

From: Ted Peterson <TPeterson@lajollamgt.com>
Sent: 11/21/2022 12:22:32 PM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Cc: Michael B Peterson <mpeterson@microfocus.com>;
Subject: [BULK] Mohari Group Investment in Homewood Mountain Resort Development.
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

Paul,

Per our phone conversation: Please find below link regarding Mohari Hospitality investment in the Homewood Mountain Resort Development.

March 2022 they became the main equity investor. They are a significant international player.
<https://www.moharihospitality.com/portfolio/homewood-mountain-resort/#>

Thank You.

Ted

Ted Peterson | La Jolla Management Company
Executive Vice President | 7855 Ivanhoe Avenue, Suite 333, La Jolla, CA 92037
Direct Dial 858.500.8225 |
Main 858.481.7767 x265
DRE# 00816492
tpeterson@lajollamgt.com ; www.lajollamgt.com



 please consider the environment before printing this e-mail

This e-mail transmission and any attachments that accompany it may contain information that is privileged, confidential or otherwise exempt from disclosure under applicable law and is intended solely for the use of the individual(s) to whom it was intended to be addressed. If you have received this e-mail by mistake, or you are not the intended recipient, any disclosure, dissemination, distribution, copying or other use or retention of this communication or its substance is prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please immediately reply to the author via e-mail that you received this message by mistake and also permanently delete the original and all copies of this e-mail and any attachments from your computer. Thank you.

From: Ron Grassi <ronsallygrassi@mac.com>
Sent: 1/5/2023 5:05:28 PM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Cc: Judy and Jerry Winters <Jmtornese@aol.com>; Dana Schneider <danafschneider@gmail.com>; TPeterson@lajollamgt.com <TPeterson@lajollamgt.com>;
Subject: Homewood going private

Not so fast Homewood! There are still a few limits on your arbitrary decision-making process to develop this public ski area. My recollection is Homewood Ski Area is bound by the General Plan for your area and it does not even mentioning privatization. And I personally sat in the audience when Art Chapman wanted a permit to "improve" Homewood and he promised he had no intention to privatize the ski area. On that basis, he received his permit.

I realize TRPA thinks it needs to help out the developers for "prosperity" reasons but this is going too far. If you-TRPA- let this sail through, you will have left no doubt that that you've abandoned any pretense of protecting the environment. Now your mission is solely limited to protecting developer's pocket-books. It's this type of maneuvering that galvanizes people around the Lake to not trust TRPA.

Paul: if Placer Planing is also involved in this end run, would you please forward my written opposition to them as well, Thanks.

Ron Grassi
Tahoe City, Calif.

From: Renee Koiwane <rkoijane@gmail.com>
Sent: 1/5/2023 7:52:14 PM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Subject: Homewood Project

Hello Paul.

My name is Renee Koiwane, 22 year full-time resident in Homewood, Lake Tahoe. I also, regrettably, for two years worked with JMA to help approve the Homewood Redevelopment Project. I did this specifically because I was worried that if we did not support a public use project, we'd be looking instead at a gated community of sorts. I was very naive as I've now come to learn that many developers like to use a tactic of approving plans they know the public will support so that they can ultimately sneak in their actual intentions. I do know that JMA had very early switched to the concept of privatization soon after their plans were approved.

Paul, a better concept for our area would be an open space preserve. Our community would rather see NOTHING on that parcel than an extremely elite concept that will block off access to a vast amount of land and will change the nature of our community. This type of plan is the opposite of what any community should be planning for in the wake of climate change, wildfire, and affordable housing issues. Nobody in this day and age needs a 4th or 5th home. The planet, and Lake Tahoe, simply can no longer bear it. Had JMA set in front of our community this member-only concept (ala the Yellowstone Club) there would have been lines out the door in protest.

My hope is that you will think about Lake Tahoe as the TRPA once did back during your inception. This is a special spot. And we are "loving it" to death. Some places have thresholds. Maximum capacities. We are at a precipice here and we simply don't need this type of business. All we really need now is preservation. And balance.

I'm a mother in Tahoe raising two boys. I am a transplant from San Francisco and while working and living there, helped for a brief time work on the Crissy Field Restoration Project. I'm not anti development, as long as it takes into account the current time, place and people. The Tahoe community is not responsible for making sure speculative developers remain solvent. We are only responsible for ensuring our environment is protected. We'll all be better off without Homewood Ski Resort in the end.

Thank you for your time.
I'd be happy to talk in person.

Best,
Renee Koiwane
c. 530-363-2091

www.reneekoijaneart.com

From: Mimi Morris <fifthwink@gmail.com>
Sent: 1/5/2023 5:36:05 PM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Subject: Homewood Resort Privatization Plan

Dear Mr. Nielsen-

Please note that a developer is attempting to substantially alter usage plans for the Homewood Mountain Resort at Lake Tahoe's West Shore.

The inconsistency with the original intent of the 2011 Master Plan which indicated access would remain open to the public, invalidates 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 stewardship of the Tahoe region.

Sincerely,

Mimi Morris

From: Robert Tolin <oceantolin@gmail.com>
Sent: 1/5/2023 11:51:03 AM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>; TPeterson@lajollamgt.com <TPeterson@lajollamgt.com>
Subject: Privatization of Homewood Resort

Dear Sir,

We own a cabin in the Glenridge development at Meeks Bay. We heard there is a plan to privatize Homewood Resort and this plan would exclude local homeowners not in an existing HOA from using the resort as they have been able to and has been done for decades. This plan is too exclusive and would likely be unsustainable and would go against the broader purpose of allowing a wide range of people to recreate and enjoy the Lake Tahoe Basin.

We have enjoyed skiing at Homewood Resort and it appears this proposal would exclude us from recreating at the mountain. This would cause us to have to drive many more miles to recreate at the other ski resorts which would contribute to climate change, I'm sure TRPA doesn't support increased risks for climate change caused by their actions.

Please do not support the proposed privatization of the Homewood Resort.

Respectfully,
Robert K Tolin
386 Sunnyview Drive

From: Lorie Cress <lcress7199@gmail.com>
Sent: 1/5/2023 7:33:17 PM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Subject: Privatization of Homewood.

I am a resident of Homewood (5250 Westlake Blvd). I have been reading about the proposal to privatize the Homewood Ski Resort.

I have followed the Homewood Mountain Resort Development from the beginning stages. In order to get the locals to back the project, many amenities were promised; a Tahoe Tavern style resort with a Soda Fountain, Ice skating, a Hardware store and the ski hill always available to the locals. Understandably there have been economic issues that have slowed the project, yet some development of surrounding units, purchase of restaurant/inn and purchase of Homewood Marina have proceeded. Gone is the Tahoe Tavern Style resort, soda fountain, ice skating rink, hardware store and now no locals can use the ski hill!!

I believe the request to privatize the ski area goes outside the original approval of the development. Such privatization could have adverse affects on property values and business interests in the neighborhood.

I am requesting TRPA require a new plan to review this significantly-revised project, including a public hearing and comments.

I understand you are meeting privately on January 9th. Please include my letter in the presentation.

Thank you, Lorie Cress

From: daneeley@aol.com <daneeley@aol.com>
Sent: 1/6/2023 11:45:54 AM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Subject: Homewood Privatization

Dear Mr. Nielsen

I understand the TRPA is considering the application by Homewood Mountain Resort to take the ski area private. I encourage you to reject the request for a number of reasons. I am a long time second home owner in Meeks Bay and have skied Homewood for many years. While Homewood is a private enterprise, it should be considered a tourist amenity for the west shore of Lake Tahoe that the locals have enjoyed for generations. I attended a meeting some years ago held by Art Chapman of JMA Ventures when they were trying to get local support, or diffuse local objections over the substantial development they were proposing on the Homewood/Tahoe Ski Bowl site. I clearly remember Art Chapman claiming he loved Homewood and his goal was to keep it operating as a ski area, but he needed the volume of development he was proposing to keep Homewood economically viable. The explicit threat was that if he couldn't get the density he wanted, Homewood would close. How ironic now that he has those entitlements that he wants to close Homewood to the public! My fear is that he tries something like the Yellowstone Club in Montana (which initially went through bankrupts) and we lose a wonderful Lake Tahoe amenity forever. Please do not allow this to become a place for the super rich that excludes the people that have supported it for so many years.

Regards, Dennis Neeley
(916) 214-2184

From: Dana Schneider <danafschneider@gmail.com>
Sent: 1/6/2023 9:33:19 AM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Subject: Homewood Privatization Plan

Dear Mr. Nielsen-
My husband and I are homeowners on the West Shore of Lake Tahoe.

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.

Sincerely,

Dana Schneider
482 Sweetwater Drive
Meeks Bay

--

Dana Schneider LMFT
License #M13811
Mailing address
125 South Main Street #194
Sebastopol, CA. 95472
danafschneider@gmail.com
<http://danaschneidermft.com/>

This electronic document may contain confidential information and is intended for use by the addressee and/or their intended representatives only. Review by unintended individuals is prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient please do not read, transmit, copy, disclose, or utilize this communication in any manner. If you received this message in error, please notify the sender immediately and permanently delete this message from your computer. Email is not guaranteed to be a secured medium for exchange of information; therefore, confidentiality cannot be assured.

From: JOAN BATTAINI <joanbattaini@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: 1/7/2023 7:02:48 PM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Cc: joan battaini <joanbattaini@sbcglobal.net>; Michele Battaini <battaini.michele@gmail.com>;
Subject: Fw: Homewood redevelopment draft

Hello, We are in agreement with other community members and home owners that oppose privatization.

Homewood is attractive as the "sleepy" side of the lake. Homewood is true to the natural beauty of the area. We had always enjoyed the casual, friendly climate at Homewood Ski Resort as well as its accessibility. We are no longer season ticket holders due to cost.

Privatization of Homewood Ski Resort is sure to cause congestion, increase pollution, threaten the health of the lake not to mention change the atmosphere and dynamics of the "sleepy" side of the lake.

In essence, it is a bad idea that is threatening the health of the environment as well as the down to earth, humble nature of Homewood.

Additionally, considering the restrictions on development in the area, it is unclear how a large development on a mountain could possibly comply with current regulations and restrictions in place to protect the lake.

What benefits are to be gained by the proposed development and privatization of Homewood?

Thank you

Joan Battaini
Michele Battaini
100 Snowbird Loop
Homewood, CA

From: David Waal <davidwaal@gmail.com>
Sent: 1/7/2023 6:04:38 PM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Subject: Fwd: Homewood Mountain Resort plan

David

----- Forwarded message -----
From: **David Waal** <davidwaal@gmail.com>
Date: Sat, Jan 7, 2023 at 5:53 PM
Subject: Homewood Mountain Resort plan
To: <pnielsen@trpa.gov>

Paul,

(This is a second email to you as I received a notification saying that your email server wouldn't accept the first one due to a link I had in the first paragraph. The last part of the first paragraph, below, was to an article of the top 10 most expensive places to ski in the USA and Homewood was the most expensive).

Art Chapman purchased Homewood and has since run it into the ground. He hasn't put any money into it and says that he can't afford to because he can't attract the skiers. At \$279 for a day of skiing, Homewood is the most expensive place to ski in the USA and his pricing model is ridiculous for the category of mountain Homewood is. Please read what this article says about Homewood from someone who is not a local and is looking at resorts on a national basis

Mr. Chapman has gradually been increasing the price of tickets, and in doing so, has tanked his attendance. It used to be one of the more affordable options and was always packed. When he purchased Homewood he did his cost analysis for the resort and I'm sure he's smart enough to have purchased it so he can make a profit from the operations at lift prices Homewood had at the time.

About 30 years ago (approximately) Tahoe Ski Bowl (TSB) tried to go private by having it be a timeshare. That effort failed miserably and Homewood wound up buying TSB. The same dynamics are in place today.

The question we're having a difficult time answering is: What benefit is his plan to the West Shore and to Lake Tahoe? It now forces everyone on the West Shore to go to Palisades or Alpine. That takes away a nearby family-friendly resort and increases traffic, pollution and congestion. Reducing traffic, pollution and congestion are key initiatives for Lake Tahoe.

Art Chapman is a real estate developer - that's how he makes his money - not running a ski resort. His plan from the very beginning has been to develop this and now he also wants to take it private.

I urge you and the rest of TRPA to reject plans of privatization and also the proposed development. The West Shore is the sleepy side of the lake and nothing is wrong with that. We do not need another high-end development that will be dormant by its residents. Look at Fleur-du-Lac and the condos at Chamberlands. Two high-end condo developments that are barely used by the owners. Let's not make this mistake - again.

Best regards,

David and Laura Waal
420 Grouse Drive
Homewood, CA

From: Patrick Brady <mr.patrick.brady@gmail.com>
Sent: 1/7/2023 10:10:31 AM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Subject: Fwd: Objections to JMA / Discovery Land Co. plan for Homewood Mountain Resort

Hi Paul,

I understand that TRPA is meeting next week to review JMA's new Homewood privatization plans, and I heard you were perhaps the right person to which I should send any concerns regarding the plans.

Please see the email below that I sent to TRPA, Placer, etc. when the privatization plans first became public. Let me know if you have any questions on the below or want any additional information, and thanks for the consideration.

Best,

Patrick Brady
5945 Lagoon Road, Homewood

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

From: **Patrick Brady** <mr.patrick.brady@gmail.com>
Date: Wed, Mar 30, 2022, 10:48 PM
Subject: Objections to JMA / Discovery Land Co. plan for Homewood Mountain Resort
To: Steve Buelna <SBuelna@placer.ca.gov>, Joanne Marchetta <jmarchetta@trpa.org>, Julie Roll <jroll@trpa.org>, John Marshall <jmarshall@trpa.org>

Hi Steve, Joanne, Julie and John,

First off: I apologize for the broad email distribution to all of you. I wasn't sure the most effective channel to voice my opposition on this topic, and I figured a single email was perhaps more efficient than sending them separately. But I realize you are likely fielding many similar emails on this project and many others, so my apologies for adding to your inbox, and thanks for taking the time to read mine :-)

I've been following along on the Phase 1 approvals for Homewood's Master Plan, and have also seen the [recent news](#) on the new JMA plans to turn Homewood into a semi-private resort in partnership with Discovery Land Company. While I'm still waiting to learn more details from JMA on their new plan, I have serious concerns about the new direction, and wanted to state my objections early as I see this as a dramatic departure from the [2011 Homewood Mountain Resort mast plan](#) that gained approval with community input and support.

In talking with the other West Shore residents and HOA members, I know I'm not alone in this objection, but as I'm speaking only for myself at this time. Summarizing my objections based on my review of the updated plans and comparing with the original approved master plan:

1. Architecture

The new "mountain modern" architecture is a big departure from the "chalet style" approved plan, and does not preserve the West Shore / Homewood feel. While this is not my primary concern, it is a big departure from the original plan, and it raises the question of whether the plans should be considered part of the original approved plan, or a completely new plan. (I'm guessing a change this dramatic on a residential property would trigger new reviews?)

2. Layout, site plan, land use

Looking at the site layout between the approved 2011 master plan and the new 2022 plan, it's clear the plan and intended use have changed dramatically. While I'm less concerned on this aspect, I would think it means we need to re-evaluate this submission as a new plan.

3. Intended use (private / exclusive)

This is by far my biggest objection, and what I see as the more egregious departure from the approved master plan. Looking at the opening "vision and goals" section in the original plan:

The vision also includes preserving Homewood's basic personality as a small, un-crowded, family-friendly enclave for those who love winter sports and spending summers at Lake Tahoe. 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.

While Homewood Mountain Resort (HMR) is committed to improving the property, including updating its aging infrastructure and financial viability - and, in so doing, implementing a variety of environmental initiatives, HMR is equally committed to preserving Homewood's basic personality as a small, no-crowds-on-the slopes, family-friendly enclave for those who love skiing.

And the updated plan:

At Homewood, members can expect the privacy, exclusivity, five-star service, and family-friendly amenities that define Discovery Land Company. The project offering will be limited to 223 lakefront ski in/ski out residences and condos. Nestled in between the mountains and the lake, Homewood's already-established ski and lake club will be further developed to become Lake Tahoe's most luxurious and exclusive family lifestyle community to date.

It's pretty clear that the new direction is a major departure with respect to the intended use and access for this important Tahoe property, shifting from a model that is fully open and accessible to the community and general public, to a private club resort available to an exclusive few.

The new plan restricts access considerably, and certainly does not *"restore Homewood as a key gathering center for Lake Tahoe's West Shore and to maintain the heritage of a ski resort that can be enjoyed equally by local residents and visitors."* This change will have ramifications throughout the entire West Shore and change its character completely.

While JMA currently proposes a "hybrid" / "semi-private" model where West Shore residents will have access to the resort, I believe the evidence strongly suggests that they intend to go fully private as soon as possible:

(a) Looking at Discovery Land Company's other "worlds", they specialize in building very exclusive private communities that have exorbitant buy-in prices and membership fees. For example, the Yellowstone Club has an initial buy-in price of \$300k and an annual membership fee of \$35k. They cannot justify these prices while also providing public access at a reasonable price. The exclusivity drives the price.

(b) JMA (Art Chapman) has said themselves that there are no guarantees the public or residents will have access (at a reasonable price) into the future. They know the semi-private plan won't succeed.

4. Piecemeal plan without transparency

Unlike the original master plan (see link earlier), the new plan is shrouded in secrecy and published piecemeal. After *years* of community engagement and negotiation that went into the original master plan, which gained widespread community support, JMA has pulled all public materials on the master plan, and has pursued piecemeal phase approvals without sharing any new plans with the community. Years of inquiry from West Shore residents received a response that the original master plan was "proceeding according to plan", which was clearly not the case. We strongly believe that JMA should share the full plan with the West Shore communities before they move forward with the phase approvals and build-outs.

Please do not let JMA and Discovery turn one of Lake Tahoe's most treasured properties and [historic gathering places](#) into a private club for the super rich.

Thanks for reading,

Patrick Brady
5945 Lagoon Road, Homewood, CA

Ps. Julie -- I think we last talked in 2015 when my wife and I were rebuilding our home in Homewood. Hope you're doing well!

From: Kevin Moloney <kevinpatrickmoloney@yahoo.com>
Sent: 1/7/2023 1:36:45 PM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Subject: Homewood

Hi Paul,
Saw some posts on Nextdoor, with your email and notice of an upcoming TRPA meeting. We built in Chamberlands in 1962 and used to ski home from Tahoe Ski Bowl. I am totally opposed to the privatization of Homewood.
Is there any way to follow the meeting? Please put me on any email lists, so that I can stay informed. Thank you.

Kevin Moloney

Sent from my iPhone

From: Amy Black <amyblackmd@me.com>
Sent: 1/7/2023 2:04:10 PM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Subject: Homewood development

Hello,

In long slog toward some sort of redevelopment of Homewood Resort, many of us have lost track of what the plans are. We hear they have changed in ways that will affect us, current (and longtime) homeowners in the surrounding area. Please address, if you would be so kind, the changes in the plans that have occurred since the last TRPA review.

Sincerely,
Amy Black
415 Grouse Drive
Chamberlands

From: James Lyon <jim@lyonfamily.tv>
Sent: 1/7/2023 5:40:25 PM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Subject: Homewood Mountain Resort

Hello Mr. Nielsen,

I write you to express my concern over the proposal by JMA Ventures to make Homewood Mountain Resort a private ski club. The public has not had a complete explanation of the proposal and West Shore HOA's including Chamberlands Beach & Mountain Club, of which I have been a member since 1972, have not had any communication or plan presented by JMA.

It is concerning that JMA has contracted with Discovery Lands Company to market Homewood Mountain & Lake Club. Discovery Lands is known for its private ski and golf club in Montana. This sends a signal to the public that there is no intention to allow any public use.

JMA continues to use traffic as is justification of going private, "because skiers can get to Homewood". This is a disingenuous argument. JMA has underinvested in Homewood to attract skiers, services are poor and lift operation is spotty – all with the intent for a private resort conversion. As a lifelong skier at Homewood, if the resort goes private, all West Shore skiers will be driving past Homewood to an IKON pass resort, creating more traffic and congestion in Tahoe City and on Highway 89.

I do not believe the current plan represents the Master Plan approved by TPRA and Placer County. The new architecture of "mountain modern" is not appropriate and the West Shore. JMA should be required to return to the original architectural style as was approved in the Master Plan. I believe the entire project should return to the public hearing process including a reopening of CEQA, with transparency and full disclosure by JMA Ventures on the development and change of use.

We need to protect the West Shore and Homewood community.

Regards,

Jim Lyon
+1 408 429 4816

From: Daphne Hatch <daphnehatch@gmail.com>
Sent: 1/7/2023 12:44:23 PM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Cc: Daphne Hatch <daphnehatch@gmail.com>;
Subject: Homewood Mountain Resort Revised Master Plan

Hello,

I understand that TRPA is meeting this week about Homewood Mountain Resort's Master Plan. I'm unable to find any information on TRPA's website about this meeting or the status of the revised plan they shared with the public in 2022. The revised plan is totally inconsistent with the approved plan and will not do anything to improve lake clarity or support the west shore community, home owners or visitors as it is envisioned to be a completely private membership-only development. As planned, it has the potential to completely change the character of the west shore, where my family has owned property in Tahoe for 55 years. The larger issues they claim are making the approved plan unsustainable (traffic congestion in Tahoe City) are not adequately being addressed by TRPA or Placer County (overdevelopment and overcrowding of Alpine Meadows and Olympic Valley). I would like to see an in-depth analysis, including the effect of mortgage interest rates, and increasing rain at Homewood's low elevations (climate change), on the sustainability of the proposed project, as well as how it will affect the character of Tahoe's west shore.

Please add me to any mailing list regarding the revised project and let me know where I can find information regarding Placer County and TRPA planning documents, meetings, hearings, etc.

Thank you very much,

Daphne Hatch
Daphnehatch@gmail.com
67 Pinheiro Cir
Novato, CA 94945

and property owner at
492 Elm St
Tahoma, CA

Sent from my iPhone

From: Barbara Dyszynski <dyszynska@yahoo.com>
Sent: 1/7/2023 11:59:53 AM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Subject: Homewood plans

Dear Mr. Nielsen,

My husband and I have owned a home in Tahoma for over 26 years. We strongly object to the plans to privatize Homewood Ski Resort and build multiple condos on the property. Our grandchildren will soon be learning to ski at Homewood and we would hate to see it become off limits for our family and other locals who love Homewood. Please do not let this happen!
Thank you.

Sincerely,
Barbara Dyszynski
7049 10th Ave
Tahoma

Sent from my iPhone

From: jeplumb@earthlink.net <jeplumb@earthlink.net>
Sent: 1/7/2023 3:07:21 PM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Subject: Homewood privatization

Dear Mr. Nielsen,

I am contacting you with concerns about the proposed privatization of Homewood Mountain Resort. As you know, Homewood has been a cherished site for recreation amongst Tahoe locals for many years. It provided affordable access to skiing and snowboarding for many whom the larger resorts are too expensive. It is an oasis for those living on the West Shore, especially now that traffic congestion to the larger resorts has become so bad on weekends, holidays and powder days. It has hosted community events during Snowfest and dance/music events during the summer. The idea that Homewood may become an elite, exclusive resort that shuts out the local people who are employed and live in the area is sickening. When ticket prices suddenly shot up this year, it appeared that someone may be trying to create an appearance of lack of use. Homewood is very much utilized by Tahoe locals.

Countless N. Tahoe kids and teens have grown up with Homewood as a safe place where they can gather with their friends, exercise some independence and enjoy their sierra backyard. Many have scanned tickets or learned to ski on the ski team. If Homewood becomes an elite, private resort, it will rob countless West and North Shore locals from having a place that they can hold community events, gather to ski with their friends and colleagues away from the chaos of the larger resorts and enjoy the benefits of living in Tahoe. Promoting affordable outdoor exercise and sports amongst our residents benefits the physical and mental health of our community as a whole. Tahoe residents are asked to openly welcome visitors and to share their beautiful backyard with non residents – privatizing a ski resort cherished by these same locals would be the antithesis of the welcoming spirit expected of them. Please consider how privatization of Homewood would negatively impact residents of N. Tahoe who value the community “mom and pop” character of Homewood Mountain Resort.

Thank you very much.

Sincerely,

Jeanne Plumb, M.D.

