Cc: Michael Selig <mrselig@yahoo.com>;
Subject: PLN22-00534, Homewood Mountain Resort Privatization - opposed

Dear Stacy, Cindy, TRPA and Paul,

My husband, Michael, and I are writing to each of you to oppose the privatization of Homewood Mountain Resort. We purchased our home on Snowbird Loop in Homewood for many reasons, one of which was to enjoy skiing at Homewood Mountain Resort. Our 10-year old currently skis on the Homewood team along with other local children -- all children who would be excluded from the use of the mountain if it were to be privatized.

The 2011 Master Plan approved by TRPA clearly outlined a community goal including updating the facilities, rebuilding a clubhouse and increasing housing. The newly submitted plan does not align with any of these central ideas as the mountain would not be accessible by those of us in the community.

TRPA has requested additional information from JMA. We would also like to request an immediate stop to the non-conforming construction underway at South Lodge, a final determination from TRPA that the revised plans, including privatization, are not in line with the approved 2011 Master Plan and a complete replan for Homewood Mountain Resort following the same public process as before, including environmental impact.

Thank you in advance for your consideration.

Warmly,
Carolyn & Michael Selig
445 Snowbird Loop, Homewood, CA

From: Wechter Debra <dgwechter@aol.com>
Sent: 2/26/2023 6:36:50 PM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: Privatization of Homewood Mountain Resort

Instead of “maintaining the heritage of a ski resort that can be enjoyed equally by local residents and visitors,” developers JMA Ventures, Mohari Hospitality, and Discovery Land Company are severely restricting public access to Homewood Mountain Resort through paid memberships.

Despite the 2011 Master Plan’s “central goal” to “restore Homewood as a key gathering center for Lake Tahoe’s West Shore1,” developers JMA Ventures, Mohari Hospitality, and Discovery Land Company will only “open the area to residents multiple times each month (no holidays or weekends).” The idea that local residents would be allowed to use the resort for a few designated days during each month is not in sync with the thrust of the original proposal.

Developers JMA Ventures, Mohari Hospitality, and Discovery Land Company claim their new plan will reduce traffic (“Vehicle Miles Traveled”) compared to the original plan. West Shore skiers and boarders driving to Palisades or Northstar, plus resort employees commuting from Truckee or Reno, will worsen already-congested Resort Triangle traffic.

Contradicting the 2011 Master Plan, in which “the new Homewood Resort design is conceived as an alpine village community in the architectural style of the classic old Tahoe lodges,” JMA Ventures, Mohari Hospitality, and Discovery Land Company have already begun building homes in a “mountain modern” architectural style in the South Base Area. Not only is this not in keeping with the original plan, but images of these homes on the website show flat roofs, not exactly an architecturally sound design for an area with significant snowfall.

Responding to the vehement objections of 300+ concerned residents, TRPA has asked JMA Ventures to provide additional information on how the proposed changes align with original plan’s goals. We share TRPA’s concerns and thank them for their letter.

As next steps, we demand:

An immediate stop to the construction underway at the South Lodge.

A final determination from the TRPA Governing Board that JMA Ventures, Mohari Hospitality, and Discovery Land Company’s proposal to privatize Homewood Mountain Resort is NOT consistent with the 2011 Master Plan.

A complete revision of the master plan for Homewood Mountain Resort, following the same publicly accountable processes that resulted in the 2011 Master Plan, including environmental review.

Debra G Wechter
5963 Lagoon Road
Homewood, CA

From: Rebecca Sweet <rebecca@harmonyinthegarden.com>
Sent: 2/26/2023 3:43:46 PM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: Reference PLN22-00534

Dear TRPA,

I am writing to express my concerns with the proposed direction for the Homewood Mountain Resort.

Developers JMA Ventures, Mohari Hospitality, and Discovery Land Company are breaking their promise to make Homewood Mountain Resort a community center. This is a bait-and-switch!

Instead of "maintaining the heritage of a ski resort that can be enjoyed equally by local residents and visitors," developers JMA Ventures, Mohari Hospitality, and Discovery Land Company are severely restricting public access to Homewood Mountain Resort through paid memberships, at not-yet-revealed cost.

Despite the 2011 Master Plan's "central goal" to "restore Homewood as a key gathering center for Lake Tahoe's West Shore¹," developers JMA Ventures, Mohari Hospitality, and Discovery Land Company will only "open the area to residents multiple times each month (no holidays or weekends)."

Developers JMA Ventures, Mohari Hospitality, and Discovery Land Company claim their new plan will reduce traffic ("Vehicle Miles Traveled") compared to the original plan². This is hard to believe; West Shore skiers and boarders driving to Palisades or Northstar, plus resort employees commuting from Truckee or Reno, will worsen already-congested Resort Triangle traffic.

Contradicting the 2011 Master Plan, in which "the new Homewood Resort design is conceived as an alpine village community in the architectural style of the classic old Tahoe lodges," JMA Ventures, Mohari Hospitality, and Discovery Land Company have already begun building homes in a "mountain modern" architectural style in the South Base Area.

Responding to the vehement objections of 300+ concerned residents, TRPA has asked JMA Ventures to provide additional information on how the proposed changes "fit within the vision and goals of the Master Plan.¹" We share TRPA's concerns and thank them for their letter.

As next steps, we demand:

An immediate stop to the non-conforming construction underway at the South Lodge;
A final determination from the TRPA Governing Board that JMA Ventures, Mohari Hospitality, and Discovery Land Company's proposal to privatize Homewood Mountain Resort is NOT consistent with the 2011 Master Plan;
A complete re-plan for Homewood Mountain Resort, following the same publicly accountable processes that resulted in the 2011 Master Plan, including environmental review.

Thank you,
Rebecca Sweet

6320 Flicker Avenue
Tahoma