(530) 401-4606

From: Max Alcorn <maxalcorn@gmail.com>
Sent: 1/7/2023 4:05:59 PM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Subject: Homewood Resort

Hi Paul,

I am a Tahoma resident and loyal season pass holder at Homewood Resort and have concerns about the recent privatization plans.

- **There has been no community outreach or official statement from Homewood regarding these plans and potential change in access to the resort. The only way to follow along is via piecemeal news articles from multiple sources with conflicting statements from Art Chapman.**
 - The proposed development and operational plans should be clearly communicated to the public in advance with detailed specifics around access and pricing.
 - The proposed membership fee initiation figures I have heard from several sources, including several local realtors, is more than the cost of a median-single family home in the Tahoe basin which is outlandish and effectively eliminates access to nearly all local residents. The most expensive ski season pass in the nation is at Deer Valley (one of the top-ranked global resorts with 5-star facilities and over 2,000 skiable acres) which comes in around \$3,000 for reference. The proposed Homewood membership fees I have heard blow this figure out of the water which is hard to believe.
- **The privatization plan is a drastic change in the intended use of the resort from the previous approval of their master development plan.**
 - Homewood is a cherished community asset on the West Shore and a big part of not only my family's life, but those of my neighbors as well.
 - Restricting access to the ski resort to only those who can shell out millions of dollars for the new homes/condos would negatively impact the recreational pursuits of local pass holders but also tarnish the community-oriented nature of the West Shore.

I recognize Homewood is a business that needs to change its operating model to ensure its sustainability. I also understand the large amount of infrastructure investments the resort needs to make in terms of lifts/dining/lodging that would necessitate increased costs passed on to consumers/season pass holders like myself.

That being said, I think there is a mutually beneficial opportunity here that ensures Homewood's future success and maintains local passholder access to the ski resort. I think different tiers of membership at varying price points could effectively manage capacity and appease all parties among JMA/Discovery Land, potential new residents of the proposed development, and existing local residents. Other clubs in the area such as Tahoe Mountain Club/Schaffer's Mill have implemented similar multi-season membership options at Northstar.

- Different tiers of club membership
 - Premium four season membership for residents of the new development with access to the ski resort and new lake club (\$\$\$)
 - Full access to all facilities including specific resident-only sections in certain restaurants/lodges/etc.
 - Certain first-tracks ski privileges (i.e. skiing before 9am or before other non-residents on select days, etc.)
 - Access to certain events reserved for resident members (concerts/performances, food/tasting events, etc.)
 - Premium four season membership for other West Shore residents with access to the ski resort and new lake club (\$\$\$)
 - Full-access winter ski membership for West Shore residents (\$\$)
 - Limited-access winter ski membership for West Shore residents (weekdays/non-holidays) (\$)

I am sure I am among many local residents reaching out concerned regarding future accessibility to the resort and the change in intended use from previous approvals. I would love to hear your thoughts on the new plans and future accessibility to the ski resort for locals.

Best,
Max

From: Noel McNabola <nmcnabola@earthlink.net>
Sent: 1/7/2023 2:44:26 PM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Subject: Homewood Ski Area redevelopment

Hello Mr. Nielsen,
I would like to let you know of my concern that the Homewood Ski Area will be redevelopment without adequate and proper input from the local area residents and people like me who do not live there all year round but who own homes there and visit the area frequently. We bought our home in the Chamberlands development because it was a quiet area and we do not want to see that change dramatically, just for the benefit of a developer, who may be from out of state. Please arrange to get proper input from local area residents and people like me.
Very truly yours,

W. Noel McNabola
493 Chukar Circle
Homewood, CA
415-987-5173

From: Mimi Cunningham <mimi@thepartyqueen.com>
Sent: 1/7/2023 6:17:16 PM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Subject: Homewood Ski Hill

Dear Mr. Nielsen,

I am writing as a Chamberlands Homeowner who has been on the West Shore of Tahoe since 1963.

I grew up skiing Homewood, as did my kids....Homewood **was** a FAMILY FRIENDLY ski hill. That was its charm and attraction to many many families. The lodge up stairs was packed with children and parents - and now it is empty.

As a local to the area, I believe that privatizing Homewood will push even what few people go there now to stay away even more. The infrastructure of the West Shore can barely handle the local traffic from Rubicon the Granlibahken, let alone " a world class private resort". It just is NOT the West Shore Vibe.

I urge you to work with Mr. Chapman on returning the family oriented ski hill that Homewood once was. It was the "Ace in the Hole" on windy stormy days, as well as the jewel of the West Shore for all these years. We are very grateful to have it - but to turn it into a Private & Super Resort will create a shiny ghost town that we locals will have to look at for years to come.

Thank you for your consideration....
Mimi Cunningham

6210 Lark Drive, Chamberlands

From: Kate Allen <kathrynjallenesq@gmail.com>
Sent: 1/7/2023 6:20:08 PM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Cc: Anthony Rabinowitz <anthonyrabinowitz3196@gmail.com>;
Subject: Homewood Ski Resort

Dear Mr. Nielsen:

We are long-time property owners on the West Shore, where we raised our kids skiing at Homewood. The main reason we bought our cabin was due to its proximity to Homewood Ski Resort. We have 20+ years of memories skiing there.

We sometimes rent out our cabin as a Winter ski lease, providing housing to local ski resort workers and families from the Bay Area. This rental income helps to fund our retirement, and we have come to rely on this income in our budgeting. If we and our cabin renters could no longer ski at Homewood, this would reduce our property value and probably eliminate our rental income.

We are not opposed to privatizing the ski resort, so long as our property would continue to have access to skiing at the resort.

Our property is located in the McKinney Estates subdivision, in Tahoma (unincorporated El Dorado county bordering Placer County), and I believe it has CC&Rs and possibly an HOA.

Could you please require the developers to clarify whether property owners such as us will have access once the resort privatizes?

And if so, how exactly would membership be funded ?

Many thanks,
Kate Allen-Rabinowitz
7025 Bellevue Ave
Tahoma, CA 96142
925 270-5693
KathrynJAllenEsq@Gmail.com

Sent from my iPhone

From: Susan Johnson <Durango_Sue@comcast.net>
Sent: 1/8/2023 5:41:28 PM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Subject: [BULK] HOMEWOOD MOUNTAIN RESORT

Regarding the proposed plan of development and privatization of Homewood Mountain Resort (HMR).

As full time residents of the West Shore and ticket holders at HMR we are dismayed at the way HMR is being run.

We are of the mind that the owner, Art Chapman, is a developer and not interested in running a visible ski resort.

An article naming the 10 most expensive places to ski in America lists HMR as number 1. While the ski lift prices are utterly ridiculous the amenities are atrocious. The mid mountain lodge is a quonset hut with a gravel floor and there is a group of truly disgusting outhouses.

Additionally, the lifts themselves have not been reliable. Last year one was out for most of the season reducing the amount of skiable terrain at an already small ski resort

Several years ago a presentation was made to the 290 plus members of the Chamberlands Beach and Mountain Club which showed drawings and renderings of an old Tahoe style update. We see now that Phase I has been allowed to go through with an entirely different look than was brought to the public all those years ago.

We do not feel that the developer has any regard for the skiers, the residents or the needs of the West Shore and Lake Tahoe.

We urge you to look more closely at what the development of the rest of the project will do to the immediately surrounding areas remembering that from Truckee to South Lake there is only one lane in and one lane out.

It seems that Mr. Chapman's goal is to deliberately reduce access to HMR with extremely high lift prices, reducing the number of buyers, thereby forcing him to shut itdown and then let it sit dormant until he decides to over develop the area which would be detrimental and a disservice to the West Shore and Lake Tahoe.

Respectfully,

Scott and Susan Johnson
600 Grouse dr
Homewood

From: Jeff Berglund <tahobie3@gmail.com>
Sent: 1/8/2023 11:25:59 AM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Subject: [BULK] privatization plans for Homewood Mountain Resort

Where do I start. This plan has to be the craziest, and most selfish idea I have ever heard. I have been skiing at Homewood for over 40 years, and bought our house in Tahoma (2 miles from Homewood) because of the mountain. Our son has worked at the slopes for years, and the idea of losing all this for some rich, out of town people is insane. Using the excuse that Homewood causes traffic problems on the west shore is wrong. Compare Homewood to the Palisades should be proof enough that traffic is not an issue. Homewood is unique with it's small crowds, unreal views, and friendly staff, should be reasons to consider keeping. Compare these issues with what will happen if Homewood is privatized, bringing in the rich, forcing local stores and restaurants to close, years of construction, noise, traffic from construction equipment, etc., etc.

A sign of this greed has already started. People that bought day passes at the window this year, paid over \$280 per person, per day over the Christmas Holiday at HOMEWOOD!. I have been told that is the highest price IN THE NATION! AT HOMEWOOD?

Rumors are going around that some West Shore locals will still be able to buy season passes. If that is true, at what price will they charge, and what hoops will we have to jump through to qualify for getting a pass?

Please consider these issues, along with many others that will come out , and stop this plan.

Thank you.

My cell is 530 354-6990

My landline is 530 525-1937

From: Homewood Email <keephomewoodpublic@gmail.com>
Sent: 1/8/2023 11:03:34 PM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Subject: Comment re: Homewood Mountain Resort

January 8, 2023

Paul Nielsen, Special Projects Manager
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
Sent via email to pnielsen@trpa.gov

To Paul Nielsen -

I am writing as a full-time resident and community member on the West Shore to strongly encourage a new comprehensive review and renewed authentic public engagement around JMA Ventures' new plans for Homewood Mountain Resort.

I also am writing with a human health lens, in particular, as the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) support including a comprehensive analysis of human health in projects of this nature.

The new privatization plan, design features, etc differ dramatically from what previously was evaluated in the Master Plan and related environmental analyses some time ago. It now is based on features that were not included as alternatives in earlier analyses, and warrants different analyses.

Questions that this new proposal raise include, but are not limited to:

- Impacts to health and equity in its eliminating or severely restricting public access to natural resources that currently are available to the public.
- How it will layer onto existing traffic and evacuation issues -- an important question on the minds of full-time residents, particularly in neighborhoods that were evacuated in recent years with the Caldor Fire.
- How the new plan affects the physical natural environment, including water use, land use, lake clarity, noise, light pollution, and more.
- How the new design and building heights fit with the surrounding mountains or the natural setting, and visual landscape.
- What it means to add units costing above local median income in a place where there is an ongoing affordable housing crisis. Housing in general, and especially workforce housing, is a top issue in the Tahoe Basin and an underlying determinant of health.
- The job loss among West Shore businesses -- such as rental shops, restaurants, grocery stores, inns, short-term rentals and related staffing, etc -- if the proposed privatization occurs. Also, how that job loss will trickle down to residents, and whether and what kind of jobs may be available to the public at the private resort. Adequate jobs and living wage for workers are well-documented root factors for health. The new analyses should consider the affordability crisis in the area and how the proposed privatization plan creates or kills jobs within that context.
- How it affects local home values, both for full-time residents and short-term rental owners, and what expected loss will look like along the West Shore.

What little has been made public of this new plan by JMA Ventures is a great enough departure from what was actually approved in the past to warrant thorough review and renewed public engagement.

Thank you for considering these comments.

Sara Satinsky

From: Kevin Foster <kevinfoster3489@yahoo.com>
Sent: 1/8/2023 8:45:57 PM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Subject: Comments on Homewood resorts development

Paul,
As you consider development applications for Homewood Resort, please consider my comments. I am the president of the Community Association for Chamberlands Beach and Mountain Club which governs the 350+ homes in the Chamberlands community directly south of Homewood resort.

I fear the impact of the current private equity investment group who are looking to make a quick buck by flipping homes they can develop at Homewood. I have met directly with Art Chapman and had him speak to our home owners in May. It was clear that they are using the reduced ski resort revenue to justify development yet they have driven the resort into the ground through their actions which appears to be all part of their plan.

The resort has diminished because they have not put any investment or effort into the resort over the last 10 years so that result is of their own doing.

I think any development approvals need to be considered carefully not to disrupt the beauty and harmony of the West Shore which include increase traffic, increased erosion and significant changes to the culture.

Please keep the West shore residents in mind as you consider the requests of JMA to expand development of Homewood Mountain Resort.

Kevin and Michelle Foster
315 Grouse Drive
Homewood, CA. 96141
925-788-9481

From: Claire Cunningham <clairewcunningham@gmail.com>
Sent: 1/8/2023 11:10:16 PM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Subject: Concerns about the privatization of homewood from a Lake Tahoe full time resident

Hi Paul,

I'm emailing you as a Lake Tahoe full time resident and homewood season pass holder. The community has a number of huge concerns about JMA's privatization of homewood. There is extremely limited information available about the updated proposal, but privatizing the resort was not mentioned or approved in the original project.

TRPA approved the original project as a community enhancement project (CEP) due to the benefits it was supposed to bring the community. It was approved based on the resort being open to the public. What happened to the promise of continued open skiing for the local community?

How does a private resort conform to the requirements of the CEP to provide community benefits?

How can the TRPA allow these huge changes to the project to be made without further review, environmental analysis, Fire / evacuation planning, community surveys, etc?

Please consider the questions and concerns outlined in my email and the feedback of the entire Lake Tahoe community before you approve this new project. We don't get to have a voice in the meeting because it's a closed session so please please speak up for our community and be our voice.

Thank you,
Claire Cunningham

From: Diane Ellison <yshuasdi@comcast.net>
Sent: 1/8/2023 6:45:43 PM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Subject: Dear Paul Nielsen

Hi. My name is Diane Ellison and my husband and I bought a home at 488 Bay View Ct. in Tahoe Hills in 1972. My dear husband, Robert Ellison passed away January 21, 2021. At that time, we had 2 children from his first marriage whom I adopted. From that first winter of 1972, we skied at Homewood. It was our favorite place to go. We now have another child between us, 10 grandkids [one is in Heaven from a fentanyl overdose at 35 years of age], and 9 great grandkids. Homewood is like “home” to us, and we would hate to be denied access to ski there! Is there anything you can do to continue to allow us access there?

Gratefully and sincerely,
Diane Ellison

From: Tiffany MacLaughlin <tmaclaughlin9@comcast.net>
Sent: 1/8/2023 12:56:29 PM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Subject: Fwd: Homewood Mountain Resort

>
> Happy new year Mr. Nielsen,
>
> This is email is to offer you my plea to not allow Homewood Mountain Resort to be privatized, but rather kept accessible
to residents of, and visitors to, the Homewood community.
>
> At this stage in the process, it is possible to negotiate an attractive compromise for current owners, potential
investors, AND the community at large.
>
> As an active member in the Homewood Homeowner's Association and leader of our neighborhood, Keep Tahoe Blue/Blue Crew, I
offer you my time to assist in anyway that could contribute to maintaining public access to Homewood Mountain
Resort/territory.
>
> Respectfully,
>
> Tiffany MacLaughlin
> 350/355 Trout Street
> Homewood, CA 96141
> 916-275-2357
>
> Sent from my iPhone

From: jmtornese@aol.com <jmtornese@aol.com>
Sent: 1/8/2023 3:39:48 PM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Subject: HMR - FOWS April Newsletter - Privatization and the CEP Designation

Hi Paul,

FYI - below is the FOWS April 2019 newsletter which provides a confirmation from Art Chapman that the resort and its amenities will continue to be available to the West Shore community, as he originally promised. This information was confirmed to me via phone and a follow-up e-mail by Art. Privatization of the ski resort is a total repudiation of the Master Plan approved in 2011.

Additionally, as part of the Homewood Mountain Resort (HMR) Master Plan approval, TRPA granted the CEP designation (with its development incentives) to HMR in exchange for benefits that would be provided to the community, including continuing to have skiing available to the public. The ski resort amenities to the public were part of the requirements of the CEP designation. If this skiing amenity is eliminated, then HMR has violated its agreement & requirement under the CEP arrangement with TRPA. This needs to be remedied by a new Master Plan or amendment with an environmental review and a public hearing.

Judith Tornese
Tahoma, Ca.

From: jmtornese@aol.com
Reply-to: jqtahoe@sbcglobal.net
To: jmtornese@aol.com
Sent: 4/4/2019 8:15:35 AM Pacific Standard Time
Subject: April 2019 Bonus Newsletter - Updates regarding Homewood Mountain Resort, Fanny Bridge, and other activities



April 2019 Bonus Newsletter

Friends of the West Shore works toward the preservation, protection, and conservation of the West Shore of Lake Tahoe, our watershed, wildlife, and rural quality of life, for today and future generations.

There have been some recent developments and planning activities that we wanted to share with you in a timely manner. Please continue reading below for updates regarding the Homewood Mountain Resort, Fanny Bridge/SR 89 Realignment Project, Alpine Meadows to Squaw Valley Gondola, and upcoming opportunities to support improved transportation planning.

We would also like to thank our members and supporters who donated in response to our last newsletter. We appreciate your support!

Sincerely,

Judith Tornese,
President

Homewood Mountain Resort (HMR):

We recently received a copy of an "Offering Memorandum" for Homewood Mountain Resort. The Offering is a proposal to potential investors to provide financing for the new development. JMA Ventures has recently confirmed to us that there is no change in ownership and they are still the sole owner of HMR. JMA also confirmed that nothing's changed concerning the intent of the Master Plan development, and the resort and its amenities will continue to be available to the residents of the West Shore, as previously promised.

Fanny Bridge/SR 89 Realignment:

The Tahoe Transportation District (TTD) recently provided the following construction updates ([read full TTD email here](#)).

- The new highway segment, new Truckee River Bridge, and two roundabouts on either end of the realignment are anticipated to be completed this year. However, due to high water levels, construction may not begin until sometime in mid-June.
- Work at the Tahoe City Wye may start after August 2019.
- The rebuild of Fanny Bridge will not take place this year.

Alpine Meadows to Squaw Valley Gondola:

The final Environmental Impact Statement/Report [is now available](#); public hearings will be scheduled in May. We will provide more information in our May/June newsletter.

Transportation Planning:

Placer County is developing [Transportation Demand Management \(TDM\) strategies](#) that focus on enhancing travel options and encouraging the use of alternative travel choices (e.g. transit, ridesharing, walking, and biking). View the summary of options [here](#) and the draft report [here](#). Placer County staff will present the report to the North Tahoe Regional Advisory Council.

When:

April 11, 2019 at 6 p.m.

Where:

North Lake Tahoe Event Center
8318 N Lake Blvd, Kings Beach, CA

The strategies are primarily focused on improving travel options once residents and visitors are within the Basin (i.e. the "park-once" approach). While we still have a long way to go to address traffic entering and exiting the Basin, implementing these options is an important starting point. Further, if it is easier to get around the Basin without relying on a personal vehicle, it will be easier for people to travel to the Basin via transit, trains/buses, ride sharing, and other options that reduce reliance on personal vehicles.

We encourage you to submit comments ([click here to email](#)) and/or attend the 4/11 meeting and ask Placer County to implement these options.

Ways to support FOWS:

FOWS is always in need of funds to support the use of our consultant who reviews and makes scientific comments to the Tahoe agencies to improve local projects. **Please consider a tax-deductible donation soon! Note: we have reestablished the ability to donate online using PayPal.**

Amazon Smile:

We've joined the Amazon Smile program; all you have to do is order from Amazon through [smile.amazon.com](#) and 0.5% of your purchase will be donated to FOWS at no additional cost to you!

eScrip SHARES:

The eScrip Shares program allows shoppers to designate FOWS to receive donations earned through their purchases; up to 5% of your purchase will be donated to FOWS at no cost to you. See which retailers are participating [here](#) and sign up through [this link](#).



We invite you to contact us to learn more, ask questions, or simply get to know the FOWS Board.

Please contact Jennifer Quashnick, FOWS Conservation Consultant, at: jqtahoe@sbcglobal.net, or Judith Tornese, FOWS President, at: jmtornese@aol.com.

Friends of the West Shore | www.friendswestshore.org



Friends of the West Shore | PO Box 5095, Tahoe City, CA 96145

[Unsubscribe jmtornese@aol.com](mailto:jmtornese@aol.com)

[Update Profile](#) | [About our service provider](#)

Sent by jmtornese@aol.com in collaboration with



From: Robert Waal <rcwaal@comcast.net>
Sent: 1/8/2023 6:59:46 PM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Subject: Homewood

Hello,

This is a quick letter stating that my whole family is against how we see Homewood resort going. We have worked at the resort for years, and have been skiing there since the 60s. We have been homeowners since 1961 and still have our place in Chamberlands. Please do what you can to make an equitable outcome for all on the west shore and Tahoe, not the super rich.

Sincerely,

Bobby, Sharon, Colleen, Steven and Michelle Waal.

Sent from my iPhone

From: Andrew Cring <andy.cring@yahoo.com>
Sent: 1/8/2023 7:10:53 PM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Subject: Homewood development

Paul, I am a homeowner in Homewood on the west shore of Lake Tahoe. I was informed that you are TRPA's Special Project Manager aligned with the proposed Privatization of Homewood. I wanted to share concerns regarding this development that I and other homeowners have. It's my understanding that the current development plans are substantially different than what was previously approved. There seems to be very little public awareness of the scope and impact of this development and, given the change in development plans along with uncertain environmental and economic impact of this development, it seems that a more public review and engagement would be beneficial to the many people who would be most impacted.

Most specifically, a deeper understanding into the following....

- Economic impact to the west shore of privatizing the resort and eliminating public access to one of the major west shore marinas. Given the volume of people using the ski hill and or marina will be much lower, has there been a study of what the impact would be to local businesses? Have those businesses been informed of what is coming so they have ample time to adjust business plans?
- Environmental impact of new plans
- Does privatization of Homewood fit in with long term west shore development plans
- Impact on local residents if public access to the ski resort were eliminated. i.e. anticipated impact to value of homes in the area, Potential loss of local stores/restaurants given lower volumes.

Thanks for your consideration. If there is anything I can do to assist in this matter please don't hesitate to contact me.

Regards,
Andy

From: Tracy Best <tracyclore@yahoo.com>
Sent: 1/8/2023 5:01:13 PM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Subject: Homewood development

Hi Paul,

We are long time (40 plus years) homeowner in Homewood. The new development plan was to bring benefits to the community and to be open to the public. We have heard details about the plans to make this a private resort available only at a very high price to the homeowners. This was not what was previously proposed or what was approved. We pay a lot of money to live on the west shore and to have Homewood accessible to us. Not only was this not what was previously agreed to but will also add considerably to the traffic issues we already have. TRPA needs to standby what is best for the Homewood area and property owners.

Sincerely,
Tracy Best

From: Lisa Berghout <berghoutlisa@gmail.com>
Sent: 1/8/2023 2:03:48 PM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Subject: Homewood Mountain Plan

Paul Nielsen,

Hi Paul, my name is Lisa Berghout and my Husband is Ed Apodaca we own a cabin at 330 Tanager Drive in the Chamberlands subdivision and have since 2008.

Without getting into too much detail we wanted to express our opposition to the exclusive privatization of Homewood Ski Resort and the new home designs that both differ from the original master plan. When the master plan originally came out we were looking forward to enjoying an improved Ski Resort with amenities for our family and guests but year after year the work never materialized and the owners let the resort further deteriorate all while raising the price of the passes. Now they claim financial losses without having invested in the improvements to the resort they knew were necessary when they purchased it.

The current plan has not been properly vetted with community engagement or environmental analyses. I question how this plan improves traffic since according to ownership they have a resort that is losing money with little to no attendance. I can only imagine worsening traffic with all of Westshore having to commute to other resorts if this property goes to a private model.

Thank you for your attention to this matter,

Lisa Berghout and Ed Apodaca
330 Tanager Drive
Homewood, CA 96141

(415)250-5823

From: flesner dan <flesner@yahoo.com>
Sent: 1/8/2023 11:04:21 PM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Subject: Homewood Mountain Resort

Paul,

I'd like to express my displeasure with the Homewood plan to become a private club. I feel that the bait-and-switch JMA did with the public should require a complete reevaluation of the Homewood Master Plan by TRPA. The original plan when pitched to the public was for the resort to remain available to the general public, not a private club for "Billionaires and Professional Athletes". I also find it disingenuous that JMA says it is trying to make the current resort viable and profitable. They have owned the resort for nearly 20 years and have made little to no investment in the property and have raised the daily and yearly passes by something like 400% in the last 5 years. The south lodge burnt down years ago and has never been replaced. The north lodge smells of mold and grease and hasn't changed since I came to Tahoma 11 years ago.

The shame of it is that before they increased the pass rates it was an affordable place for families and locals to ski and snowboard. And it was becoming more and more popular until they sabotaged the ski school programs and raised the rates exponentially.

Homewood and the TRPA can do so much better, please make JMA restart the planning process with their real plans and intentions on full view for all to see.

Thanks,
Daniel Flesner

From: bowdle <bowdle@protonmail.com>
Sent: 1/8/2023 4:52:23 PM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Subject: Homewood Mountain Resort

Greetings, very concerned about threatened privatisation and development of Homewood Mountain Resort. Difficult to see how this could benefit citizens of California and Nevada as it would limit recreational access to a tiny number of extremely wealthy people. Cheers

Andrew Bowdle
GaviaLabs.com

Sent from Proton Mail for iOS

From: Margaret Eadington <meadington@gmail.com>
Sent: 1/8/2023 1:17:12 PM
To: Julie Regan <jregan@trpa.gov>; John Marshall <jmarshall@trpa.gov>; Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Subject: Homewood Mountain Resort

From: Margaret Eadington, 25 Somers Loop,
Crystal Bay, NV

Dear Messrs Nielsen, Marshall and Ms Regan,

In 2011, the Placer County Board of Supervisors approved the Homewood Mountain Resort Ski Area Master Plan.

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. It's not what was approved.

My concern is that the Basin, indeed, the world has changed fundamentally since 2011. Today we are sobered by our dry forest and the reality of living with fire in more suburbanized mountain communities of two lane roads. Today Tahoe is a rich man's playground with million dollar second home condo developments (proposed and existing) empty most of the year. We have no teacher, fireman, policeman, public agency, ski & restaurant employee affordable housing anymore. Year round residents make up the heart of our communities. Using the limited development potential remaining in the Tahoe Basin on exclusive condo communities that will be ghost towns most of the year does not make or support a "community" of year round residents. I fear TRPA can no longer see the forest for the trees.

To that end please address the following terms of the Homewood settlement agreement:

- To gain community support JMA, the developer, guaranteed perpetual public access to the ski area. Now they want to privatize.
- Is TRPA reviewing the settlement with California Clean Energy Committee on fire evacuation in Homewood. Will 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 be addressed?
- 100 units of the shuttered Tahoe Inn in Kings Beach have been transferred to Homewood to increase its density but no mitigation has occurred on the derelict Tahoe Inn. It's been 11 years! How does TRPA propose to enforce the mitigation demanded by the already transferred development rights? I propose a developer bond equal to the cost of mitigation as well as completion and TRPA approval of mitigation before a shovel is put

Sent from my iPhone

into the ground on any new development and before the bond is released.

- TRPA should require an updated traffic study
- TRPA should require employee housing
- There needs to be opportunities for public review.

I look forward to your response and responsible actions on this new proposal.

Thank you.

Margaret Eadington

From: Mattywags <mattywags@gmail.com>
Sent: 1/8/2023 1:15:49 PM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Subject: Homewood Mountain Resort

Hi Paul,

Thank you for taking the time to review the developers plans for HMR.

I am emailing as a resident of Chamberlands.

Since JMA ventures initially proposed development at HMR years ago the local community has been poorly informed in the entirety of the process which is common with private developers. While not surprised I am alarmed at the negative impact of the changes to the original plan for the following reasons:

1. The mountain cannot be supported viably by privatization with lifetime memberships. It has been exited in the past and time and time again it does not pencil. Capital improvements for chairlifts, facilities, and parking have always been an issue that will not be addressed correctly through privatization of a resort that would unilaterally serve non-residents who likely have lakefront access already. This is not a smart plan and will fail in time.
2. It would be a blemish on TRPA to have a private mountain that takes 6-10 years to show the true failure of privatizing membership to a piece of property that resides within the Tahoe basin. The property is understandably privately owned; no qualms with that and I appreciate their prerogative to do with the property as is allowed by law.
3. The laws and guidelines that governed the property and continue to be enforceable seem to be inconsistent with the new plans that have been proposed and I would encourage the Planning Association to dig deeply into the financial viability of this plan. Semi-private/preferred access membership seems to be the only way to viably incorporate a mountain where the developer is not able to contribute enough housing to cover their needed membership, additional staffing, and guests of private members to an amount that would be allowable on site. Discovery's other properties across the country have all included much more buildable land than this site allows and they would in turn be placing duress on the local community for their own enjoyment.
4. While unique to the situation mountainside of 89 I can think of no other large format developments that have not had to allow public access to such a piece of land on Tahoe. I think of Chambers Landing, West Shore Cafe, Obexers, Homewood High and Dry and others as examples of public access year round to ensure financial viability as well as public approval for their other private operations.

Thank you so much for your time and openness to comments.

All the best,

Matty

From: Anne Peterson <apeterson4@gmail.com>
Sent: 1/8/2023 9:37:04 AM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Subject: Homewood Mountain Resort

Dear Paul
We were thinking that we were getting a Lodge, Mountain Chalets, a Mid Mountain Restaurant and an Ice Rink--and now we find out that we are outside the fence looking in.
No more Family dinners on the Dock, Summer hikes to Quail Lake, Snowshoeing across the Mountain or Grandchildren learning to ski at Homewood Mountain.
Seems like a substantial change to me!
Please consider this at your Monday meeting.
A Public Review of this Major Change should be required.
Thank you!
Anne Peterson
5265 Sacramento Avenue
Honewood CA

From: jason estill <jasonestill@gmail.com>
Sent: 1/8/2023 10:14:14 AM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Subject: Homewood Mountain Resort Privatization

Good morning Paul,

I am writing to you with regards to the drastic new changes to Homewood Mountain Resort. The new plans are a complete bait and switch. The permits and environmental impact reports that were approved for the original plan are completely different from the new proposed plan. This should not be allowed to go through especially without a complete re-permitting and EIR process. The fact that they are trying to get away with this shows just how little they care about our community and all of the west shore.

The privatization of the resort is wrong in its principle and should not be allowed to go through. I hope that you can help to fight this from happening to my favorite resort. I learned to ski at homewood and had hoped to teach my children to ski there one day.

Thank you
Jason Estill
--
Jason Estill
(831) 998-0416

From: Ted Peterson <TPeterson@lajollamgt.com>
Sent: 1/8/2023 11:10:46 AM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Subject: Homewood Mountain Resort Privatization

Dear Paul,

As you know, the TRPA's Community Enhancement Program (CEP) provided for development incentives (such as additional development commodities and deviations from design standards) on premises that CEP projects would provide benefits to the local community.

The HMR Master Plan in 2011 was approved as a TRPA CEP project because it was found to provide benefits to the community, including public access to skiing, a swimming pool, a hardware store, boutique hotel and other community amenities. The findings that legally had to be made by TRPA in 2011 to approve the project were in large part based on it providing these community benefits. In addition, many community members supported the new Master Plan because it was presented as the only way to keep the ski resort open for the community.

The proposed privatization of the resort does not conform to the approved Master Plan, TRPA's CEP program requirements and associated findings, nor to the promises made in order to garner community support.

"As a compromise & to retain public access as promised under the CEP designation, TRPA could consider making Tahoe Ski Bowl area available only to club members and the North Base area open to the public, or vice versa".

Please open this project to public review.

Thank You,

Ted Peterson
5265 Sacramento Ave.
Homewood, CA

Sent from my iPhone

From: dfmac5@aol.com <dfmac5@aol.com>
Sent: 1/8/2023 3:18:08 PM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Subject: Homewood Mountain Ski Resort privatization

TRPA Special Project Manager
Mr. Paul Nielsen,

I heard from a source that JMA'S Art Chapman was in talks with Discovery's Mark Meldman prior to submission of the permit applications for Homewood's Master Plan. A (deposition) would compel the timing to be disclosed. That would change everything.

From: Jo Estill <estilljo@gmail.com>
Sent: 1/8/2023 8:17:15 PM
To: Julie Regan <jregan@trpa.gov>; John Marshall <jmarshall@trpa.gov>; Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Subject: Homewood Now Private?

I understand privatizing this property was not mentioned in the original environmental documents and/or the approval process...can this be legal? This approval was to bring benefits to the community and the ski area was to be open to the public. How can they change it afterwards?How can there be any benefit to the West Shore owners and businesses when the closest ski run would be Alpine or Heavenly. Your new Executive Director states that TRPA's goal will be to build new destination stewardship partnerships to better manage recreation (?) and tourism (?).....neither of which does the Homewood plan do.
And, lastly, from your TRPA website under heading of State and Federal Funding:
"TRPA works with communities and agency partners to invest in projects that.....revitalize local economies and improve recreation.....".
Homewood private ski area seems to be in direct opposition to these TRPA stated investments.
Thank you for your time.
JoAnne Estill
1972 Deodara Drive
Los Altos, CA 94024

From: Mackenzie Sickle <mackenziesickle@gmail.com>
Sent: 1/8/2023 9:35:05 AM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Subject: Homewood Owner Concern

Hello-

Our family, homewood members for over 50+ years, we do not want a private club preventing our access to Homewood.

Mackenzie Sickle

Sent from my iPhone

From: Alexander Tyler <alexanderfttyler@gmail.com>
Sent: 1/8/2023 7:34:27 PM
To: John Marshall <jmarshall@trpa.gov>; Julie Regan <jregan@trpa.gov>; Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Subject: Homewood Privatization

Deal All,

I am writing you with deep concern over the privatization of Homewood. I find the proposal to be not only secretive, but also detrimental to the West Shore of Lake Tahoe.

I am born and raised in NLT. I grew up in the public school system and have spent the vast majority of my life in the area. I went to KBE, North Tahoe, and UNR. I worked for 10 years at Sunnyside and have been apart of many local fundraisers and events. I have been through droughts, blizzards, fires, and everything in between.

There are very few things that have yet to be changed since my childhood days. One of which, is Homewood. It is a local staple. I recall being on the honor roll in middle and high school, and the resort offering free lift tickets. Although I know those days are of the past, I think the mountain is still a local escape from the madness. As you know, the area has exploded. Which, I agree, is great for the local community and the businesses. However, I do not see how privatizing a mountain that many people deem a go to, is beneficial to anyone besides the extremely wealthy individuals who will seek the benefits.

Let the people who live, work, and play in the area enjoy Mother Nature as it was intended and give anyone else an opportunity to enjoy as well. It is pathetic that this is even a proposal, and so hush hush to begin with.

Please protect the area as your elected job entails you to do.

Best,
Alex Tyler

From: Don Lambrecht <donl@dlainc.us>
Sent: 1/8/2023 6:12:08 PM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Subject: Homewood Privatization
Attachments: [Letter to TRPA .docx](#), [Homewood Emails.docx](#)

Please see attached letter from Tahoe Cedars Property Owners Association and a full range of comments from our members regarding a potential privatization of Homewood.

--

Don Lambrecht
President
Tahoe Cedars Property Owners Assn.
(916) 417-6768 -Donl@tcpoa.org



TAHOE CEDARS PROPERTY OWNERS' ASSOCIATION

Post Office Box 130 Tahoma, California 96142

January 7, 2023

Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
Paul Nielsen
Special Projects Manager

Re: Homewood Resort Privatization

Dear Paul,

Thank you for the opportunity to submit our comments regarding the privatization of Homewood Ski Resort.

Simply stated, a large majority of our members strenuously object to the privatization of the Homewood Ski Resort as proposed by the developer, JMA Ventures.

Attached is a sampling of the many comments made to me by homeowners in the Tahoe Cedars Tract. Tahoe Cedars property owners make up one of the largest property owners on the West Shore of Lake Tahoe.

Interestingly, as one of the largest groups of potential customers, and with generations of people that have long used the mountain and associated facilities, we have not had one outreach to us about plans by JMA to curtail, lessen or continue our access to their resort.

Homewood and Tahoma are representative of the "real" Tahoe. We know our neighbors and support local events, schools, and local merchants. We work with and are part of the fire department, PUD, Placer, and El Dorado County. We make up many of the customers that Homewood Resort needs to accommodate to be successful.

Once again, thank you and TRPA for considering our comments when you review the development plan.

Sincerely,
TAHOE CEDARS PROPERTY OWNERS ASSN.

A

Don Lambrecht
President

We've been residents in Tahoe Cedars for 34 years and have skied at Homewood and held a pass there every year! We feel the area is being groomed for the Bay Area people and for those richer beyond the local's means. Good example is Obexer's Market and now the old PDQ. We feel saddened and helpless in seeing Tahoma and the West Shore going down this path. We have felt the change since JMA purchased Homewood Mountain Resort. Remember the article quoting JMA stating that Homewood would always be about the locals? Ha! Quite the opposite. I feel sorry for our kids that have been born and raised here and are trying to carve out a future for themselves here. Not the West Shore they were born into. Not the place we all treasure and hope to preserve.

S & C Cornwell

Sent from my iPad

Received your message about the Homewood Ski Resort. As a Tahoe Cedars property owner, I am aware that there was talk of these changes some years ago, and that I am saddened/ upset that the push to privatize has resurfaced. It appears more and more "Big Money " enterprises are swallowing up more and more of our local west shore. I would be willing to support efforts to resist these changes, as they seem to become more exclusive of the local public. In addition, I'm also concerned about the woman who has purchased and is holding in "limbo " the Norfolk Inn, among other properties. Especially with the current lack of housing for local Tahoe workers. It makes me wonder if there is a potential connection with the Homewood plans (that these properties might be adapted to another "Big Money " encroachment in Tahoma. It's unsettling that the woman/owner does not respond to questions about her intentions (per the recent article in Moonshine Ink). Thanks for the information, and please let me know of any further developments.

Dear Mr Lambrecht,

My husband and I are quite upset to learn of the future plans for Homewood Ski Resort becoming a private facility. Our family has enjoyed skiing there for decades!

We hope the Home Owners Association will convince the new owners to allow others to use the resort. It should not be allowed to become a place only for the wealthy.

Sincerely,

Barbara Dyszynski and Richard Smolen

7049 10th Ave, Tahoma

Don,

Thanks for sending this email out to the association. My name is Trevor Larkins and my wife and I own West Shore Sports in Homewood. We currently own 3 cabins on 7th Ave, which house our employees. The news of Homewood going private is devastating not only to this community but local families and businesses.

When Homewood first came out with their original development plan, there was certainly no mention of being a private or semi private resort. In fact, it was focused on locals and tourists alike, community, and trying to keep Homewoods existent character . The Lake Tahoe area has always been focused community, and is why so many of us want to live here. This is certainly not the plan for Homewoods new development plan.

I agree that Homewood does need to develop and create a more viable resort with the amenities and real estate, but it should not be exclusive. I believe that most locals and visitors, if knowing the true facts of this development, would reject it.

Thanks,
Trevor Larkins

Don,
Although we aren't skiers much anymore, this news is upsetting. We, our family and friends have enjoyed the priceless views of skiing from this scenic resort. It doesn't seem right that we, the public, won't be able to access this resort.
Ron and Pam Nepstead
Tahoma Second Home Residents for 40 years

Good afternoon,

I am writing to share my concerns about Homewood Ski resort turning private. We've been taking our family to Tahoma for years because Homewood has been a family-friendly place to ski. There must be other solutions to their business problems than making this Tahoe gem an exclusive resort.
Appreciate the Board's consideration,
Sarah McCaughey

Hi Don. Just read about JMA Venture's plan to have Homewood Ski Resort go private. I understand where they're coming from, but the last 10 years haven't been the best for ANY ski resorts, and planning to shut out the skiers and patrons who have supported them in the past is a mistake. Maybe building high-end homes on the property will enable those folks to utilize the property, but has JMA noticed that those folks also live elsewhere, and tend to spend a short time at Tahoe? If the younger crowd prefers the more difficult slopes of Palisades and North Star (have they ever been to the top of Homewood? I found it quite challenging!), what plans does JMA have to make the mountain more difficult? Seems to me, that's the problem, not that there aren't enough homes for the rich and famous.

And if traffic is part of the issue, I'm sure DOT would love to hear a solution! I live in the East Bay area and would be on board with ANY alleviation of traffic!

Why do they feel they need to shut out the public and only allow homeowners to ski? Keep it public, and perhaps do as Kirkwood does/did, and limit the number of skiers/boarders each day. Cutting out the public in favor of private homeowners seems to me to be even more limiting. How long will those homeowners continue to pay for the privilege of having a "private ski area" and the maintenance involved? What's to stop the new homeowners from traveling the short distance to the more challenging slopes and ignoring the hill in their backyard that doesn't promise the same exhilaration?

Why would the marina remain public? Why would the cafe not be public? Is Highway 89 through Homewood going to become a toll road, since it's passing through "private property"? I think someone has decided that the West Shore is theirs, and they are very mistaken. They are certainly welcome to be a part of the West is Best Shore, but privatizing the ski resort isn't the right path.

My family has had a small home in Tahoma since 1951; we've seen a LOT of changes. We don't agree with a lot of them, and have just learned to get along. I would vote against this proposal, but would remain open to hearing what else they have to say. Being a homeowner in the area, there are a lot of entities who claim to have a right to tell us how to maintain our home, so I would point out that I feel the same about this proposal (i.e.. not having the right to tell JMA what they can and cannot do with their property)'; as long as all property owners are treated fairly and equally.

Thank you.

It's always interesting how the "original" developers' publicized plans often morph/mutate privately. That's the reason for ongoing public hearings.

I think you know how I feel. I'm sure the "wealthy elite" would love their own private ski resort.

One former consultant to JMA told me that small ski areas like HMR don't financially "pencil out", and that the real estate is more valuable as a private development with an "amenity" like a ski resort.

The model for this is the Yellowstone Club in Montana. JMA is using their marketing consultant. You can Google Yellowstone Club and see how HMR could look.

Ed

Don,
Thanks for sending your note about Homewood changes.

As a part-time resident, it appears that I (and my family) would be apparently excluded from Homewood. I'm old enough that I'm not sure I care. But it would certainly diminish my overall satisfaction with Homewood. I'd like to be able to ski there, even if I'm finding I'm doing so less over time.

I supported the Homewood put forward some years ago. They do need to be able to make a reasonable profit from the business of skiing. And they do need to upgrade the slope and the amenities to do that. Certainly better than closing the resort. That said, with this new plan, they're proposing to close the resort, at least to people like me. So I'll have to deal with the downsides of having this destination in our midst. But I won't get any of the benefit.

Also, given the enormous space they occupy on the West Shore, I. believe it's asking a lot to make the whole area private, excluding many/most people who live, drive and pay taxes in the area.

Thanks.

—

Patrick Twohy

Thanks don, i read it the same way. billionaires don't want to hang out with us regular people. just another local resource being take away from regular people and given to the rich who are rarely ever here to use them anyway.

and it's clear from the last statement in the article that if local HOA's have access at the beginning it will be taken away whenever they choose to make it completely private. i just hope they go bankrupt and lose control of the place.

respectfully,
daniel flesner

Mr Lambert,

I just wanted to respond to your message about the changes at Homewood. I am certainly opposed to what JMA wants to do. Aside from shutting out locals and property owners who've been in the area for decades, it is also likely to fail and lead to the hill closing. Fundamentally, if people won't pay \$60-\$100 to get on the hill, I have a hard time imagining they'll pay \$3-4million. After sinking many millions into luxury "improvements" when they can't recoup those expenditures through home sales, the whole enterprise will likely fail. It would be better to direct those funds to improving the experience for normal visitors, and expanding terrain to be more competitive with other resorts. Also, if they're worried about low attendance, the current pricing strategy seems bizarre. Tickets are mostly cheap, but are extremely expensive on holiday weekends. That keeps crowding low, which is nice, but if they are genuinely concerned about low visitation, they can't be charging more for tickets than Palisades (as happened at least one weekend this winter).

My one additional concern is that they said some HOAs would be included such that their members could purchase passes. I am hoping TCPOA is in discussions with JMA to be one of those HOAs so that members will still have access to the mountain. Is that the case? Is that planned?

Thank you for taking on this issue,

-Tevis Nichols (7219 10th Ave, Tahoma)

Good Morning Don: Homewood has been open to the public for longer than I can remember, and it should stay that way. Locals should be able to ski close to home and not have to deal with

the traffic (and add to it) to go into the bigger resorts. Personally I don't think the "rich and famous" would like to ski on a smaller ski area anyway if they are serious skiers.

Thanks for jumping on this.

Jean Gray

Hi,

I can support the proposed changes at Homewood, I understand the struggles they are having to stay solvent. I would like to have local access to Homewood if it could be affordable for us local homeowners. I anticipate having grandkids in the next few years and think it would be fun to have access to Homewood to teach them to ski. I have and plan to continue with my EPIC pass, so I primarily ski at Heavenly and Northstar. But if I could get a reasonably priced family pass at Homewood I would buy it for my kids and their partners and the kids they are talking about having.

I hope that is the kind of feedback that is helpful.

Regards,

Sue Nutter

7302 7th Avenue

The owners of a business are entitled to do as they see fit for the benefit of the business and it's owners. I'm sure you're going to hear mostly from people who think this is some sort of crime against skier humanity, so thought I would chime in with the opposite view. And maybe more importantly, how often has Homewood actually done/completed any of the plans they have talked about? 😊

Since you asked....

One other thought: as the responses come in and you develop the consensus position (which sounds like has emerged), I'd suggest that not only opposing this latest turn of events, but try and develop a position going forward. In other words not just oppose but recognize some of JMA's positions and try to find some common ground. It's not all about the traffic bottleneck. I have friends in Tahoe City who "loved" Homewood but says the lack of investment and maintenance has turned the place into a dump. Years ago when I lived in Granite Bay we would drive to Homewood, passing Palisades... so I know it's not all about the traffic.

Hi Don,

It seems there was some sort of scheme to build a condo resort at Homewood around ten or fifteen years ago. I wrote some letters opposing that proposal. Let me dig into this new proposal and I'll write something perhaps you can use. Also, do you know if *Sierra Watch* is aware of this issue? They were instrumental in keeping the Martis Valley development at bay with their "Keep Squaw True" work.

Best wishes,

Clark Taylor

Ed
Hi Don,

This whole deal reeks of sleaze.....JMA set this up....I'm disgusted with them and Placer County Sups who are in the pocket....they have owned Homewood for years and deliberately let it fall behind every other ski area. No wonder they have a decline in business. Blaming it on the mouse hole is insulting. They have let the resort fall apart. Even if TCPOA were included in their "club", I don't care. We are watching the destruction of our "local" economy which matters more to me than my personal "privileges" as an owner and resident. Count me as a HELL NO to this rubbish!!!!

Regards,
Dave Smith
Hi Don,

I sent this to Moonshine Ink a couple days ago.

Gary

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Gary Gutowsky <gary.gutowsky@gmail.com>
Date: April 1, 2022 at 12:12:18 PM PDT
To: Alex Hoeft <alex@moonshineink.com>
Subject: Re: Homewood Switches Gears

Hi Alex,

Yes, please feel free to include my response in your April edition.

Gary

On Apr 1, 2022, at 10:55 AM, Alex Hoeft <alex@moonshineink.com> wrote:

Hi Gary, thank you so much for reaching out. I wonder if we might include your response in our April edition's Readers Reflect section. We'd include your words, name, and place of residence. Let me know if you're okay with that!

Thanks,

Alex Hoeft | Moonshine Ink

News Reporter
Phone (530) 587-3607 x10
Cell (702) 595-7259
alex@moonshineink.com
moonshineink.com

The Independent Newspaper for Truckee/North Lake Tahoe
#KeepTahoeSmart

If you find value in quality local news, and if you believe that our democracy needs fortifying, [please become a member of Moonshine Ink.](#)

On Thu, Mar 31, 2022 at 8:07 PM Gary Gutowsky <gary.gutowsky@gmail.com> wrote:
I read the article by Melissa Siig regarding the future of Homewood Mountain Resort and have a few comments/observations.

Homewood management states that “commuter” skiers have difficult time getting there due to traffic issues on Hwy 89. Commuters don’t ski at Homewood; it’s too far out of the way for a day trip. They ski at Sugar Bowl, Boreal, Tahoe-Donner, and Sierra at Tahoe (when it’s open). Also maybe, Palisades and Northstar. Homewood caters primarily to locals and those staying on the West Shore.

Our family has had a cabin in Tahoma since 1976 and we all love skiing at Homewood. However, Homewood has lost business because of slow chair lifts, old/outdated infrastructure, and low technology. In other words, it’s their own doing.

This plan will have a big impact on winter tourism on the west shore and many local businesses will suffer because of it.

Respectfully,
Gary M. Gutowsky
Roseville, CA

This is a terrible money hungry elitist idea and it’s not for Tahoe.

Sent from my iPad

I had heard recently from a friend that Homewood was going private, and I was worried about it. Then I read this article, and was at least hopeful that Tahoe Cedars was one of the larger (if not largest) west shore HOA and that because of this we’d still be able to ski there. I have a young child and another on the way and Homewood was a big reason I bought a house in Tahoma. I realize that if you’re not in one of the big west shore HOAs, it would be a bummer to get excluded. But it’s better than Homewood being fully private or completely shutting down. As a representatives of our HOA, I hope the board will come to the table with the owners of Homewood with an open mind and do what you can to ensure that we all can continue to ski there.

Thanks for asking for feedback.

-Damien

Don,

I will follow up later and attempt to elaborate on my opposition to this plan, however in the interest of replying quickly, my family and I would be very sad to see this happen. In some ways it would probably be good for the area, but the loss of public access would be I think tragic. Thanks for sharing the information.

Rich

Sent from my iPad
Richard K. Schaefer
7140 Sixth Ave.
707-299-8514

My feeling, or question is; is TCPOA part of the rich and famous? Are we an association they are going to offer memberships to? I am guessing they haven't reached out based on this email.

- Brandon

Hi Don,

My husband and I saw that article a few weeks ago and were very saddened about this new change. We purchased our home in Tahoma a few years ago and while it is a second home for us we have spent every weekend and vacation we can there. This is our 2nd year of being season pass holders at Homewood and it is a very special place for us. Our boys now 4 and 7 have learned to ski there and we hope we will have many more years skiing there as a family in the future. Attached is a picture from a few weeks ago. Please let me know if there is anything else I can do. Thank you.

Ann Mock

Hello Don –

My sons and I own a house in Tahoma and we value the Homewood ski area as a family skiing destination – close to our home.

How best can we register our resistance to the plan to privatize the mountain and exclude local residents?

Tell us how we can be helpful in combatting this terrible idea.

Best,

Mary

Mary R. Trudel

166 East 61st Street

Apt 20E

New York, NY 10065

Don,

It would be really sad if Homewood was not available to people that live right here in Tahoma. Please let us know anything we can do to help ensure that this is a place we can all ski.

Thank you,

Garth Bradley

I assume they have not called or sat down and said that our HOA will be one of the ones allowed to buy passes?!

Thanks so much for sending this out as whatever happens to Homewood will have a HUGE effect on West Shore life.

As both of my license plates say HOMWUD, I have supported & hope that they are successful as a Tahoe business.

That being said, this new plan is entirely different from the old plan. I think it could be successfully argued that it was bad faith bargaining in 2011, when all the locals agreed to the General Plan.

At the very least, there needs to be new discussions. As a past president of a firefighters union, I always began talks with shaking hand and hoping for mutual positive agreement. If JMA only want the l%ers to enjoy the West Shore...then I say,
"damn the torpedoes
full speed ahead!"

I'm willing to help in any way I can, including going and beginning discussions with them.
I'm sure the Yellowstone Club and JMA are looking for some positive press, perhaps we could lock them into TCPOA being one of the HOAs allowed.

Please let me know if there's anything I can do to help.

Doug Estill
650-302-3127

Don,

Thanks for the email.

The article mentioned they'd make "some homeowners associations eligible" - ours should be one of them. We have sustained the resort since it opened, has our community not? Seems crazy for them to dismiss that, but I could see them only honoring associations in Homewood. And I'm sure Chamberlands will want in as well.

Bottom line - we should advocate to be one of the chosen associations. And, incidentally, it would certainly get more Tahoma property owners to join the association eh!

Good luck fighting the good fight & keep the community updated as discussions evolve...

Totally unacceptable! As a former lobbyist in Sacramento for 27 years, this is what we call a classic "gut and amend" agreement. They got the agreement for the new development based on the plan presented and many on the west shore supported it. Now, without and community involvement they make a serious pivot away from what the area supported. I get the premise that business is down, but there has been little investment to lure skiers to the mountain. The Ellis chair has been down, too many times West Shore cafe has been closed and JMA bears some responsibility for what appears to be a poor business plan. One last point... The article states they will bring in a small "grocery store", then what happens to the Tahoma Market which clearly struggles to make a go of it? Suggest the board take a hard look at this issue.

Ed Bedwell

Don -

I work at Homewood and actually just sat through a meeting on this topic yesterday. There is so much unknown at this point that it's sort of ridiculous to be speculating.

What I do know...

1. Homewood is not sustainable under the current operating system. We simply aren't bringing enough revenue.
2. Homewood has not been sold... They've simply brought on and merged with two investors namely Discovery group and Yellowstone group. This will provide the necessary capital investment to upgrade things that sorely need upgrading at Homewood...infrastructure, the lodge, the lifts, the bathrooms, etc. The first visible change may be the 7 condos they plan to start building in Lot 5, the gravel one near the base of Madden Chair. But also remember, they've been talking about changes for over ten years now!
3. There are no plans to make it exclusively private. Yellowstone group owns 22 ski resorts around the country/world and only one is completely private. Homewood most likely will eventually transition to some sort of "hybrid model".
4. Season passes have already been sold for next year and there will be no changes in them for next year and possibly/probably even the year after.

5. There's been a lot of rumors about the HOA aspect of it all. There is no actual confirmed talk of any of that. It may be, much like Diamond Peak already does, that there will simply be some season passes reserved for certain HOAs at a set rate.

Just my two cents worth... I'm sure the Marketing Dept at Homewood would be happy to talk to you about this more. Give them a call or stop by...

Donna Langenderfer

That stinks! One of the reasons that we bought our cabin in Tahoma was to be AWAY from the snotty rich people!!!

I'm middle class and want to be treated with respect. I respect and appreciate where I live/have home. I don't want to be treated as the worker bees. (I do respect them as well!)

Don,

Your interpretation is correct. This is the beginning phase of a private exclusive operation at Homewood. I think TCPOA should oppose the construction of private residences intended to usurp local skiers there. Any HOA offer should make facilities available to all for day tickets, not only season passes. It should also be clear that if this development does not gain local support, programs to house employees at the private operation will not be supported.

Bottom line: this type of development will be detrimental to our Tahoma community, produce additional traffic and other resource impacts, and our HOA is opposed to it.

John W Foster

7153 10th Av

Seems odd to try and improve a business by pushing away a segment of their customers.

Robert

Hi Don,

Yes I am concerned about this turn of events as well. In reading the article I was under the impression that the owners are going to give a last ditch effort to keeping the ski area public by relying on the local folks to buy ski passes. Since as of yet according to them this has not happened I think they will go to their final "sustainable plan" and make it private.

This takes away a local ski area giving the locals here the opportunity to compete with everyone else at the larger resorts if we wish to ski.

For me I suspect I just won't ski anymore.

I will hate to see this happen. Additionally this privatization along with the wealthy only homes will continue to erode the quiet West Shore communities with wealthy entitled people that think we are here to serve them.

Whatever we can go to stop this plan we should do it

John Poppe

7102 7th Ave

Don,

They are going to do what they want to do. As a property owner and a TCPOA member I want to be able to purchase lift tickets for myself and family members after this proposal takes effect.

Make it a great day,

Daniel O'Connell

Hi Don Have you heard that they would exclude Tahoe Ceaders?

Keith Bauer

925-209-5632

I would hope that if they decide to limit to only season passes that they would allow anyone that wants to buy a season pass. Correct? Why would they limit themselves to further revenue and or why just homeowners?

--

Keith A. Bauer

925-209-5632

Don:

I don't like this idea as where would we on W. Shore go to ski ? It has always been close and small scale , not like Squaw & Heavenly, which I prefer . Please let me know when you have the summer bands scheduled too.
Thanks - beth

Sent from my iPhone

Thanks for this heads up. I personally don't think the falling attendance has as much to do with traffic as it has to do with the run down nature of the lodges and constantly failing chair lifts. I know a ton of people that used to be regular skiers there who hardly ever ski there now because they are skeptical that JMA is ever going to actually upgrade the place and until they do they don't want to ski there with no lodge at the Quail lift and a badly outdated lodge at the Madden lift. It's become a running joke; "I hear this is the year that they'll actually start making the place nice again!" Nobody believes it and that's led to a sour taste overall that's visible in the attendance.

I understand the financial aspects of this situation and how the falling attendance impacts things but I do think it's a bit of a chicken versus egg thing. They let the place get rundown and thus the attendance has fallen not the inverse.

Curious, is the TCPOA one of the property associations that would retain the ability to buy season passes? My family has been season pass holders for every year for the past 14 years except one when we had to travel a lot one year.

Chad Follmer

7109 10th.

Not How can they take this away from the west side renters and home owners who have loved skiing at Tahoe ski bowl and home wood for years. My kids grew up learning how to ski there! This is so unfair to all who live on the west shore

Sent from my iPhone

Don, not a good thing but with low attendance, lack of snow, and too many people and traffic it's not what it used to be, unfortunately. Some sort of comprised hopefully will be work out so the West Shore still can enjoy the resort without overpaying...times are changing.

Terry Keenan

From: dcopenhagen@comcast.net <dcopenhagen@comcast.net>
Sent: 1/8/2023 2:57:15 PM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>; Julie Regan <jregan@trpa.gov>
Cc: Shawn <copenhagen@comcast.net>;
Subject: Homewood Privatization Concerns

Hi Paul and Julie -

I am reaching out to express concerns about the latest Homewood Mountain Resort private development, which I understand may be coming up for additional discussions within TRPA this week.

There has been very little information the past few years about what is occurring at Homewood, but from what we are learning recently, it seems there is new ownership and substantial changes to the development plans that were originally approved. The largest change I am aware of is the intent of new HMR owners to fully privatize the mountain and surrounding area by creating a luxury "membership only" resort, eliminating access for most west shore homeowners and locals. This runs counter to the detail and spirit of the original project plan (per summary document dated August 2011). My family and I have been homeowners in Rubicon Bay for 62 years and lifelong skiers at Homewood, and we would surely be part of the local homeowners excluded. I wonder about other changes that are being contemplated and are out-of-sight to west shore locals and to the public at large?

Given the new development plans are significantly different than what was previously approved, it seems appropriate that additional public engagement and TRPA review is warranted before any further development proceeds. This should include further/new review of environmental, economic and community impacts.

I am happy to discuss further; or submit formal public comments if appropriate.

Thanks
Dan Copenhagen
8637 Rubicon Drive
925-683-1899

From: Tim Angst <timangst@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: 1/8/2023 10:22:59 AM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Subject: Homewood Privatization Development

Paul, I am a home owner on the west shore of Lake Tahoe - in Homewood, and it is my understanding that you are TRPA's Special Project Manager aligned with the proposed Homewood Privatization Development. This being the case, I wanted to share concerns regarding this development, specifically that there has been little to no public awareness of the scope and impact of this development and thus it warrants comprehensive review and public engagement.

Given the new development plans are significantly different than what was previously approved, there are a range of topics that should be considered/reviewed.

- Environmental impact of new architecture design
- Economic impact to the west shore of privatizing the resort and eliminating public access to one of the major west shore marinas
- Alignment of the Homewood Privatization with long term west shore development plans
- Eliminating local access to the Homewood Ski Resort (something that has long been viewed as a shared community asset)

If it would help in any way, I would be happy to discuss this topic with you.

- Tim

Tim Angst

415-244-8252

timangst@sbcglobal.net

From: Patrick Dodson <patrick.dodson@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: 1/8/2023 8:07:09 AM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Subject: Homewood Privatization

Dear Mr. Neilsen:

I am writing to express my opposition to the plan to further expand and privatize Homewood Ski resort.

A high-end, private resort does not fit into, or enhance the West Shore area. The proposal for high density housing will change the nature of the neighborhood that drew current residents to the West Shore. The increased traffic and development will harm the local environment and negatively impact current residents.

I understand the business realities of running a ski resort, however many of the financial issues suffered by Homewood have been self-imposed. The lift tickets are priced at a premium compared to to nearby resorts which offer significantly more terrain and amenities. Homewood is a very desirable ski area; all it requires to be successful is good ski management that will make targeted improvements, market itself, and price itself realistically.

The concept of a high-end, private resort on the West Shore is dubious at best. We aren't Montana with a guaranteed snowfall and clientele that a will jet in from the east coast. If Homewood is privatized and the resource is taken off the market it will likely never return. This will force residents and visitors to travel to neighboring resorts, adding to our already congested roadways.

I am a strong supporter of private property rights, and respect Mr. Chapmans desires to further develop and enhance his investment. However, when his desires negatively impact the lives of current residents and visitors they must be stopped. I strongly urge TRPA to deny his development plans.

Sincerely,
Patrick and Linda Dodson
6335 Chamberland
Homewood, CA

From: Allie Crichton <allie.crichton@gmail.com>
Sent: 1/8/2023 10:51:57 PM
To: John Marshall <jmarshall@trpa.gov>; Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>; Julie Regan <jregan@trpa.gov>
Subject: Homewood Project

Good Evening,

This email is to voice my objection to the bait and switch tactics employed by JMA Ventures in their decade plus quest to redevelop the Homewood Ski Resort, West Shore Cafe, and Homewood High and Dry Marina.

It appears that what was approved by TRPA is not what is actually going to happen and the result will be a detriment to our community. Our family, along with most of the west shore community, has been enjoying Homewood Ski Resort for many years, and to say it would be a shame to not allow our community access to the resort would be a major understatement.

The original project was supposed to bring benefits to the community and be open to the public. If JMA has changed its plans, they should be required to go before the TRPA again and anyone else that needs to approve changes. We ask that you reconsider these changes and remember that there is an entire community that you are serving.

Thank you,
Allie Crichton

From: Anthony's Pool Service <info@anthonyspoolservice.com>
Sent: 1/8/2023 4:50:45 PM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>; John Marshall <jmarshall@trpa.gov>; jregen@trpa.gov <jregen@trpa.gov>
Subject: Homewood Project

If this plan moves forward please continue to allow access for locals and non members. I have been skiing at Homewood forever and want my kids to have the same opportunity and experience. Also if they privatize the marina there will only be one public marina on the West Shore which will not adequately handle all the volume. Our quality of life will be adversely affected. Thanks for your consideration.

Pete Uehlin
7091 Ninth Ave. Tahoma.

From: the hideout <thehideoutlaketahoe@gmail.com>
Sent: 1/8/2023 11:28:36 PM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Subject: Homewood resort - do not approve privatization

Hello Paul,

My family and I (along with the rest of the Lake Tahoe community) are very concerned with the latest proposal we're hearing that would make homewood resort private and not accessible to the local skiing community.

The TRPA originally voted on and approved a very different project over 10 years ago. This seems like a classic bait and switch - where the project was approved as a CEP - community enhancement project - and now they're proposing to make it a private resort, where there is no community benefit or value at all. How does a private resort benefit our community or fall into the requirements of a CEP? How can a huge change like this get made via a private closed door meeting without any community input? Where is the accountability from the TRPA to complete environmental / fire analysis?

The TRPA has the authority to do this the right way instead of letting a company pull a bait and switch which only benefits them and creates a ton of issues for the community.

Thank you for reading my email.

Lily Woods

From: Patti Doherty <pattidoherty1@comcast.net>
Sent: 1/8/2023 1:29:30 PM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Subject: Homewood resort

Hello,

My family and I have been long time Tahoma homeowners. We have spent easily 40 years coming to the West Shore to enjoy everything that it has to offer. My children learned to ski at the Homewood Ski Resort; so family friendly. I would argue that it has the most beautiful view of Lake Tahoe better than any other ski resort surrounding the Lake. It was a great place for family to gather and appreciate such splendor. But now however, the new development that is proposed to “privatize” the mountain means that families like mine will never be able to experience this beautiful mountain. We will be unwelcomed and turned away. Is it in the best interest of anyone to deny access to Homewood resort so that a few privileged skiers can call it their own? Where is the benefit to the community surrounding it? It is too big a resource to limit it access to a precious few who can pay its exorbitant price.

The resort has fallen into disrepair over the last years. It has virtually been abandoned by the owners who have done the bare minimum to maintain its operations and have done nothing to update or implement any improvements to make the resort a place you would want to come to. The current problems they are experiencing is of their own doing. Or in this case their lack of doing.

Don't let Homewood put out the Not Welcome to sign to our community. Keep it available to all.

Thank you for reading this,

Patti Doherty

From: Heather Rantz <tahoeheather@hotmail.com>
Sent: 1/8/2023 9:24:40 PM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>; John Marshall <jmarshall@trpa.gov>; Julie Regan <jregan@trpa.gov>
Subject: Homewood revised development plan

Hi there. I believe there will be some meetings this week concerning the revised development plans for Homewood Ski Area, and I would like to be added to the list for more information and public meeting dates. I had a great ski afternoon today at Homewood, as I have for many years, and I hope that we can continue to use our local ski area. I'm a full time resident in rubicon bay for 23 years, my husband has worked for Homewood for many years and held various high level management positions there, and my kids learned to ski there and still regularly ski there when they aren't training as hopefuls for the US ski team. I was a strong supporter of Jma's original development plan. It was a good design, well thought out and would have been a great asset to the community. Today for the first time, I saw the Discovery group's new plan and honestly, I feel sick. While TRPA might feel that this is a scaled back version of the original project and thus better for the environment, it is anything but. There will certainly be lots more traffic on the west shore and Tahoe city if we all have to drive to palisades Tahoe to ski. While I understand that the property is privately held, the plan your agency approved was not a private development that excluded public access. Taking away a major recreation area from the full time residents and visitors to the west shore will be devastating to our community and our property values and it simply isn't "right". It is quite obvious that it is their plan to make this completely private and eliminate this as a recreation area for residents by either not selling season passes at all or making the cost so outrageously priced that normal people won't be able to access it. I know development needs to happen here, it's falling down, but keeping the public off these slopes we've used for years shouldn't be part of their new plan. Their project, the Yellowstone Club is the model for this project. Yellowstone club employees are not even allowed to ski there. At least with that project they built something new and didn't take away recreation from people who already used the facilities. Jma had good intentions at least, although they ran the place into the ground intentionally as their tax write off and then couldn't sell the development plans, and now claim there is no other use for the property. False. We love Homewood, I am sickened at the thought of not skiing there next year. Look at Palisades and the overwhelming demand for recreation there, we need more skiing in Tahoe, not less! Thank you for reading my message and please help find middle ground on this project. Our property values and our happiness are counting on you! Thank you, Heather Rantz.

Heather Rantz
530.680.5816

Sent from my iPhone

From: John Botto IV <jvbotto@hotmail.com>
Sent: 1/8/2023 7:51:46 PM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Subject: Homewood

Paul,

As a resident of Tahoma and the Tahoe Cedars HOA. I would like to express my concern for Homewood going private. I am Pilot for Careflight in truckee and am just starting my family. I look forward to teaching my kids to ski at Homewood in the future. I just want to give them the opportunity to do so.

Regards
John Botto

Sent from my iPhone

From: Brad Erger <braderger@gmail.com>
Sent: 1/8/2023 10:22:18 PM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Cc: John Marshall <jmarshall@trpa.gov>; Julie Regan <jregan@trpa.gov>;
Subject: Homewood/JMA Project

Good evening Mr. Nielsen,

This email is to voice my objection to the bait and switch tactics employed by JMA Ventures in their decade plus quest to redevelop the Homewood Ski Resort, West Shore Cafe, and Homewood High and Dry Marina. It is my understanding that over the course of the public approval process for this development, JMA represented the project as something that would enhance the west shore community. New homes, new restaurants, and new retail were all proposed and I believe, generally well received by the community. Now that JMA has let the ski resort infrastructure deteriorate to the point that they struggle to attract the crowds necessary to operate in the black, they have decided to scrap the proposal as presented to various government entities, including TRPA and cater to only the richest of the rich. I believe that, should TRPA and the various governing bodies wish to allow JMA to proceed with this project, there has been a material change to the project such that they should essentially start the public processes over from the beginning. At minimum, an environmental assessment must take place to ensure that the change in the project does not negatively impact the environment, including our beloved lake.

Thank you for your consideration. I, along with many others in the community feel JMA misled the public as well as numerous public entities such as yourself. Please hold them accountable and ensure that they are forthright with their plans to redevelop these facilities, and enable the public to provide their input on a development that will no doubt change the west shore.

Best regards,

Brad Erger
braderger@gmail.com

From: Erika Veidis <erikamagone@gmail.com>
Sent: 1/8/2023 11:01:23 PM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>; John Marshall <jmarshall@trpa.gov>; Julie Regan <jregan@trpa.gov>
Subject: Letter concerning Homewood development

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

From: Kathleen M Eisenhardt <kme@stanford.edu>
Sent: 1/8/2023 8:55:21 AM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Subject: Please No on oHomewood Conversion

Paul,

I am writing to urge you and TRPA broadly to reject the proposed development and privatization of Homewood. These plans fly in the face of public interest use of the land, and conservation concerns.

I completely agree with the Waal's letter below. In particular, Homewood was a very popular resort. It was priced in the reach of many, thus serving public interest, and attracting local people, thus reducing traffic impact. It was an ideal complement to the larger Tahoe resorts like Alpine/Squaw and Northstar.

Unfortunately, the current ownership :

1. has not maintained the lifts (e.g., they often break - especially the Ellis chair - forcing people to sit for hours in the cold),
2. has priced too high, way out of what makes sense, especially given the mountain
3. has gutted the ski school and other services

Why would anyone ski at Homewood today?

Attendance is declining because the ownership has managed poorly, not because of bogus claims like traffic. An exclusive resort is unlikely to save Homewood as a financial proposition, and instead restrict public use. It seems that the owners should sell to real ski area operators.

Thanks for your consideration.

Kathleen Eisenhardt
6400 Chamberland
Homewood

WAAL LETTER TO YOU - I AGREE COMPLETELY WITH IT

Art Chapman purchased Homewood and has since run it into the ground. He hasn't put any money into it and says that he can't afford to because he can't attract the skiers. At \$279 for a day of skiing, Homewood is the most expensive place to ski in the USA and his pricing model is ridiculous for the category of mountain Homewood is. Please read what this article says about Homewood from someone who is not a local and is looking at resorts on a national basis [These Are the 10 Highest Ski Resort Lift Ticket Prices In North America This Winter - PeakRankings](#)

Mr. Chapman has gradually been increasing the price of tickets, and in doing so, has tanked his attendance. It used to be one of the more affordable options and was always packed. When he purchased Homewood he did his cost analysis for the resort and I'm sure he's smart enough to have purchased it so he can make a profit from the operations at lift prices Homewood had at the time.

About 30 years ago (approximately) Tahoe Ski Bowl (TSB) tried to go private by having it be a timeshare. That effort failed miserably and Homewood wound up buying TSB. The same dynamics are in place today.

The question we're having a difficult time answering is: What benefit is his plan to the West Shore and to Lake Tahoe? It now forces everyone on the West Shore to go to Palisades or Alpine. That takes away a nearby family-friendly resort and increases traffic, pollution and congestion. Reducing traffic, pollution and congestion are key initiatives for Lake Tahoe.

Art Chapman is a real estate developer - that's how he makes his money - not running a ski resort. His plan from the very beginning has been to develop this and now he also wants to take it private.

We urge you and the rest of TRPA to reject plans of privatization and also the proposed development. The West Shore is the sleepy side of the lake and nothing is wrong with that. We do not need another high-end development that will be dormant by its residents. Look at Fleur-du-Lac and the condos at Chamberlands. Two high-end condo developments that are barely used by the owners. Let's not make this mistake - again.

Best regards,

David and Laura Waal
420 Grouse Drive
Homewood, CA

From: Teresa McNamara <teresadmac@aol.com>
Sent: 1/8/2023 7:30:34 PM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Subject: Privatization of Homewood Ski Area

Paul Nielsen, Special Projects Manager - TRPA and TRPA Committee Members,

As a longtime (30 years) home owner in Homewood, skier, Homewood Season Pass Holder, and full time resident of Homewood, I am deeply concerned with and opposed to JMA Ventures Homewood Mountain Resorts plans to privatize the Homewood Ski Area.

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

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

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

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

Thank you,

Teresa McNamara

Sent from my iPhone

From: Michael Sickle <msickle@me.com>
Sent: 1/8/2023 9:25:13 AM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Subject: Privatization of homewood

we as members of the Homewood neighborhood, do not want a private club preventing our access to Homewood.

Sent from my iPhone

From: Cathy Bean <cathybean1@gmail.com>
Sent: 1/8/2023 1:31:45 PM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Subject: Privatization of the Homewood Mountain Resort

Privatization of the Homewood Mountain Resort



Dear Mr. Nielsen,

Our family has owned the property at 5285 Sacramento Ave, Homewood, CA 96141, for over 60 years. In that time, we have remodeled our home 3 times in order to meet our changing family needs and we have been full time residents since our retirement in 2015.

The Homewood Mountain Resort, despite its need for significant upgrades, has been very important to our family over the years. As such, we are definitely opposed to the privatization we now know is being proposed. It not only will negate our opportunity to utilize the facility, but it will also go farther to disenfranchise the entire existing Homewood community. The JMA development has, from its inception, failed to uphold its initial commitments to the community, and the proposed privatization of the resort, which is on your agenda for consideration tomorrow, is just one more inappropriate approach to solving the economic challenges the project is working so hard to resolve. Also, this proposed privatization of the resort does not conform to the approved Master Plan, TRPA's CEP program requirements, nor the promises made in order to garner community support.

We urge you to seriously consider the compromise solution of making the Tahoe Ski Bowl area private and the North Base ski area open to the public. Although not a perfect solution, it is certainly more acceptable to those of us who have made our homes and raised our families here for so many years.

Thank you.

Don and Cathy Bean

From: Mark Swimmer <drswimmer@comcast.net>
Sent: 1/8/2023 11:31:28 AM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Subject: Privatization

Good morningPaul,

We have had a house in Tahoma for 29 years and have been pass holders at homewood every year. We know that many families stay on the west shore to ski and not contribute to the traffic jams on Hwy 89 towards The palisades. We hope that the plan for privatization make some concessions so that the locals that have been supporting and promoting Homewood mountain resort can join the "membership" somehow. Maybe some sort of country club buy in with monthly dues or some way to allow our families continued enjoyment and participation on the west shore.

Thank You,

Dr's Mark and Kristi Swimmer
7071 Gray Ave
Tahoma CA
925-216-0490

Sent from Marks iPhone

From: Rick Hoke <rickjanehoke@gmail.com>
Sent: 1/8/2023 8:24:16 AM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Subject: Privitization of Homewood

Paul.
Please consider the long term effects of this Rich and Elite project will have on the established West Shore residents and homeowners. This group has a proven track record of "working with the planning and zoning of an area", only to skirt around requirements and requests of the municipality that they are supposedly working with. (The Cabo development.) They seem to get what they want with all of the \$ doing the talking. Please consider the actions that this developer has already taken regarding the Homewood project, without approval of the appropriate agencies, or surrounding areas.
I feel this developer cannot be trusted with the future of this West Shore development.
Thank you,
Rick Hokanson

From: Linda Erger <renoergers@hotmail.com>
Sent: 1/8/2023 10:36:20 PM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>; jmarshall@trpa.goc <jmarshall@trpa.goc>; Julie Regan <jregan@trpa.gov>; Supervisororgustafson@placer.ca.gov <Supervisororgustafson@placer.ca.gov>
Subject: Re: "Community Enhancement Project" is Not What Homewood Will Be

Good Evening,

Our family has been enjoying Homewood Ski Resort for the past eight years. We have been following the rumors as well as the newspaper articles that have detailed the purchase of Homewood Ski Resort. Now it appears that what was approved by TRPA is not what is actually going to happen. Not allowing any local people to ski at the new resort, unless they are quite rich, is despicable.

The original project was supposed to bring benefits to the community and be open to the public. The public is not usually just the wealthy people. If JMA has changed its plans, shouldn't they be required to go before the TRPA again and anyone else that needs to approve changes? Why are they getting special treatment? Please reconsider these changes and remember that there is an entire community that you are serving.

Sincerely,
Linda Erger

From: William landis <billylandis3@icloud.com>
Sent: 1/8/2023 11:37:16 AM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Subject: Stop privatization

Please stop the privatization, my family has owned since 1918 on the West shore of Lake Tahoe and this would utterly change our small community in so many negative ways!
We cherish Lake Tahoe and have given so much to this community for over 100 years! Please put a stop to this!
Let alone the environmental impact that it will cause among many other negative impacts! Please look out for Tahoes best interest like you always have!

Thanks
Billy Landis
5308488497

Sent from my iPhone

From: nancy cunningham <nacattahoe@yahoo.com>
Sent: 1/9/2023 3:03:07 PM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Subject: Concern re. Homewood Mnt. privatization

To TRPA Board:

I am writing as a concerned local in the Homewood community. I am against the privatization of the Homewood Mountain Resort for several reasons. I will list just a few for your review.

- This is not in the interest of this community in which I have been a home owner since 1987. I am a full-time resident in Homewood and see this shift of the business model from public tickets to private membership as a direct take-away from community members. We understand that the plan is to offer a limited number of high priced memberships and eliminate day passes and general season passes to the public. With privatization, the local community will not only be impacted by negative environmental impacts of the development, but we will not have access to what once was a family oriented, day pass or season pass outdoor activity.

- The original plan was approved by TRPA as a Community Enhancement Project, intended to benefit the community and to be open to the public. The plan to privatize the resort, we understand, will target a small, elite clientele that will not be open to the public nor the local property owners and will not provide community benefits but serve to take away a community resource for outdoor family activities. All these changes are being made without a new, current environmental analysis.

- The negative environmental impact of the new plan has not been fully explored nor has the increase in water usage been recognized. Shifting from a small community resort to a privatized model may lead to placing profits above environmental concerns.

As a local Homewood resident and a long time member of the West Shore community, I hope you will recognize a responsibility to the residents of this community and revisit this plan that negatively impacts our neighborhood and removes a valuable asset from the property owners and tax payers of this Homewood.

Respectfully, Nancy A. Cunningham
Cell 415-350-1051 or Home 530-525-5813

From: Sara Rooker <srooker@its4logistics.com>
Sent: 1/9/2023 7:37:33 PM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>; Julie Regan <jregan@trpa.gov>; John Marshall <jmarshall@trpa.gov>
Subject: Concerned Citizen
Attachments: [its_logo_2016_200px_e8ea9bf2-7704-407f-90ef-fc4a1b3d7c3a.png](#), [ITS-Temp-Controlled-Badge_4310630e-a84f-4065-9613-bf693077eb4f.jpg](#)

Dear TRPA,

I am writing to you with concern regarding the privatization of Homewood Mountain Resort. There are several reasons I believe the privatized development is not in the best interest of the community.

1. Loss of benefit to the local community: Shifting the business model from public to private with the implication that the resort will only offer a limited number of lifetime ski memberships with the elimination of day passes and general season pass sales. Homewood is a community fixture that provides an opportunity for residents of the Tahoe basin to come together in both winter and summer months to recreate. With privatization, the local community will not only be impacted by the negative environmental impacts of development, but they will not have access to what was once a place to enhance the physical and mental wellbeing of the community.

2. Lack of transparency in a shift of plans: The original project that was approved by TRPA was approved as a Community Enhancement Project - a project intended to bring benefits to the community and be open to the public. This plan was projected to bring an estimated 16 million to 20 million in visitor spending to the local community. With the shift in plans to privatize the resort, and target a small, elite clientele, how will the new plan provide community benefits, and furthermore, how can these changes be made without a new environmental analysis?

3. Negative environmental impact: Adding the proposed infrastructure could cause significant environmental impacts, including the alteration of the natural landscape, increase in water usage and a threat to the clarity of Lake Tahoe. I fear that shifting from a community based resort to a privatized model will lead to a prioritization of profit over environmental stewardship.

As a west shore resident who cares deeply about their community, I urge you to re-examine and reconsider the privatization of Homewood.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Sara Rooker
Representative - Strategic Accounts



Direct: (775) 501-3607
Dept: (775) 501-3315
srooker@its4logistics.com



From: Jamie Hendrix <jamie.hendrix55@gmail.com>
Sent: 1/9/2023 1:56:23 PM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Subject: Concerned member of the west shore community

Dear TRPA,

I am writing to you with concern regarding the privatization of Homewood Mountain Resort. There are several reasons I believe the development is not in the best interest of the community.

1. Loss of benefit to the local community: Shifting the business model from public to private with the implication that the resort will only offer a limited number of lifetime ski memberships with the elimination of day passes and general season pass sales. Homewood is a community fixture that provides an opportunity for residents of the Tahoe basin to come together in both winter and summer months to recreate. With privatization, the local community will not only be impacted by the negative environmental impacts of development, but they will not have access to what was once a place to enhance the physical and mental wellbeing of the community.

2. Lack of transparency in a shift of plans: The original project that was approved by TRPA was approved as a Community Enhancement Project - a project intended to bring benefits to the community and be open to the public. This plan was projected to bring an estimated 16 million to 20 million in visitor spending to the local community. With the shift in plans to privatize the resort, and target a small, elite clientele, how will the new plan provide community benefits, and furthermore, how can these changes be made without a new environmental analysis?

3. Negative environmental impact: Adding the proposed infrastructure could cause significant environmental impacts, including the alteration of the natural landscape, increase in water usage and a threat to the clarity of Lake Tahoe. I fear that shifting from a community based resort to a privatized model will lead to a prioritization of profit over environmental stewardship.

As a west shore resident who cares deeply about their community, I urge you to consider these negative impacts and reject the proposal for the privatization of Homewood.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,
Jamie Hendrix

From: heather Gover <heathergover12@gmail.com>

Date: Monday, January 9, 2023 at 12:07 AM

To: Julie Regan <jregan@trpa.gov>

Subject: Do not approve homewood's new project

Hi Julie,

Privatizing homewood resort was not mentioned in the original environmental documents and was not a part of the approval process. How is it possible that the TRPA may approve this totally new project before completing the necessary steps and due diligence?

I just saw on the news the other day that it cost more to buy a daily pass to ski at homewood than any other ski resort in the country! They claim they don't sell very many passes and can't compete with bigger ski resorts in the area, but yet they charge the most expensive lift price - it doesn't make sense. They're clearly trying to purposely keep daily ticket sales down (and have been for a few years now) in an effort to back up their claims about slowing ticket sales to get their new project approved. New analysis along with environmental, economic and traffic studies should be done before this updated project is approved.

Please consider the opinions and feedback of the local community before approving this project.

Thank you,
Heather

From: Monica Evans <monicaevans444@gmail.com>

Date: Sunday, January 8, 2023 at 11:12 PM

To: Julie Regan <jregan@trpa.gov>

Subject: Homewood project

Dear Ms. Regan-

I'm writing in hopes that you will reconsider the approval for JMA Ventures plans to make Homewood private.

From my understanding, a big part of how the original project got approved was their commitment to the local community. It was listed as a CEP, community enhancement project. I don't see how a private resort falls under those guidelines and feel strongly that it should be revoked.

Making Homewood private would devastate our community, taking away the most beautiful local resort and making it accessible to a very elite few that can afford such prices.

I worked for JMA for 11 years and they do not care about the local community, but only profits. They priced season passes in such a way that it didn't make sense for most people to purchase a Homewood pass, versus the combo passes other bigger mountains made available, and now they are using their lack of sales as grounds for shutting out the local community.

The purchasing of West Shore Cafe and the marina in retrospect all seem like a very calculated business move to make Homewood private while lying to us the entire time by saying they wanted to improve the West Shore.

A company with their vast holdings doesn't care about short term losses, as long as they can make a profit in the long run and that is exactly what is happening if this project is allowed.

I really hope their sneaky behavior is not rewarded and you will revoke the approval of the project. Homewood is a local Tahoe gem, not an exclusive resort that only billionaires should be allowed to enjoy.

Thank you for taking the time to hear my voice. I have been a resident and home owner in Tahoma for 25 years. The west shore is special, please don't let that be taken away.

Sincerely,

Monica Evans

From: Jeff Cowen <jcowen@trpa.gov>
Sent: 1/9/2023 1:51:41 PM
To: Ann Nichols <preserve@ntpac.org>
Cc: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>;
Subject: FW: Homewood Ski Resort Privatization Shell Game

Hi Ann,
I am helping respond to comments we are receiving about Homewood. Unfortunately, your email (I asked Bill Rozak to share the email with me) claims there is a meeting today and the public is being kept out. This is false and I'd like you to consider sending a follow up email correcting this.
Wherever you got the information that TRPA is having a public meeting on this today was incorrect and it makes interested community members feel they have nothing to say or do that can help inform our process.
TRPA has a process that decisions like this need to follow and keeping the public informed and in open dialogue is very important to us. As soon as we know what our process and timeframe on the Homewood proposal looks like, we will share that with you, the public, and the folks who have reached out to us.
Thank you,

Jeff Cowen (he/his)
Public Information Officer
775.589.5278

From: Ann Nichols <preserve@ntpac.org>
Sent: Sunday, January 8, 2023 10:35 AM
To: Bill Rozak <brozak@tahoedailytribune.com>
Subject: Homewood Ski Resort Privatization Shell Game

External Email. Caution.

View this email in your browser (<https://mailchi.mp/ddfa98c73a1d/homewood-ski-resort-privatization-shell-game?e=fb36681e9c>)
<https://ntpac.us9.list-manage.com/track/click?u=c2651ac4497b4fa0886fa6f7f&id=20a63d09dc&e=fb36681e9c>

**** Ask TRPA for Public Review of Homewood Ski Resort Privatization**

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?

If you have concerns about the Homewood Mountain Resort please email them to Pneilsen@TRPA.gov (<mailto:Pneilsen@TRPA.gov>) (lead planner), jregan@trpa.gov (<mailto:jregan@trpa.gov>) (TRPA ED), jmarshall@trpa.gov (<mailto:jmarshall@trpa.gov>) .(TRPA Lead Attorney)

=====
North Tahoe Preservation Alliance
P.O. Box 4
Crystal Bay, NV 89402
775-831-0625
**** preserve@ntpac.org (<mailto:preserve@ntpac.org>)**
Copyright © 2023 NORTH TAHOE PRESERVATION ALLIANCE, All rights reserved.
You are receiving this email because you exhibited interest in our environmental efforts.

Want to change how you receive these emails?

You can ** update your preferences (<https://ntpac.us9.list-manage.com/profile?u=c2651ac4497b4fa0886fa6f7f&id=b78da912ac&e=fb36681e9c&c=152628dff7>)
or ** unsubscribe from this list (<https://ntpac.us9.list-manage.com/unsubscribe?u=c2651ac4497b4fa0886fa6f7f&id=b78da912ac&e=fb36681e9c&c=152628dff7>)

.
Email Marketing Powered by Mailchimp
http://www.mailchimp.com/email-referral/?utm_source=freemium_newsletter&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=referral_marketing&aid=c2651ac4497b4fa0886fa6f7f&afl=1

From: Giovanni Andolina <giovannifandolina@gmail.com>
Date: Monday, January 9, 2023 at 10:05 AM
To: Julie Regan <jregan@trpa.gov>
Subject: Homewood

Hi Julie, my name is Giovanni Andolina, I now live in South Lake Tahoe. My friend who lives in Tahoma sent me a link on “Saving Homewood Ski Resort” I moved to Tahoma in 1996 and worked at Homewood Ski Resort year tiund from 1997 to 2005. The resort was owned by one man named Steve Wyler, then some sold to Jeff Yrosek, then to JMA I believe? The west shore community was Homewood, it provided jobs and a sense of community that I’ve yet to find any other place I’ve lived. Rumor has it there is proposal on the table for Homewood Ski Resort to go private? Homewood Ski Resort, Tahoma, Homewood, Swiss Village, Timberland, and Sunnyside were one the tightest communities on the Lake, Homewood Ski Resort is a common bond for all these locals. I moved to South Lake because the cost of purchasing a house on the WestShore had become higher than Southshore. I’d like to know who will work at the private resort? What will become of a resort and town that has no community? Homewood Ski Resort is the WestShore and not all land is privately owned, leased from the forest service right? Just seems a “public” place is turning private, kind of like if Kiva or Baldwin beaches or Hurricane Bay beach became completely private? I feel Homewood has always been a meeting place and embodies the essence of the WestShore and should be preserved as a park or a ski resort for all locals and visitors to use? What will the WestShore become if Homewood becomes a private resort, who will live in Tahoma, who will work at the resort? Will workers be able to access the mountain? What families will visit the WestShore in the winter? Can we hold onto any family values in Lake Tahoe or does it need to become a place only for the elite to enjoy? Thank you for taking the time to read this, I liken this issue of making Homewood private to wiping out a culture, Homewood Ski Resort and living in Tahoma and Homewood shaped my life, gave me lifelong friends and taught me the importance of a community. Who is truly going to benefit from a private resort? Please consider the local person who makes the wheels go around in a community. The whole world is becoming elite, can we not hold onto an old value and a way of life?

Sincerely, Giovanni Andolina

From: Randy Thomas <rwthomas@hotmail.com>
Sent: 1/9/2023 2:38:34 PM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Subject: FW: TRPA Meeting - Homewood Mountain Resort

Dear Paul:

My family and I are fulltime residents of Tahoe Pines, and Homewood has been part of our lives since I was a child. I learned to ski at Homewood in the early 1970s, and I am a current season passholder. I understand that TRPA is conducting an internal meeting today re privatization plans for the resort.

I am not opposed to thoughtful development. However, privatization of this local, family-popular ski area is very concerning. If privatized, the fear is that Homewood would no longer be accessible or economically feasible for local families, and this is the only ski resort readily accessible to the west shore. Homewood's development plans should not neglect the importance of this area to local families and the quality of local life, nor its long tradition providing healthy family activity.

Sincerely,

Randy Thomas
4140 Interlaken Road
Tahoe Pines

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows

From: Alanna Misico <jeeptahoe@hotmail.com>
Date: Monday, January 9, 2023 at 8:24 AM
To: Julie Regan <jregan@trpa.gov>
Subject: Homewood Resort

>
> Good Morning,
>
> I am a lifelong resident of the Tahoe Truckee area and have concerns of the privatization of the Homewood Mountain Resort. I've have seen a great deal of change to this area since the 1990s. Sadly, many of these changes do not benefit full time residents, local youth, employees, employers, or small business owners in the area and do not support community enhancement. Can you please provide me with information on how the future plans of Homewood benefits our community? It would truly be a loss to see this happen and would simply be unjust to the enhancement of our community.
>
> Thank you,
>
> Alanna Misico
>
> Sent from my iPhone

From: Tori Perrella <tori.perrella@gmail.com>

Date: Monday, January 9, 2023 at 10:16 AM

To: pnielson@trpa.gov <pnielson@trpa.gov>, John Marshall <jmarshall@trpa.gov>, Julie Regan <jregan@trpa.gov>

Subject: Stop Privatization of Homewood

Hi TRPA Members,

I'm reaching out regarding the privatization of Homewood. I am a Homewood resident and have been skiing the Homewood mountain for many years. I am a proponent of remodeling the Homewood resort as I know it has been around for many years and I think it would add benefits to the local community, however, I completely oppose the privatization of this resort from all local residents.

Homewood residents have been loyal to this resort for decades and I don't see any benefit of closing this off to the locals that have been skiing it for many years. This goes against the notion of "community" in West Shore, and if anything, we will provide more money and business to the resort. Please reconsider this decision as it would be catastrophic to the local community here in West Shore.

Thank you very much,
Tori

From: Randy Thomas <rwthomas@hotmail.com>
Sent: 1/9/2023 2:38:34 PM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Subject: FW: TRPA Meeting - Homewood Mountain Resort

Dear Paul:

My family and I are fulltime residents of Tahoe Pines, and Homewood has been part of our lives since I was a child. I learned to ski at Homewood in the early 1970s, and I am a current season passholder. I understand that TRPA is conducting an internal meeting today re privatization plans for the resort.

I am not opposed to thoughtful development. However, privatization of this local, family-popular ski area is very concerning. If privatized, the fear is that Homewood would no longer be accessible or economically feasible for local families, and this is the only ski resort readily accessible to the west shore. Homewood's development plans should not neglect the importance of this area to local families and the quality of local life, nor its long tradition providing healthy family activity.

Sincerely,

Randy Thomas
4140 Interlaken Road
Tahoe Pines

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows

From: James Margolis <jamadapa@att.net>
Sent: 1/9/2023 10:48:13 AM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Subject: Homewood

I am a 30 year patroller at Homewood, now alumni, and have a home in Tahoe Pines. I fully support some real estate development but not privatization. Homewood has always been and should continue to be a family and locals ski area. I am concerned that the privatization would be the end of Homewood for families and locals – this is the only ski area that is readily available to the west shore of Lake Tahoe.

Sent from my iPhone

From: Donna Reid <Donna@adiyl.net>
Sent: 1/9/2023 6:03:20 AM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>; Julie Regan <jregan@trpa.gov>
Cc: John Marshall <jmarshall@trpa.gov>;
Subject: Homewood

Hello,

Are small community has been promised a
Community enhancement project (CEP)
This project was to bring opportunity to locals and keep skiing accessible.
Apparently there have been changes made. How can this be allowed? How can a private resort conformed to the requirements of
the CEP and provide community benefits, and how can these changes me made without a new environmental analysis?
Consider this being a reality in your back yard? This small local community needs this mountain to be shared or we lose all
sense of community.

Thank you for your time,
Sincerely, Donna Reid
Tahoe local since '95

From: Hamilton <ham@brixgraphix.com>
Sent: 1/9/2023 8:19:49 AM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Subject: Homewood development
Attachments: [image001 2.jpg](#)

Good morning Sir,
I have lived on the west shore of Lake Tahoe for over 50 years. In the 70's I worked at both Homewood ski hill and Marina. Best jobs I have ever had.
The West Shore is a very special place to live and play, this private development will destroy one of the last small ski area's in California. I understand they can not keep running in the red, but there must be some way to come to a compromise on this project, and keep the ski hill public. There are so many of us on the West Shore that enjoy the wonderful skiing and hiking that Homewood Resort has to offer with out the big mountain crazyness of late at Squaw and Alpine.
Please put all these emails coming to you to good thought.

Thank you for your time,
Hamilton
Hamilton Rogers
CEO
Brix Graphix
415-264-2659





From: Ariel Macrae <akmacrae@gmail.com>
Sent: 1/9/2023 4:10:07 PM
To: John Marshall <jmarshall@trpa.gov>; Julie Regan <jregan@trpa.gov>; Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Subject: Homewood Development Project

Dear TRPA,

I am writing to you with concern regarding the privatization of Homewood Mountain Resort. There are several reasons I believe the development is not in the best interest of the community:

1. Loss of benefit to the local community: Shifting the business model from public to private with the implication that the resort will only offer a limited number of lifetime ski memberships with the elimination of day passes and general season pass sales. Homewood is a community fixture that provides an opportunity for residents of the Tahoe basin to come together in both winter and summer months to recreate. With privatization, the local community will not only be impacted by the negative environmental impacts of development, but they will not have access to what was once a place to enhance the physical and mental wellbeing of the community.
2. Lack of transparency in a shift of plans: The original project that was approved by TRPA was approved as a Community Enhancement Project - a project intended to bring benefits to the community and be open to the public. This plan was projected to bring an estimated 16 million to 20 million in visitor spending to the local community. With the shift in plans to privatize the resort, and target a small, elite clientele, how will the new plan provide community benefits, and furthermore, how can these changes be made without a new environmental analysis?
3. Negative environmental impact: Adding the proposed infrastructure could cause significant environmental impacts, including the alteration of the natural landscape, increase in water usage and a threat to the clarity of Lake Tahoe. I fear that shifting from a community based resort to a privatized model will lead to a prioritization of profit over environmental stewardship.

As a west shore resident who cares deeply about their community, I urge you to consider these negative impacts and reject the proposal for the full privatization of Homewood.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

--

Email sent from my phone, please excuse any typos

From: John Regan <regan.john@yahoo.com>
Sent: 1/9/2023 9:29:45 PM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Subject: Homewood Development

My dad bought our house in Homewood in 1959. When things were affordable and everything was easy and simple. Now Tahoe is becoming the rich and famous whoever has the most money wins. Now it's all about lining everyone's pockets with money. What about the people that really made Tahoe what it is today we're not counted. The rich are taking over Tahoe and pushing the little guys out and leaving us with nothing. So sad the building department would even consider this huge development considering it's so hard to get a permit in Tahoe. So I guess if you have a lot of money you can get a permit to build anything never thought this would ever happen in Tahoe. No consideration of the clarity of the lake the wildlife that it's going to affect and the pollution it's going to cause. Please please read this and take all this into consideration Tahoe will never be the same if this development goes through

Thanks
John Regan

If you have any questions you can call me 925-899-6383

Sent from my iPhone

From: Susan Holm <susan.holm@icloud.com>
Sent: 1/9/2023 11:03:52 AM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Subject: Homewood development

Dear Mr . Nielsen,

We are aware of the startling change in the development of Homewood by JMA and would like to express our surprise and concern.

It is disconcerting that this development can basically change the scope completely without public comment and input. That they can turn this from a public ski resort to a private one is shocking to the community who were supportive in 2011 because it would continue to give access to the public. To make such a drastic change without additional public input as well as updated environmental reviews is shocking.

Many of us bought our homes because of the local ski resort and even paid a premium for being able to ski in and ski out of Homewood Ski Resort. The privatization will immediately devalue our homes and we are not even given an opportunity to make our concerns heard.

As well, the architecture has taken a 180 degree turn from a traditional mountain architecture to mountain modern with so much additional glazing which will be seen from across the lake and will destroy our valuable night time darkness that allows us to enjoy the beautiful night sky and is a main reason many of us live here.

Finally, and perhaps most importantly, we live with the annual - almost year round - threat of wild fires. The current Homewood Ski Resort provides the only staging area for up to twenty strike teams (each strike team is 5 engines) and all the supporting assets needed to support them. They must have a place to amass and responds to our vulnerable west shore neighborhoods. Even with the original development plan, this was a concern. As residents, we must know how this will be addressed by any development on this property.

We would like you to take these concerns into consideration in a public way and allow for additional public review.

Best regards,
Susan & Dick Holm

Sent from my iPad

From: Avery Clough <averyclough@yahoo.com>
Sent: 1/9/2023 6:58:33 PM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>; John Marshall <jmarshall@trpa.gov>; Julie Regan <jregan@trpa.gov>
Subject: Homewood Mountain Resort concerns

Dear TRPA,
Hope this finds you well.
I am writing to you with concern regarding the privatization of Homewood Mountain Resort. There are several reasons I believe the development is not in the best interest of the community:

1. Loss of benefit to the local community: Shifting the business model from public to private with the implication that the resort will only offer a limited number of lifetime ski memberships with the elimination of day passes and general season pass sales. Homewood is a community fixture that provides an opportunity for residents of the Tahoe basin to come together in both winter and summer months to recreate. With privatization, the local community will not only be impacted by the negative environmental impacts of development, but they will not have access to what was once a place to enhance the physical and mental wellbeing of the community.
2. Lack of transparency in a shift of plans: The original project that was approved by TRPA was approved as a Community Enhancement Project - a project intended to bring benefits to the community and be open to the public. This plan was projected to bring an estimated 16 million to 20 million in visitor spending to the local community. With the shift in plans to privatize the resort, and target a small, elite clientele, how will the new plan provide community benefits, and furthermore, how can these changes be made without a new environmental analysis?
3. Negative environmental impact: Adding the proposed infrastructure could cause significant environmental impacts, including the alteration of the natural landscape, increase in water usage and a threat to the clarity of Lake Tahoe. I fear that shifting from a community based resort to a privatized model will lead to a prioritization of profit over environmental stewardship.

As a west shore resident who cares deeply about their community, I urge you to consider these negative impacts and reject the proposal for the privatization of Homewood.
Thank you for your time and consideration.
Sincerely,

Avery Clough

From: EJ H <ejholow@gmail.com>
Sent: 1/9/2023 2:18:00 AM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Subject: Homewood Mountain Resort

Dear Paul, I strongly urge you not to approve the privatization of Homewood Mountain Resort. Homewood has always been the place that the locals ski and is the best place to ski when there is fresh snow. For 10 years I've been reading about plans to revitalize the resort, but over the last few years we've only seen it become more run down. The only improvement I've seen was improving the Ellis chair, which was a half effort. Last year I was in shock when I went to buy a day ticket and saw the price was over \$200, with only half the mountain open. Art Chapman has done nothing to improve this resort and now wants to privatize to salvage his investment, but he does not deserve to salvage his investment because he has done nothing but run it into the ground.

Homewood provides a relaxing and affordable place for families to ski. Though with current climate forecasts, I think the big mistake is to look at it as only a winter resort. Homewood has the unique opportunity to be a great summer resort and I believe that is where future revenue will be at, supplemented by the unpredictable winter weather. Future investors only need to look at Snow King Mountain in Jackson Wy, or Chamonix France. These places have provided summer recreation activities like a Luge ride, and other things. Homewood could put in a mid mountain pool, mountain bike trails, hiking trails, beach, etc.. To privatize is also bad for local businesses as well, as the only ones who will be able to afford it are the wealthy and only come up a few times a year.

Thank you for considering

EJ Holowicki
6415 Flicker Ave
Homewood CA

From: dmbdds@aol.com <dmbdds@aol.com>
Sent: 1/9/2023 8:24:53 AM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Subject: Homewood Mountain Ski Resort Development

Dear Mr. Nielsen,
I have been going to the west shore of Lake Tahoe since 1964 when my family built a cabin in Chamberlands. I know things change and although we didn't love the proposed development at Homewood Mountain, we were OK with the plan that came out of the review process. However, they are now trying to make significant changes to the plans that were approved. Both in the design of the buildings as well as the entire concept of the resort, private vs public. Please don't allow Homewood Mountain to make these kinds of changes to approved plans without requiring them to go through the review process again.

Sincerely,
David Bauer
390 Ellis Road
Homewood
dmbdds@aol.com
510-468-4382

From: Michael Murray <yardsale.q1@gmail.com>
Sent: 1/9/2023 10:08:31 PM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>; John Marshall <jmarshall@trpa.gov>; Julie Regan <jregan@trpa.gov>
Cc: cmur9@aol.com <cmur9@aol.com>; Cindy.Gustafson <cindygustafson@placer.ca.gov>;
Subject: Homewood Mountain Ski Resort Privatization

Good Evening Members of the TRPA,

By now I hope our email is simply joining the long list of correspondence from other Homewood Property Owners as we express our concern with the announced plans to “privatize” Homewood Mountain Resort. As a family we have ties to the Truckee/Tahoe region dating to 1939 and we have specifically been Homewood property owners since 1960. We have witnessed all of the many regional changes over the years but the recent announcement by JMA Ventures and Discovery Land Corporation to privatize Homewood Mountain Resort is most troubling. Although the 2011 approval of the development plans granted to JMA Ventures wasn’t without controversy, the one thing it most certainly included was a commitment to the West Shore Community.

In 2011 The West Shore Community was promised/assured/sold a vision of transforming Homewood Mountain Resort into an economic and community focal point for residents and guests of the West Shore. Now, despite “community ski days” and other small platitudes posted in some on-line literature, the very obvious business model of Discovery Land Corporation is absolute exclusivity. There is zero room for any sort of community when the celebrated members are

“.....captains of industry, athletes, actors, owners of sports teams. At all our places, they’re able to actually relax and be themselves and enjoy the environment and their family. No one needs anything from them, because everyone has a lot. No one is hitting you up for an interview or job or picture, because everyone is at the top of their industry.”

These comments made by Discovery Land Corporation’s founder do not in any way match the community commitments that were approved as part of JMA Ventures original proposal. Therefore we hope that you will not allow this privatization effort to proceed as the original terms have been completely altered. We feel the TRPA and Placer County must require JMA Ventures and their partners at Discovery Land Corporation to submit an HONEST and complete proposal so that all stake holders are able to evaluate this completely NEW business development proposal.

Thank you for your time,

The Murray Family

Sent from my iPhone

From: Maurice Storch <maurice.storch@gmail.com>
Sent: 1/9/2023 4:00:34 PM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>; John Marshall <jmarshall@trpa.gov>; Julie Regan <jregan@trpa.gov>
Subject: Homewood Mountain

Dear John, Paul, and Julie,

I am a homeowner in Tahoe Pines on the West Shore located at 3910 Alpine Ave. I recently become aware of the privatization efforts of the developer of Homewood Mountain.

I have one question. A condition for approval of this project was that it was a Community Enhancement Project. If Homewood becomes completely private, beyond the reach of the local residents and homeowners... how does this qualify under the CEP provisions?

Sincerely,

Maurice Storch
415-992-1085

From: Zachary Moreno <zachmmoreno@gmail.com>
Sent: 1/9/2023 12:52:42 AM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Subject: Homewood Privatization & Development

Paul,

I hope you strong consider not approving Homewood's new plans to privatize the resort and the added development coming with it. This new plan did not have our community's support like the original proposal did years ago. The new plan will bring unwanted traffic, environmental degradation, and wildfire evacuation risk while providing the community nothing in return and actually causing the loss of access to what is an important part to all of the west shore's access to recreation. We are already seeing the problems of this kind of development in nearby communities and should not want to join their ranks. This project is not in alignment with the TRPA's mission to protect the lake and recreation access/activity and must not move forward.

Thank you,
Zach Moreno

--

Zachary Moreno
zachmmoreno@gmail.com

From: Zachary Moreno <zachmmoreno@gmail.com>
Sent: 1/9/2023 12:52:42 AM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Subject: Homewood Privatization & Development

Paul,

I hope you strong consider not approving Homewood's new plans to privatize the resort and the added development coming with it. This new plan did not have our community's support like the original proposal did years ago. The new plan will bring unwanted traffic, environmental degradation, and wildfire evacuation risk while providing the community nothing in return and actually causing the loss of access to what is an important part to all of the west shore's access to recreation. We are already seeing the problems of this kind of development in nearby communities and should not want to join their ranks. This project is not in alignment with the TRPA's mission to protect the lake and recreation access/activity and must not move forward.

Thank you,
Zach Moreno

--

Zachary Moreno
zachmmoreno@gmail.com

From: shana boyd <dirtybirdboyd@yahoo.com>
Sent: 1/9/2023 6:31:18 AM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Cc: John Marshall <jmarshall@trpa.gov>; Julie Regan <jregan@trpa.gov>;
Subject: Homewood project

Good morning,

We are very concerned with the direction the Homewood development seems to be heading. In the initial "pitch" of this project (sold as a community enhancement project) nothing was mentioned about privatization. Although initially a bit hesitant about the changes, we could see that it could be beneficial to ourselves and the community as a whole. How can a private resort enhance our community? How can this not have been included in the original presentation to the community and then be added as if it is some minor addition? It is a major change and it is absolutely not OK and we would really expect TRPA not to support this.

We look forward to your response.

Thank you,
Shana Boyd and Jon Johannsson
7028 6th Ave
Tahoma, Ca

From: Lilly Ilic <LillyIlic19@outlook.com>
Sent: 1/9/2023 10:06:09 AM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>; John Marshall <jmarshall@trpa.gov>; Julie Regan <jregan@trpa.gov>
Subject: Homewood project

Hello,

As a homeowner in Tahoma for over 30 years, I am adamantly against privatizing Homewood Ski Resort. I think the idea of having that much beauty in my back yard and not being able to access it is beyond unreasonable. People who have supported the community for years and years and not being taken into consideration when looking to privatize is irresponsible. It is my tax dollars that have supported the West Shore, not someone who is going to come in just because they have money, that has kept the West Shore what it should be, an area for all to enjoy. I have kept my Tahoma property (2 units which I rent to local workers at an extremely affordable rate) and 1 very small unit for me just so that I can enjoy the beauty of the west shore, even though I don't have a job currently and the rents I charge could be raised to unreasonable amounts to help support me, but I don't. I appreciate what the West Shore has to offer and adding these homes and changing the mountain to something that only the rich support is totally irresponsible to us average citizens who have worked for years and years to keep Tahoma and the West Shore accessible to average West Shore homeowner. I am sickened at the thought of not being able to spend my retirement skiing Homewood. It's where I learned to ski 30 years ago and it's where I have my current yearly ski pass. Please do not let a few rich people spoil it for the many homeowners who have supported the West Shore for years. Please call me if you have any questions for me at (408) 421-8138.

Sincerely,

Lilly Ilic
7132 7th Ave, Tahoma
359 Poplar, Tahoma

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows

From: Sossé M <sosse.makasdjian@gmail.com>
Sent: 1/9/2023 6:39:46 PM
To: John Marshall <jmarshall@trpa.gov>; Julie Regan <jregan@trpa.gov>; Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Subject: Homewood Resort

Dear TRPA,

I am writing to you with concern regarding the privatization of Homewood Mountain Resort. There are several reasons I believe the development is not in the best interest of the community:

1. Loss of benefit to the local community: Shifting the business model from public to private with the implication that the resort will only offer a limited number of lifetime ski memberships with the elimination of day passes and general season pass sales. Homewood is a community fixture that provides an opportunity for residents of the Tahoe basin to come together in both winter and summer months to recreate. With privatization, the local community will not only be impacted by the negative environmental impacts of development, but they will not have access to what was once a place to enhance the physical and mental wellbeing of the community.
2. Lack of transparency in a shift of plans: The original project that was approved by TRPA was approved as a Community Enhancement Project - a project intended to bring benefits to the community and be open to the public. This plan was projected to bring an estimated 16 million to 20 million in visitor spending to the local community. With the shift in plans to privatize the resort, and target a small, elite clientele, how will the new plan provide community benefits, and furthermore, how can these changes be made without a new environmental analysis?
3. Negative environmental impact: Adding the proposed infrastructure could cause significant environmental impacts, including the alteration of the natural landscape, increase in water usage and a threat to the clarity of Lake Tahoe. I fear that shifting from a community based resort to a privatized model will lead to a prioritization of profit over environmental stewardship.

As a west shore resident who cares deeply about their community, I urge you to consider these negative impacts and reject the proposal for the full privatization of Homewood.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,
Sossé

From: Alanna Misico <jeeptahoe@hotmail.com>
Sent: 1/9/2023 7:36:04 AM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Subject: Homewood Resort

Good Morning,

I am a lifelong resident of the Tahoe Truckee area and have concerns of the privatization of the Homewood Mountain Resort. I've have seen a great deal of change to this area since the 1990s. Sadly, many of these changes do not benefit full time residents, local youth, employees, employers, or small business owners in the area and do not support community enhancement. Can you please provide me with information on how the future plans of Homewood benefits our community? It would truly be a loss to see this happen and would simply be unjust to the enhancement of our community.

Thank you,

Alanna Misico

Sent from my iPhone

From: Kelly Ryan <jtrpaper@gmail.com>
Sent: 1/9/2023 1:20:24 AM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Subject: Homewood Resort development

Mr Nielsen, as a homeowner in Tahoe Pines for 50 years, I strongly object to Homewood becoming a private resort. Thank you for understanding my family's position.
Kelly Ryan-Tahoe Pines

Sent from my iPhone

From: Colin Feichtmeir/USA <Colin.Feichtmeir@cushwake.com>
Sent: 1/9/2023 2:34:56 PM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>; John Marshall <jmarshall@trpa.gov>; Julie Regan <jregan@trpa.gov>
Subject: Homewood Resort Plans and Privatization

Hello Julie, John and Paul.

I am sending this email as a concerned, multi-seasoned and longtime Homewood visitor.

The most recently proposed plan for the Homewood Resort project is not of what this very delicate and special area needs and will be a mistake in the long (and short) term.

Improving the resort is fine but going private with a very expensive ski resort is the opposite of a Community Enhancement Project – which was the initial intent of the approved project.

Secondly, the very modern architecture of the high density housing is extremely incongruent with the surrounding area and will age poorly – they will be like the many, very undesirable 1950s, 60s and 70s building we see marring the area today (of which several are being razed thankfully).

I would be happy to speak or contribute anyway I can to prevent the destruction of Homewood with this new revision to a previously approved (and attractive) project.

Sincerely,
Colin Feichtmeir

Colin Feichtmeir
Mobile: 408-203-7735
colin.feichtmeir@cushwake.com

The information contained in this email (including any attachments) is confidential, may be subject to legal or other professional privilege and contain copyright material, and is intended for use by the named recipient(s) only.

Access to or use of this email or its attachments by anyone else is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful. If you are not the intended recipient(s), you may not use, disclose, copy or distribute this email or its attachments (or any part thereof), nor take or omit to take any action in reliance on it. If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender immediately by telephone or email and delete it, and all copies thereof, including all attachments, from your system. Any confidentiality or privilege is not waived or lost because this email has been sent to you by mistake.

Although we have taken reasonable precautions to reduce the risk of transmitting software viruses, we accept no liability for any loss or damage caused by this email or its attachments due to viruses, interference, interception, corruption or unapproved access.

For information on how your personal information is processed, including information on how to exercise state or country specific Privacy Rights please view our privacy notice here:
<https://www.cushmanwakefield.com/en/privacy-and-cookies>

From: Hal Robertson <halrobertson@me.com>
Sent: 1/9/2023 8:12:57 AM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Subject: Homewood Ski Area Development

Dear Mr. Nielsen,

As a full time resident of Homewood in Chamberlands, I am very concerned with the privatization of the ski resort. It seems like the developer is not concerned about the ability of the average person to be able to afford to ski at Homewood and we will be forced to ski at other resorts adding to the terrible traffic that I encounter traveling around the lake. It will also increase outside of the West shore area traffic for new member's coming into this area every day. I would hope that West Shore residents would not be impacted any more than we have these last few years, and that not just the ultra wealthy can continue to enjoy this beautiful mountain resort!

Sincerely,
Hal and Courtney Robertson

Sent from my iPhone

From: Leann Dyer <leannmagic@gmail.com>
Sent: 1/9/2023 7:14:32 AM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Subject: Homewood Ski Resort

Hi Paul,
I have been a member of the westshore since the early 80s. I have raised our family and worked on the wrstshore since the early 80s. My family supported and loved homewood since then. Now under the radar and with misdirection JMA & others TRPA included is forever wanting to take away and change our home.
I Beg of you you DONT LET THIS HAPPEN.
JMA has made several changes without any update and research of the EIA. The infrastructure can't support this, our roads, our housing can support this.
The Westshore was our dream
LONG BEFORE JMA Came along. We invested in our dream Long before JMA came along. Please listen to the locals. Don't sell out our Dream and our Homes.

From: Eric Everson <eric.everson@matchps.com>
Sent: 1/9/2023 11:29:26 AM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Subject: Homewood Ski Resort, West Shore Cafe, and Hi & Dry Marina Privatization

Paul,

I am a longtime home owner in McKinney Estates on the west shore of Lake Tahoe. I was directed to you because I was told that you are TRPA's Special Project Manager aligned with the Homewood Privatization Development efforts. It appears to me that what is being proposed is very different than the original plan disclosed to the public.

I have some major concerns regarding this development. I believe if more people who own on the West Shore were aware of this proposal most would have the same concerns. Since the design is different than what was originally proposed and the fact that it will not be something that can be used by the general public, I believe the following should be revisited:

- Environmental impact of new architecture design
- Impact of additional traffic from the west shore to Palisades, Alpine, and other ski resorts
- Impact of additional traffic for boat launches since the existing buoy renters at Hi & Dry Marina will be removed
- Impact of additional traffic to Tahoe City since the West Shore Cafe will be privatized
- Plans for alleviating the additional traffic that will be caused by privatizing
- Economic impact to the west shore of privatizing the ski area, marina, and one of the only restaurants on the west shore
- Long term development and economic impact on the rest of the West Shore of Lake Tahoe

Is there a way for the general public to comment about our concerns or is this email sufficient? I look forward to hearing back from you.

Thanks,

Eric E. Everson
925-922-1900 Cell
925-397-1905 Fax
www.matchps.com

- ☐ Connect with me on LinkedIn
- ☐ Follow MatchPoint on Twitter
- ☐ Follow MatchPoint on Facebook
- ☐ Connect to the MatchPoint homepage

From: Steve Erger <sjelus@yahoo.com>
Sent: 1/9/2023 9:44:09 AM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>; jmarshall@trpa.goc <jmarshall@trpa.goc>; Julie Regan <jregan@trpa.gov>; Supervisororgustafson@placer.ca.gov <Supervisororgustafson@placer.ca.gov>
Subject: Homewood Ski Resort

Good morning all,

This email is to voice my objection to the bait and switch tactics employed by JMA Ventures in their decade plus quest to redevelop the Homewood Ski Resort, West Shore Cafe, and Homewood High and Dry Marina. It is my understanding that over the course of the public approval process for this development,

JMA represented the project as something that would enhance the west shore community. New homes, new restaurants, and new retail were all proposed and I believe, generally well received by the community. Now that JMA has let the ski resort infrastructure deteriorate to the point that they struggle to attract the crowds necessary to operate in the black, they have decided to scrap the proposal as presented to various government entities, including TRPA and cater to only the richest of the rich.

I believe that, should TRPA and the various governing bodies wish to allow JMA to proceed with this project, there has been a material change to the project such that they should essentially start the public processes over from the beginning, including allowing for public comments. At minimum, an environmental assessment must take place to ensure that the change in the project does not negatively impact the environment, including our beloved lake.

Thank you for your consideration. I, along with many others in the community feel JMA misled the County and the public as well as numerous public entities such as yourself. Please hold them accountable and ensure that they are forthright with their plans to redevelop these facilities, and enable the public to provide their input on a development that will no doubt change the west shore and take away the amenities that were promised in the original plans (at least for the existing members of the community).

Remember, you represent the existing property owners and taxpayers, not the .01% who may or may not purchase 2nd, 3rd or 4th homes there, and have no real vested interest in the community!

Steve Erger
750 Cascade Circle
Homewood CA
sje1us@yahoo.com

From: Eric Everson <eric.everson@matchps.com>
Sent: 1/9/2023 11:29:26 AM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Subject: Homewood Ski Resort, West Shore Cafe, and Hi & Dry Marina Privatization

Paul,

I am a longtime home owner in McKinney Estates on the west shore of Lake Tahoe. I was directed to you because I was told that you are TRPA's Special Project Manager aligned with the Homewood Privatization Development efforts. It appears to me that what is being proposed is very different than the original plan disclosed to the public.

I have some major concerns regarding this development. I believe if more people who own on the West Shore were aware of this proposal most would have the same concerns. Since the design is different than what was originally proposed and the fact that it will not be something that can be used by the general public, I believe the following should be revisited:

- Environmental impact of new architecture design
- Impact of additional traffic from the west shore to Palisades, Alpine, and other ski resorts
- Impact of additional traffic for boat launches since the existing buoy renters at Hi & Dry Marina will be removed
- Impact of additional traffic to Tahoe City since the West Shore Cafe will be privatized
- Plans for alleviating the additional traffic that will be caused by privatizing
- Economic impact to the west shore of privatizing the ski area, marina, and one of the only restaurants on the west shore
- Long term development and economic impact on the rest of the West Shore of Lake Tahoe

Is there a way for the general public to comment about our concerns or is this email sufficient? I look forward to hearing back from you.

Thanks,

Eric E. Everson
925-922-1900 Cell
925-397-1905 Fax
www.matchps.com

- ☐ Connect with me on LinkedIn
- ☐ Follow MatchPoint on Twitter
- ☐ Follow MatchPoint on Facebook
- ☐ Connect to the MatchPoint homepage

From: AJ Cheline <ajcheline@gmail.com>
Sent: 1/9/2023 9:34:03 AM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>; John Marshall <jmarshall@trpa.gov>; Julie Regan <jregan@trpa.gov>
Subject: Homewood's plans would make the traffic nightmare worse and the harm local community

I heard that TRPA may be meeting with representatives from Homewood Ski Report about their plans to move to an exclusive, members-only model and wanted to express my deep concerns about this change.

Sounds like the group is planning to move forward with plans that are different from previous plans presented to the community for input. A classic bait and switch that I hope you can help us push back on.

This change would be devastating to the local community in many ways. It would eliminate access for many/ most of our community (note the Yellowstone Club charges a \$300k membership buy-in with over \$30k annual dues). Those of us would then need to drive to Alpine/Palisades, adding to the existing traffic and safety issues.

Homewood now says they will offer designated non-member community ski days, but we know that is a joke and completely insufficient.

Surely there could be a reasonable compromise that would allow Homewood to be sustainable as a company and allow affordable access to the community.

Their excuse of not being able to maintain a profitable business as is should be questioned based on their lack of any investments and marketing to drive a value proposition for business. It almost feels intentional to many of us because the value is there!

And keep in mind, if Homewood did a better job operating as a business to serve the regional community, they would be helping to reduce the traffic nightmare for Palisades and around Tahoe City! The more people they could attract from the lake region would go a long way in improving the horrendous traffic issues around Palisades.

I appreciate your consideration and hope that we can rely on you in fulfilling your mission at TRPA.

--
AJ Cheline

From: Mike Rogge <mike.rogge@mountaingazette.com>
Sent: 1/9/2023 9:15:04 AM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Subject: Keep Homewood local

Hi Paul –

I'm Mike Rogge. Tahoe Vista resident, longtime ski magazine editor (Powder, The Ski Journal, Vice Sports). I'm the owner of Mountain Gazette.

I am writing because in 20 years of writing about skiing I can tell you we aren't seeing more independent ski areas pop up. We're seeing more and more die. Homewood has an opportunity to solidify itself as a local mountain with character. It's my understanding the TRPA exists to protect the environmental concerns of Tahoe so that it doesn't fall into complete chaos.

Ask the folks who live in Bozeman about the Yellowstone Club. I've skied there a couple times. Sure is a great resort. Reminds me of Homewood except at Homewood you don't need a \$25 million dollar mansion to get in. Those employees at the YC? They're living in a repurposed motel in Gallatin Gateway some 40 minutes away. They add to traffic problems in the canyon every single morning and afternoon.

I get that anti-development runs rampant through our community. That isn't me. Rather, I'm writing you to consider protecting one of Tahoe's most valuable assets. My son is four and recently skied top to bottom on the Ellis Chair. Please protect Homewood for the future generations of Tahoe. Do not allow it to be an all out private resort on a two lane road.

Surely some sort of alternative route is available to protest the resort's future.

Thanks for your time.

-Mike

From: Ian Glover <bigdogsurfcamp@gmail.com>
Sent: 1/9/2023 10:29:17 AM
To: Julie Regan <jregan@trpa.gov>; John Marshall <jmarshall@trpa.gov>; Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Subject: Keeping Homewood open to the public

Pretty sure this is a done deal but just received information that there was a private meeting about this happening today and hopefully this email finds you all in time.
I am a Marin County native and have been lucky enough to live on the Westshore in Tahoe City every winter for the past 13 years. I've been a Homewood season pass holder that entire time as well. Powder days at Homewood are the best days of the year for me. With a baby boy on the way I've been flooded with fantasies of teaching him to ski there.
I've known Homewood has been struggling for at least the past several years and while I'm able to recruit more season pass holders every year it's obvious it's been a sinking ship. But making it a "billionaires only" club is not the answer.
Please help keep Homewood open to the public for more generations to enjoy.

Thanks,
Ian "Big Dog" Glover
(415)518-3805
www.bigdogsurfcamp.com

From: heather Gover <heathergover12@gmail.com>
Sent: 1/9/2023 12:02:40 AM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Subject: New Homewood project should not be approved

Hi Paul,

Privatizing homewood resort was not mentioned in the original environmental documents and was not a part of the approval process. How is it possible that the TRPA may approve this totally new project before completing the necessary steps and due diligence?

I just saw on the news the other day that it cost more to buy a daily pass to ski at homewood than any other ski resort in the country! They claim they don't sell very many passes and can't compete with bigger ski resorts in the area, but yet they charge the most expensive lift price - it doesn't make sense. They're clearly trying to purposely keep daily ticket sales down (and have been for a few years now) in an effort to back up their claims about slowing ticket sales to get their new project approved. New analysis along with environmental, economic and traffic studies should be done before this updated project is approved.

Please consider the opinions and feedback of the local community before approving this project.

Thank you,
Heather

From: Jeannette Hook <jbhook@msn.com>
Sent: 1/9/2023 10:45:32 AM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Subject: No to Homewood Privatization

This letter is to express my Non Support for Homewood Mountain Resort becoming private.

Homewood management seems to be keeping this under wraps from the community. I ski at Homewood most every day and there has been no information shared at the resort concerning the privatization change. I learned very late that today, Monday, 9-January-2023, there was to be a meeting to discuss this proposal. Homewood does not seem to be fully transparent and up front about their intended plans.

They are also not doing very much promotion of their Homewood ski mountain this season. In past years, there's been a lot of "stoke" shared on FaceBook and Twitter about upcoming events and activities at Homewood. This year, they are very quiet on social media, have not planned any pass holder events, and appear to be doing very little promotion of the resort.

Homewood is a gem for the community on the West Shore. I don't support their privatization plans as I don't think that's going to be a successful business model for them going forward. It would also mean a big loss to the West Shore community.

Please do not support the Homewood privatization plan.

Sincerely,
Jeannette Hook

Sent from Hooks iPad

From: Nancy Takaichi <nancytakaichi@gmail.com>
Sent: 1/9/2023 5:41:39 PM
To: Julie Regan <jregan@trpa.gov>; Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Subject: Please consider our community

Dear Julie, John, and Paul
We bought our home in Tahoma because of the easy access to all Homewood has to offer. My husband enjoys the skiing, I am an artist and have enjoyed access to beautiful scenery there. My kids mountain bike and enjoy winter sports there. We enjoy the restaurants as well. We are very concerned that the planning association has okayed turning Homewood into a private enterprise, This will have a very heavy impact the west shore, How will increased infrastructure be addressed? With an increase of cars on road that can't be widened, , how we can we be assured that if an evacuation is necessary, how will people escape safely? This has been a question of mine BEFORE 200+ homes were built.

I truly hope that TRPA allows public input on permitting privatization of a place we all love. There needs to be concessions of use for those who bought their homes, expecting such access.

Thank you for taking the time to listen; I welcome a response.

Nancy Takaichi
Tahoma, CA

From: Robb Gaffney <robbgaffney@hotmail.com>
Sent: 1/9/2023 8:01:53 AM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>; John Marshall <jmarshall@trpa.gov>; Julie Regan <jregan@trpa.gov>
Subject: Please REJECT the Homewood Mountain Plan- it no longer meets criteria for a CEP

Dear TRPA,

I am writing to encourage you to reject the development plan put forth by Homewood Mountain Resort, given that it now involves privatization. I have always been a staunch supporter of TRPA approaches to development around the Lake. Your organization has been remarkably successful in helping Tahoe maintain a unique character, giving it a sense of place and community.

I feel this is a situation in which TRPA must exert its authority. I support TRPAs intention of implementing a Community Enhancement Project (CEP) for Homewood. But this project has shifted course and is moving forward not as a community project but as a private one. Community implies inclusivity. This project, however, would be built on exclusivity. It would symbolize wealth disparity in our region and along West Shore and construct resentment-generating boundaries within the greater community milieu. Everyone who has lived in North Tahoe and along West Shore for a long time KNOWS deep in their hearts the current plan is a bad idea. They are fearful it could come to fruition. They know it would deteriorate the sense of community in a unique Lake Tahoe community comprised of both locals and visitors, bound by geography, a sense of being off the beaten path, and frankly, having a local ski resort that has contributed to their sense of identity for decades. Homewood is a community unifier that would be lost if you approved this plan.

I write this with all the respect I can muster because I believe in your mission.

Sincerely,

Robb Gaffney, M.D.

PS; sorry for the double send. On the previous email, one of the addresses was undeliverable.

From: Jay Danzig <jdanzig43@gmail.com>
Sent: 1/9/2023 4:34:43 PM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Subject: protect lake tahoe

Short term gain measured against long term loss is essential to planning. I was a developer for decades, building apatments in the bay area. Lake Tahoe requires visionaries. Please keep this in mind. Thank you. Jay & linda danzig,

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows

From: Nina Bridges <ninalbridges@gmail.com>
Sent: 1/9/2023 8:24:24 PM
Subject: Public Comment Regarding Privatization of Homewood Mountain Resort

As a longtime Homewood skier/Season Pass Holder, and resident/homeowner of Homewood, I am greatly concerned about the protection of the community and deeply opposed to JMA Ventures' plans to privatize Homewood Mountain Resort.

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

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

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

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

From: Kathleen McNamara <kathleen.a.mcn@gmail.com>
Sent: 1/9/2023 10:38:50 AM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Subject: Public Comment Regarding Privatization of Homewood Ski Area

Paul Nielsen, Special Projects Manager - TRPA and TRPA Committee Members,

As a Homewood Season Pass Holder, and 30 years full-time resident and homeowner, I am deeply concerned with and opposed to JMA Ventures Homewood Mountain Resorts plans to privatize the Homewood Ski Area.

In 2011, the TRPA approved proposals for changes and development of the ski area that were presented to the local community included a hotel/condo building, mid-mountain lodge, amphitheater, and assumed retail/restaurant options that would benefit all of the communities along Lake Tahoe's West Shore. What they deceitfully never proposed was their end goal had been to make the mountain and all of those buildings and amenities entirely exclusive. Had privatization of the ski area and closure to the general public been suggested, the community would never have agreed to the proposal.

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

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

<https://www.grangergrouptahoe.com/wp-content/uploads/2022/01/Homewood-Discovery-JMA-project-deck-Jan-2022.pdf>

"Homewood is perfect for those looking to escape the day-to-day and reconnect with nature."
Except for those who will be excommunicated from enjoying the nature that was once open to the public.

"[Homewood will] become Lake Tahoe's most luxurious and ~~exclusive~~ family lifestyle community to date."
While completely ostracizing the communities that already exist along Tahoe's West shore.

"Homewood's already-established ski and lake club will be ~~exclusive~~ ~~year-round~~, allowing its members to use the amenities without restrictions." "The offering will be ~~exclusive~~ to [Homewood's] residences and condos."
No mention of Homewood's existing community or any of the HOA's along the West shore were included in this limited use offering.

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.

Thank you,

Kathleen Longo

From: Allyson Schreiber <abaccagl@yahoo.com>
Sent: 1/9/2023 4:39:54 PM
To: Jeff Cowen <jcowen@trpa.gov>; Victoria Ortiz <vortiz@trpa.gov>; John Hester <jhester@trpa.gov>; Nick Haven <nhaven@trpa.gov>; Wendy Jepson <wjepson@trpa.gov>; Kimberly Chevallier <kchevallier@trpa.gov>; Kenneth Kasman <kkasman@trpa.gov>; TRPA <trpa@trpa.gov>; Cindy Gustafson <cindygustafson@placer.ca.gov>
Cc: preserve@ntpac.org <preserve@ntpac.org>;
Subject: Public Comment Regarding Privatization of Homewood Ski Area

Dear TRPA Committee Members and Placer County,

I am a homeowner and long time resident ofTahoma. Our home is less than 2 miles away from Homewood Ski Resort. We are raising three children in the community and are long time Homewood Season Pass holders. My husband runs a local custom home company, and we are involved community members.

We are deeply concerned and opposed to the plans to privatize the Homewood Ski Resort. All of our 3 children took their first ski runs at Homewood. We consider it our backyard, and it is one of our favorite places to spend time together as a family in the winter months. On any given day at Homewood, while we are out skiing, we will run into multiple long time friends and neighbors. No other ski resort in the North Tahoe area has the same local community feel. It is a treasure.

We were a part of the TRPA approval meetings back in 2011 when changes for the development of the ski area were presented to the local community. I stood up and spoke in support of the development, as the local community viewed it as a necessary means to keep Homewood as a place we could all enjoy for years to come. The ski area obviously needs updating and maintenance. We viewed the original development as a means to build up the west shore community, giving us a beautiful place to keep skiing that was just down the street, an ice rink where we could spend time, and even a pool that the public would be able to access. JMA was promising to do all this in an environmentally responsible way that would minimally impact the community. These are the reasons I spoke up in favor the development. Our west shore community needed to be strengthened and supported, and it seemed that this was one way we could accomplish that while making needed upgrades to our favorite ski area.

The changes and developments proposed in 2011 did NOT include privatization of the ski area and closure to the general public. This seems like a horrible "bait and switch" tactic, and as a local community member I am enraged and deeply saddened. I would never have spoken up in support of the development if this had been proposed. Our community would NEVER have agreed to the proposal, and I don't believe it would have been approved. Instead of bringing the west shore community together, the privatization of Homewood will have the opposite effect. The social and economic impacts of the new proposal would be disastrous to our local community. It would take one of the gems of the west shore, one of the reasons that many of us chose to live here, and completely cut off our access, putting it into the hands of wealthy people, many of whom would not call Tahoe home or live here full time. The whole purpose of a "private resort" seems to be to separate themselves, and I can't envision any way that this would benefit the local community. We will do everything we can to protect our access to what we see as "the heart of the west shore" community.

This project should not be allowed under the previous approval as it is significantly different in its purpose and the impacts it will have on the local community. I urge you to reconsider and withdraw the previous approval. This is a completely different project than what was proposed in 2011 and should require a new permit application. I also urge you to listen to voices of the west shore community. This would be a tremendous change to the west shore and the voices of the people who live here should be heard.

Thank you for your consideration,
Allyson Schreiber

From: Suzanne Wilkins <wilkinsat6229@suddenlink.net>
Sent: 1/9/2023 2:47:11 PM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Subject: RE: TRPA Meeting regarding Homewood Privatization Plan

Thank you Paul. I will give you a call later this week after you all discuss internally.

From: Paul Nielsen [mailto:pnielsen@trpa.gov]
Sent: Monday, January 9, 2023 9:29 AM
To: Suzanne Wilkins <wilkinsat6229@suddenlink.net>
Subject: RE: TRPA Meeting regarding Homewood Privatization Plan

Hi Suzanne,

Happy New Year as well!

There is a meeting today, but it is only an internal TRPA staff meeting to discuss with the Executive Team the proposed changes at Homewood and identify what the review process will be. There is nothing scheduled for APC or GB and no decisions have been made regarding the consistency of the changes with the Master Plan.

Let me know if you want to discuss further and feel free to call at 530.318.6025.

Paul

From: Suzanne Wilkins <wilkinsat6229@suddenlink.net>
Sent: Monday, January 9, 2023 8:54 AM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Subject: TRPA Meeting regarding Homewood Privatization Plan

Hi Paul,

Happy New Year! It has been awhile since we have worked together on any projects.

I am writing to you today because there is a rumor going around that TRPA is holding a meeting regarding the Homewood Privatization issue and you were listed as the contact. I looked on your website and noticed there is an APC meeting this week but Homewood is not on the agenda. Is there a meeting coming up regarding Homewood. I do know that many of the west shore residents, including myself, are very concerned about the loss of our local ski area to be reasonably accessible to the public.

It seems that the loss of public access is inconsistent with the Final EIS MMRP and likely some other inconsistencies. Do you know if Homewood will be required to submit an addendum or new EIS for the proposed changes?

Thank you in advance.

Respectfully,
Suzanne Wilkins

From: Suzanne Wilkins <wilkinsat6229@suddenlink.net>
Sent: 1/9/2023 2:47:11 PM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Subject: RE: TRPA Meeting regarding Homewood Privatization Plan

Thank you Paul. I will give you a call later this week after you all discuss internally.

From: Paul Nielsen [mailto:pnielsen@trpa.gov]
Sent: Monday, January 9, 2023 9:29 AM
To: Suzanne Wilkins <wilkinsat6229@suddenlink.net>
Subject: RE: TRPA Meeting regarding Homewood Privatization Plan

Hi Suzanne,

Happy New Year as well!

There is a meeting today, but it is only an internal TRPA staff meeting to discuss with the Executive Team the proposed changes at Homewood and identify what the review process will be. There is nothing scheduled for APC or GB and no decisions have been made regarding the consistency of the changes with the Master Plan.

Let me know if you want to discuss further and feel free to call at 530.318.6025.

Paul

From: Suzanne Wilkins <wilkinsat6229@suddenlink.net>
Sent: Monday, January 9, 2023 8:54 AM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Subject: TRPA Meeting regarding Homewood Privatization Plan

Hi Paul,

Happy New Year! It has been awhile since we have worked together on any projects.

I am writing to you today because there is a rumor going around that TRPA is holding a meeting regarding the Homewood Privatization issue and you were listed as the contact. I looked on your website and noticed there is an APC meeting this week but Homewood is not on the agenda. Is there a meeting coming up regarding Homewood. I do know that many of the west shore residents, including myself, are very concerned about the loss of our local ski area to be reasonably accessible to the public.

It seems that the loss of public access is inconsistent with the Final EIS MMRP and likely some other inconsistencies. Do you know if Homewood will be required to submit an addendum or new EIS for the proposed changes?

Thank you in advance.

Respectfully,
Suzanne Wilkins

From: Nick Harris <nhtahoe@gmail.com>
Sent: 1/9/2023 1:58:13 PM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Subject: Urgent Action Needed: Demolition of the Derelict Tahoe Inn in Kings Beach

Dear TRPA,

I am writing to express my enthusiasm and optimism regarding the potential demolition of the "Tahoe Inn" in Kings Beach. It is a well-known fact that this property has been in a state of disrepair for over a decade, and it is a blight on the community. The fact that the 100 units at the Tahoe Inn are being transferred to Homewood Mountain Resort is a positive development, and I am confident that Homewood will do an excellent job of revitalizing this area.

However, I am concerned that the "Tahoe Inn" continues to sit derelict, with mold, hanging plastic, and tagging. This is not only an eyesore, but it is also a potential health hazard. I urge the TRPA to require Homewood to demolish this abandoned property as soon as possible. It is unacceptable that it has taken over a decade for this situation to be addressed, and I hope that Homewood will take swift action to address this problem.

I believe that the demolition of the "Tahoe Inn" will be a major step forward for the community, and I am optimistic that Homewood will be able to revitalize this area in a way that benefits everyone. Thank you for considering my request.

Sincerely,
Nick Harris
Kings Beach

From: Brenda Cranford <brendacr58@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: 1/9/2023 8:36:45 AM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Subject: Who does Homewoods private ski resort benefit?

Dear sirs,
In my opinion, the only people that a private Homewood resort would benefit is the privileged.
It will not be a place where regular families will get a chance to learn to ski and enjoy winter activities. My family has had a cabin in the area since 1950s. We learn to ski on Homewood and enjoyed the chance to learn about winter and summer sports. Please keep Homewood resort as a public property that we pay to enjoy. I have no problem paying to enjoy a good day of skiing or mountain biking.
Thank you for your consideration,
Brenda Cranford.

Sent from my iPhone

From: Louie Fielding <louiefielding@gmail.com>
Sent: 1/10/2023 10:32:18 PM
To: Jeff Cowen <jcowen@trpa.gov>; Victoria Ortiz <vortiz@trpa.gov>; John Hester <jhester@trpa.gov>; Nick Haven <nhaven@trpa.gov>; Wendy Jepson <wjepson@trpa.gov>; Kimberly Chevallier <kchevallier@trpa.gov>; Kenneth Kasman <kkasman@trpa.gov>; TRPA <trpa@trpa.gov>; Cindy Gustafson <cindyg@tcpud.org>; Cindy.Gustafson <cindygustafson@placer.ca.gov>; preserve@ntpac.org <preserve@ntpac.org>; Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>; John Marshall <jmarshall@trpa.gov>; Julie Regan <jregan@trpa.gov>
Subject: Homewood development plan

Hello,
I would like to comment on the change in direction of the Homewood master plan. The change to a private "club" is disappointing and completely inconsistent with what was proposed to the community during the permitting process that was approved around 2012. The EIR describes facilities that would be of benefit to the community, consistent with the TRPA goals for town centers. Our kids have been on the Homewood ski team; every time we ski there, it's like going to a neighborhood park where we run in to friends and neighbors. Taking a community asset away would be an incredible shame.

In addition to the ski area that the community has enjoyed for decades, this was to include a village with features that would benefit the community such as an amphitheater, hardware store, skating pond, and mid-mountain facility with a pool. There are currently no public pools in north lake tahoe short of going to the facility in Truckee. The plan for a private club goes against all these principles.

Beyond the availability of facilities to the community, this drastically different nature of the resort would require a complete re-analysis of many aspects of the EIR, in particular traffic analyses. If the Homewood ski area is not available to the public, any skier visits to Homewood would presumably be redirected to Palisades, Northstar, or possibly Heavenly if Emerald Bay is open. The current traffic situation around these resorts, particularly Palisades, is already unacceptable and would be further exacerbated if Homewood traffic is diverted there. The impacts to regional roads impair transit, emergency services, and general mobility of our region.

JMA has not been a forthright actor or community partner in this process. The master plan of record was developed with community input to achieve something that would revitalize a dilapidated resort, with additional benefits to the community. The change of plan was developed in secret, with no community input, and is only the subject of public interest because community members were able to verify rumors, as ultimately reported in Moonshine Ink. JMA has been akin to a slumlord since acquiring Homewood. Facilities have become dilapidated, in some cases filthy and other cases unsafe due to their neglect. In the 10 years since the master plan was approved, there has been no initiative to implement what was approved, even after the fully insured South Lodge burned down in 2016.

JMA complains that they cannot operate a profitable business, while not making the investments needed to run a successful ski area and at the same time charging prices often higher than larger resorts with more (modern) facilities. I am reminded of the movie "Major League" where the owner of the Cleveland Indians tries to make the team so bad that attendance will fall low enough to allow her to move the team to Miami. Current and former employees of Homewood are our friends and neighbors, and the common theme we hear is that JMA does not seem to be interested in running a ski area.

Please note that I am not anti-development or anti-developer. Mixed luxury housing, hotels/condos and employee housing at Homewood could address both community needs and returns for the developer, including generating funds for needed infrastructure improvements to the resort. More amenities for the West Shore community would create a positive feedback loop within the community and "town center" that TRPA seeks, likely reducing trips to Tahoe City.

We urge the TRPA and Placer County to hold JMA/Homewood to the plan that was developed with the community and approved in 2012. If JMA is not interested in that plan, they should seek to divest themselves of this property so that a group who wants to run a ski area and be a part of a community can take the reins.

Sincerely,
Louie Fielding
7007 Hilo Ave
Tahoma, CA 96142

From: Scott MacLeod <scottmacleod5@yahoo.com>
Sent: 1/10/2023 9:45:04 AM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>; John Marshall <jmarshall@trpa.gov>; Julie Regan <jregan@trpa.gov>
Subject: Homewood Mountain and Lake Club - Violation of Public Trust

I am disappointed and frankly angry to hear that TRPA is allowing Homewood to move forward with a plan to build a private luxury club, given that the original plans presented to the community were to build a better Homewood to serve the entire community. How can this complete 180 degree change be allowed to move forward without a full review of the impact both on the environment and the community?

Given the long-standing importance of Homewood to the Tahoe community and its unique West Shore character, this is an egregious violation of public trust. JMA originally presented - and won support from the Tahoe community - to build a public resort in keeping with the character and traditional architecture of the West Shore, a conscious choice to avoid the showy and excessive styles of many other Tahoe resorts. This new direction is a clear "bait and switch" with obviously no consideration of the local community's concerns.

In the spirit of protecting Tahoe for the long-term, TRPA should not allow this new project to move forward, certainly without requiring that any new resort be open to the public.

TRPA's strategic plan states that "collaboration means the difference between losing an irreplaceable natural resource and protecting it for generations to come." It's slogan is "We're all here for the lake." I urge you to uphold these values and protect Homewood and the West Shore for all, for generations to come.

Scott MacLeod
313 Talon St.
Homewood, CA

From: Sierra Blomquist <sierra.blomquist@icloud.com>
Sent: 1/10/2023 8:45:44 PM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>; John Marshall <jmarshall@trpa.gov>; Julie Regan <jregan@trpa.gov>
Subject: Homewood mountain resort

Dear TRPA,

I am writing to you with concern regarding the privatization of Homewood Mountain Resort. There are several reasons I believe the privatized development is not in the best interest of the community.

1. Loss of benefit to the local community: Shifting the business model from public to private with the implication that the resort will only offer a limited number of lifetime ski memberships with the elimination of day passes and general season pass sales. Homewood is a community fixture that provides an opportunity for residents of the Tahoe basin to come together in both winter and summer months to recreate. With privatization, the local community will not only be impacted by the negative environmental impacts of development, but they will not have access to what was once a place to enhance the physical and mental wellbeing of the community.

2. Lack of transparency in a shift of plans: The original project that was approved by TRPA was approved as a Community Enhancement Project - a project intended to bring benefits to the community and be open to the public. This plan was projected to bring an estimated 16 million to 20 million in visitor spending to the local community. With the shift in plans to privatize the resort, and target a small, elite clientele, how will the new plan provide community benefits, and furthermore, how can these changes be made without a new environmental analysis?

3. Negative environmental impact: Adding the proposed infrastructure could cause significant environmental impacts, including the alteration of the natural landscape, increase in water usage and a threat to the clarity of Lake Tahoe. I fear that shifting from a community based resort to a privatized model will lead to a prioritization of profit over environmental stewardship.

As a west shore resident who cares deeply about their community, I urge you to re-examine and reconsider the privatization of Homewood.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Sierra Blomquist

Sent from my iPhone

From: Sam Canino <samcanino@gmail.com>
Sent: 1/10/2023 8:36:19 AM
To: Julie Regan <jregan@trpa.gov>; John Marshall <jmarshall@trpa.gov>; Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Subject: Homewood Privatization

Hello,

I am a born and raised local that grew up skiing at Homewood. It was one of the few places that my family could afford to ski at and is a cherished place for many Tahoe locals.

It should come as no surprise then, that I am deeply concerned with and opposed to JMA Ventures Homewood Mountain Resorts plans to privatize the Homewood Ski Area.

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

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

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

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

Give the community their chance to give input on this massive change to the face of Tahoe's west shore. If indeed Homewood will one day be a private ski resort, the community should be allowed to help steer it in a way to achieve the highest good for the greatest portion of your constituency. We will remember your positions when we go to the ballot box and remember there will be far more people who will be outside the gates of JMA's ski area than inside.

Sincerely,
Sam Canino

From: Terry Randel <randelfamily@comcast.net>
Sent: 1/10/2023 12:52:22 PM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Subject: Homewood

Paul,
Please consider the residents of the West Shore BEFORE you approve the Homewood privatization! This is NOT what was planned and will create a nightmare for all that live here full time.
Please reconsider!
Thanks,
Terry Randel

From: Aaron Somer <aaronsomer@gmail.com>
Sent: 1/10/2023 2:35:23 PM
To: Jeff Cowen <jccowen@trpa.gov>; Victoria Ortiz <vortiz@trpa.gov>; John Hester <jhester@trpa.gov>; Nick Haven <nhaven@trpa.gov>; Wendy Jepson <wjepson@trpa.gov>; Kimberly Chevallier <kchevallier@trpa.gov>; Kenneth Kasman <kkasman@trpa.gov>; TRPA <trpa@trpa.gov>; Cindy Gustafson <cindygustafson@placer.ca.gov>; preserve@ntpac.org <preserve@ntpac.org>
Subject: Privatization of Homewood Mountain Resort

Dear TRPA and North Tahoe Preservation Alliance,

As a longtime Homewood skier and season pass holder, and homeowner in Tahoma, I am deeply concerned with and opposed to JMA Ventures Homewood Mountain Resorts plans to privatize the Homewood Ski Area.

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

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

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

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

I am happy to discuss this further in a professional manner.

Best Regards,

Aaron Somer
775 313 7112

From: Paul Hartman <paul-hartman@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: 1/11/2023 4:28:00 AM
To: Jeff Cowen <jcowen@trpa.gov>; Victoria Ortiz <vortiz@trpa.gov>; John Hester <jhester@trpa.gov>; Nick Haven <nhaven@trpa.gov>; Wendy Jepson <wjepson@trpa.gov>; Kimberly Chevallier <kchevallier@trpa.gov>; Kenneth Kasman <kkasman@trpa.gov>; TRPA <trpa@trpa.gov>; Cindy Gustafson <cindyg@tcpud.org>; Cindy.Gustafson <cindygustafson@placer.ca.gov>; preserve@ntpac.org <preserve@ntpac.org>; Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>; John Marshall <jmarshall@trpa.gov>; Julie Regan <jregan@trpa.gov>
Subject: Homewood Plan

Hello,
I am a resident/business owner on the West Shore, and also a longtime season pass holder at Homewood Mountain Resort.

I am very concerned with the lack of transparency surrounding the privatization of Homewood. The current project appears to be entirely different from what the community rallied around a decade ago.

Please hold JMA/Discovery accountable and force them to gain approval for the current version of their project. Our community (and regulators) must have a chance to understand this project before allowing such a fundamental change to the west shore of Lake Tahoe.

Thank you,
Paul Hartman

From: Silver Hartman <silvertree12@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: 1/11/2023 9:50:39 AM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>; John Marshall <jmarshall@trpa.gov>; Julie Regan <jregan@trpa.gov>
Subject: Privatization of Homewood Mountain Resort

To TRPA Committee Members:

Paul Nielsen
John Marshall
Julie Regan

As a longtime Homewood skier/season pass holder, and resident/homeowner of Homewood, I am greatly concerned about the protection of the community and deeply opposed to JMA Ventures' plans to privatize Homewood Mountain Resort.

The 2011, **CEQA/EIR – Homewood Mountain Resort Ski Area Master Plan (SCH # 2008092008)** (2011 Master Plan (EIR)) did not include privatization of the ski area and closure to the general public. I was a part of this planning process, as the 2011 proposed development followed the environmental review process, which included public outreach and community meetings. Had privatization been proposed, the community would never have agreed to the proposal.

Changes as significant as these need to undergo environmental analysis, public and TRPA review., permitting, etc.

This current project can not be allowed to proceed under the 2011 Master Plan (EIR) because privatization alone is a significant impact. Not to mention, review and approval of all the additional changes and associated impacts. Just considering the limited information JMA has provided, multiple inconsistencies are obvious between the 2011 Master Plan (EIR) and the proposed privatization of Homewood project. Some of the most obvious inconsistencies can be found when reading these sections of the 2011 Master Plan:

- Master Plan Vision and Goals
- Physical Plan
- Regulatory Consistency and Other Plans
- The Purpose of Homewood as stated in the EIR Introduction
- Mitigation Measures 6.0, 11, and 18
- 3.2 Project Objectives
- Section 3.5.26 Master Plan Phasing

Once JMA proposes a project, and initiates the environmental review process, then the public can respond appropriately. Until then, no permits or work should begin unless it is in direct line with the 2011 Master Plan EIR.

JMA's proposed privatization and additional significant changes to the 2011 Master Plan (EIR) must be disclosed to the public, analyzed, and approved by all permitting agencies, and regulators before this new project moves forward.

Thank you for your time and consideration,
Concerned West Shore Resident,
Silver Hartman

From: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Sent: 1/12/2023 10:44:39 AM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: FW: All Hands on Deck - Stop Ruining Tahoe for The Locals

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

From: Martha Michael Gates
Sent: Wednesday, January 11, 2023 9:31 P
To: Paul Nielsen
Subject: All Hands on Deck - Stop Ruining Tahoe for The Locals

Dear Paul Nielsen:

I write to you as someone who has owned a small house in Tahoma since 1998 and as someone who is extremely disappointed and concerned that the TRPA is playing a part in allowing Homewood to turn private. Having myself faced onerous obligations from TRPA and the County for any effort to improve our home, and having watched the TRPA allow the development drive up the costs of ownership in the area making it impossible for locals to buy or even rent anymore, I say it is time for TRPA to recognize that allowing the Homewood Resort to become a private ski area for the rich is antithetical to all that an organization like TRPA should stand for in the community. While progress and change are always part of the cycle, to allow the privatization of a ski resort is simply a failure of TRPA and Placer County to do their jobs to balance progress with destruction of the Tahoe life. This has no benefits for those who have made Tahoe their home for decades. The impacts from the recent assault on Tahoe, the communities and the environment by those who decided to live there when they were able to work remotely during COVID is still evident. Tahoe and its mountains and water should remain accessible to all. Please do not support this effort.

Thank you

Martha Gates
369 Grizzly

From: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Sent: 1/12/2023 10:45:37 AM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: FW: Homewood Mountain Resort - Public Comment Regarding Privatization

From: Bill <bill.anson@duralum.com>
Sent: Wednesday, January 11, 2023 12:47 PM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>; John Marshall <jmarshall@trpa.gov>; Julie Regan <jregan@trpa.gov>
Cc: Cheryl Anson <cheryl@duralum.com>
Subject: Homewood Mountain Resort - Public Comment Regarding Privatization

Members of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency,

Once again, those of us who live, own property, pay property taxes to support schools and roads, support local jobs through purchases and work together to make the West Shore Community unique, are being hoodwinked by a large corporation working with TRPA.

This "bait and switch" regards the current plans for the Homewood Mountain Resort. Community residents are left out in the cold, left out in no where.

No where in the original approval was privatization mentioned or recommended.
No where in the original approval was to intent to lock out the local community from using or enjoying "the historic resort".
No where in the approval was privatization used as the methodology for "updating an aging infrastructure".
No where in the approval is there an explanation of how privatization will meet the requirement that Homewood "can be enjoyed equally by local residents and visitors".
No where are the required approvals for this serious diversion from what was originally approved by the community and TRPA.

Although we understand how Homewood has been impacted by traffic congestion cutting off the flow to Homewood past Squaw and Alpine and the declining quality of skiing as temperatures rise, taking the resort private and alienating the community is not the way to solve the problems Homewood faces.

The Tahoe Basin is becoming one large Air-B-N-B, pushing out all the old communities and way of life. No one lives here anymore. Short term rentals abound. Every visitor expects services but does nothing for affordable housing. Roads are clogged with traffic polluting the air and hampering 1st responders. Visitors have no "ownership" and show it by leaving piles of trash for local groups who care about the Lake to clean up when they leave.

Privatizing an historic part of Lake Tahoe will continue to promote this absentee usage by a group of well-healed uncommitted visitors. Yes these "members" will spend money, yes that money will create jobs, but where will those workers live? Where will they eat out? Where will they ski? Where will be a "community"?

If supported, TRPA sends a continuing message that they are interested in deemphasizing the importance of Tahoe communities over development.

We urge you, the members of TRPA, to stop the project as it is currently moving forward and insist that JMA meet the original guidelines under the established approval. Pending that, remove all support and submit the privatization plan to permitting, TRPA Approval and public comment.

Sincerely,
Bill & Cheryl Anson

From: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Sent: 1/12/2023 10:44:50 AM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: FW: Homewood Mountain Resort

From: Kelly Helgans <kellhel@me.com>
Sent: Wednesday, January 11, 2023 9:27 PM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>; John Marshall <jmarshall@trpa.gov>; Julie Regan <jregan@trpa.gov>
Cc: Jeff Cowen <jcowen@trpa.gov>; Victoria Ortiz <vortiz@trpa.gov>; John Hester <jhester@trpa.gov>; Nick Haven <nhaven@trpa.gov>; Wendy Jepson <wjepson@trpa.gov>; Kimberly Chevallier <kchevallier@trpa.gov>; Kenneth Kasman <kkasman@trpa.gov>; TRPA <trpa@trpa.gov>; Cindy Gustafson <cindygustafson@placer.ca.gov>; preserve@ntpac.org
Subject: Homewood Mountain Resort

Dear TRPA Committee Members,

As a longtime Homewood skier, season pass holder, and homeowner in Tahoma, I am very concerned with and opposed to JMA Ventures Homewood Mountain Resorts plans to privatize the Homewood Ski Area.

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

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

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

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

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Best Regards,

Kelly Helgans
530 386 7306

From: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Sent: 1/12/2023 4:13:12 PM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: FW: Keep Homewood Accessible

From: Ryan Cobb <ryan.w.cobb@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, January 9, 2023 1:21 PM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Subject: Keep Homewood Accessible

Dear Mr. Nielsen,

My name is Ryan Cobb, and my family and I have enjoyed Lake Tahoe for generations (dating back to the late 1800s). In fact, my great grandfather drove a stage around the east shore of the lake from Virginia City. We have all benefited from the access to the jewel of the Sierra and hope it continues for many generations to come.

Unfortunately, the new project at Homewood would preclude my children and theirs from enjoying one of the most unique ski and recreation areas in the world. In these days of privatization, I hope that you would stand against the request to close off once public areas and make it available to only a privileged few.

Please keep Tahoe blue and open to us all.

Thank you,
Ryan Cobb

From: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Sent: 1/12/2023 4:07:29 PM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: FW: Objection to Privatization of Homewood

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

From: Lisa Perrella
Sent: Monday, January 9, 2023 12:58 PM
To: Paul Nielsen ; John Marshall ; Julie Regan
Subject: Objection to Privatization of Homewood

Dear TRPA,

I am writing to you with concern regarding the privatization of Homewood Mountain Resort. There are several reasons I believe the development is not in the best interest of the community.

1. Loss of benefit to the local community: Shifting the business model from public to private with the implication that the resort will only offer a limited number of lifetime ski memberships with the elimination of day passes and general season pass sales. Homewood is a community fixture that provides an opportunity for residents of the Tahoe basin to come together in both winter and summer months to recreate. With privatization, the local community will not only be impacted by the negative environmental impacts of development, but they will not have access to what was once a place to enhance the physical and mental wellbeing of the community.

2. Lack of transparency in a shift of plans: The original project that was approved by TRPA was approved as a Community Enhancement Project - a project intended to bring benefits to the community and be open to the public. This plan was projected to bring an estimated 16 million to 20 million in visitor spending to the local community. With the shift in plans to privatize the resort, and target a small, elite clientele, how will the new plan provide community benefits, and furthermore, how can these changes be made without a new environmental analysis?

3. Negative environmental impact: Adding the proposed infrastructure could cause significant environmental impacts, including the alteration of the natural landscape, increase in water usage and a threat to the clarity of Lake Tahoe. I fear that shifting from a community based resort to a privatized model will lead to a prioritization of profit over environmental stewardship.

As a west shore resident who cares deeply about their community, I urge you to consider these negative impacts and reject the proposal for the privatization of Homewood.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,
Lisa Perrella
870 Grand Ave.
Homewood, CA 96141

From: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Sent: 1/12/2023 4:13:50 PM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: FW: Opposition of Homewood Privatization

From: Bailey Finegold <baileyafinegold@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, January 9, 2023 1:29 PM
To: John Marshall <jmarshall@trpa.gov>; Julie Regan <jregan@trpa.gov>; Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Subject: Opposition of Homewood Privatization

Dear TRPA,

I am writing to you with concern regarding the privatization of Homewood Mountain Resort. There are several reasons I believe the development is not in the best interest of the community.

1. Loss of benefit to the local community: Shifting the business model from public to private with the implication that the resort will only offer a limited number of lifetime ski memberships with the elimination of day passes and general season pass sales. Homewood is a community fixture that provides an opportunity for residents of the Tahoe basin to come together in both winter and summer months to recreate. With privatization, the local community will not only be impacted by the negative environmental impacts of development, but they will not have access to what was once a place to enhance the physical and mental wellbeing of the community.
2. Lack of transparency in a shift of plans: The original project that was approved by TRPA was approved as a Community Enhancement Project - a project intended to bring benefits to the community and be open to the public. This plan was projected to bring an estimated 16 million to 20 million in visitor spending to the local community. With the shift in plans to privatize the resort, and target a small, elite clientele, how will the new plan provide community benefits, and furthermore, how can these changes be made without a new environmental analysis?
3. Negative environmental impact: Adding the proposed infrastructure could cause significant environmental impacts, including the alteration of the natural landscape, increase in water usage and a threat to the clarity of Lake Tahoe. I fear that shifting from a community based resort to a privatized model will lead to a prioritization of profit over environmental stewardship.

As a west shore resident who cares deeply about their community, I urge you to consider these negative impacts and reject the proposal for the privatization of Homewood.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,
Bailey Finegold

From: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Sent: 1/12/2023 4:12:27 PM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: FW: Public Comment Regarding Privatization of Homewood Ski Area

From: Allyson Schreiber <abaccagl@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, January 9, 2023 1:13 PM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>; John Marshall <jmarshall@trpa.gov>; Julie Regan <jregan@trpa.gov>
Subject: Public Comment Regarding Privatization of Homewood Ski Area

Dear TRPA Committee Members,

I am a homeowner and long time resident of Tahoma. Our home is less than 2 miles away from Homewood Ski Resort. We are raising three children in the community and are long time Homewood Season Pass holders. My husband runs a local custom home company, and we are involved community members.

We are deeply concerned and opposed to the plans to privatize the Homewood Ski Resort. All of our 3 children took their first ski runs at Homewood. We consider it our backyard, and it is one of our favorite places to spend time together as a family in the winter months. On any given day at Homewood, while we are out skiing, we will run into multiple long time friends and neighbors. No other ski resort in the North Tahoe area has the same local community feel. It is a treasure.

We were a part of the TRPA approval meetings back in 2011 when changes for the development of the ski area were presented to the local community. I stood up and spoke in support of the development, as the local community viewed it as a necessary means to keep Homewood as a place we could all enjoy for years to come. The ski area obviously needs updating and maintenance. We viewed the original development as a means to build up the west shore community, giving us a beautiful place to keep skiing that was just down the street, an ice rink where we could spend time, and even a pool that the public would be able to access. JMA was promising to do all this in an environmentally responsible way that would minimally impact the community. These are the reasons I spoke up in favor the development. Our west shore community needed to be strengthened and supported, and it seemed that this was one way we could accomplish that while making needed upgrades to our favorite ski area.

The changes and developments proposed in 2011 did NOT include privatization of the ski area and closure to the general public. This seems like a horrible “bait and switch” tactic, and as a local community member I am enraged and deeply saddened. I would never have spoken up in support of the development if this had been proposed. Our community would NEVER have agreed to the proposal, and I don’t believe it would have been approved. Instead of bringing the west shore community together, the privatization of Homewood will have the opposite effect. The social and economic impacts of the new proposal would be disastrous to our local community. It would take one of the gems of the west shore, one of the reasons that many of us chose to live here, and completely cut off our access, putting it into the hands of wealthy people, many of whom would not call Tahoe home or live here full time. The whole purpose of a “private resort” seems to be to separate themselves, and I can’t envision any way that this would benefit the local community. We will do everything we can to protect our access to what we see as “the heart of the west shore” community.

This project should not be allowed under the previous approval as it is significantly different in its purpose and the impacts it will have on the local community. I urge you to reconsider and withdraw the previous approval. This is a completely different project than what was proposed in 2011 and should require a new permit application. I also urge you to listen to voices of the west shore community. This would be a tremendous change to the west shore and the voices of the people who live here should be heard.

Thank you for your consideration,
Allyson Schreiber

From: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Sent: 1/12/2023 4:09:46 PM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: FW: Ski Homewood Project

From: Chris Bauer <cl.bauer@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, January 9, 2023 1:08 PM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>
Subject: Ski Homewood Project

Paul Nielsen
TRPA Special Project Manager

RE: JMA Revised Plan for Ski Homewood Resort

Dear Paul,

We strongly recommend that JMA be required to open a new permit process for the development of the Ski Homewood Project.

The Project Plan proposed and approved in December 2011 has very little resemblance to the new plan proposed by JMA. A full review and public comment process is warranted.

The 2011 Plan was very community oriented - local grocery, Hardware store, Community ice skating, summer music concerts. The new plan is anything but. The new plan being marketed by JMA and Discovery Land is for a private community and privatizing Ski Homewood, which has been an important part of the West Lake Tahoe Community for over 60 years. JMA and Discovery Land have been arrogantly marketing that TRPA has already granted approval of the new private community. At a presentation to the Chamberlands Beach & Mountain Club, Mr. Chapman of JMA stated that as long as the approved number of housing units didn't increase, they could make any changes they wanted to the development. The newly proposed modern architecture is significantly different than the mountain lodge design approved in 2011.

Financial viability of a private luxury condominium community 100 feet off Highway 89 is questionable. What happens when construction begins yet buyers never materialize, leaving a scarred and abandoned eye sore on the West Shore? Any review and approval of these new plans needs to include both environmental impact and financial feasibility of a private ski hill. How can 200 homeowners afford the maintenance and operation of a private lift operation when JMA claims the current publicly available operation is unfeasible. Does JMA really intend to complete the development? What are the timelines for the various phases? Should JMA be required to escrow funds so that construction is not left in an unfinished state?

Please open a full new review of this project. The development, the economy and the Tahoe Basin environment is significantly different in 2023 than 2011.

Sincerely
Christine and E Gregory Bauer
5700 Sacramento Ave Homewood since 1983
925 998-2408
cl.bauer@yahoo.com

From: Cory Allison <corymarie@gmail.com>
Sent: 1/12/2023 5:13:12 PM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: Homewood Resort

Hello,
I would like to add my name to the list to receive any email updates regarding the Homewood Resort project.

Thanks!
Cory Allison
Homewood, CA

From: Patti Doherty <pattidoherty1@comcast.net>
Sent: 1/12/2023 4:53:55 PM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: Homewood Resort

Hello,

My family and I have been long time Tahoma homeowners. We have spent easily 40 years coming to the West Shore to enjoy everything that it has to offer. My children learned to ski at the Homewood Ski Resort; so family friendly. I would argue that it has the most beautiful views of all Lake Tahoe better than any other ski resort surrounding the Lake. It is a great place for family to gather and appreciate such breathtaking beauty. But now however, the new development that is proposed to “privatize” the mountain means that families like mine will never be able to experience this magnificent mountain. We will be unwelcomed and turned away. Is it in the best interest of anyone to deny access to Homewood resort so that a few privileged skiers can call it their own? . Where is the benefit to the community ? It is too big a resource to limit its access to a precious few who can pay its exorbitant price.

The resort has fallen into disrepair over the last years. It has virtually been abandoned by the owners who have done the bare minimum to maintain its operations and have done nothing to update or implement any improvements to make the resort more profitable or a place you would want to come to. The current problems they are experiencing are of their own doing. Or in this case their lack of doing.

Don't let Homewood put out the Not Welcome to sign to our community. Keep it available to all. Stop privatization.

Thank you for reading this,

Patti Doherty

From: Doug Flaherty <tahoesierracleanair@gmail.com>
Sent: 1/12/2023 4:31:07 PM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: Request to Be Notified - Homewood Plan

Please place me on a list of interested entities/persons to be notified of any public meetings or requests for public comments connected with the "Homewood Plan".

Sincerely,

Doug Flaherty, President
Tahoe Sierra Clean Air Coalition (DBA TahoeCleanAir.org)
A Nevada 501(c)(3) Non-Profit Corporation

774 Mays Blvd 10-124

Incline Village, NV 89451

TahoeCleanAir.org Organizational Purpose

Tahoe Sierra Clean Air Coalition (DBA TahoeCleanAir.Org) is a Nevada 501 (c) (3) non-profit corporation registered to do business in the State of California. Our organizational purpose extends beyond protecting clean air. and includes, among other purposes, protecting and preserving natural resources, including but not limited to clean air, clean water, including lake and stream clarity, soils, plants and vegetation, wildlife and wildlife habitat including wildlife corridors, fish and fish habitat, birds and bird migration, insects, forest and wilderness from adverse environmental impacts and the threat and potential of adverse environmental impacts, including cumulative adverse impacts, within the Nevada and California Sierra Range, and its foothill communities, with corporation/organization geographical purpose priority being that of the Lake Tahoe Basin. Our purpose further extends to all things incidental to supporting environmental impact assessments and studies, including the gathering of data necessary to analyze the cumulative adverse environmental, health and safety impacts from public and private projects inside and outside the Lake Tahoe Basin, and addressing and supporting safe and effective evacuation during wildfire. Our purpose further extends to supporting transparency in government to ensure that our purpose and all things incidental to our specific and primary purposes are achieved.

D

From: Jeff Berglund <tahobie3@gmail.com>
Sent: 1/13/2023 8:50:27 AM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: [BULK]

Thanks for your email and the status of our mountain and community. Rumors have been flying, but hearing it from you, will calm them down. Keep us posted.

From: Mary Silverman <mfsilverman2@gmail.com>
Sent: 1/13/2023 2:28:30 PM
To: HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: Homewood privation project

Dear TRPA

As a 20 yr home owner on the West Shore and Californian who has enjoyed the natural blessings of Lake Tahoe, skied many times at Homewood resort , I find it appalling that any consideration is given to extract one of the Sierra ski facilities and allow JMA and their partners to privatize Homewood Ski Resort.

While JMA owns the land , it's the public infrastructure paid by taxpayers that enables the resort to function and derive revenues even if privatized. This is not what the JMA sold to the public during the approval process and needs to be backed up and resubmitted for approval.

To allow JMA to steal away half century public facilities will forever stain the true intention of the TRPA and livability of the West Shore communities and the entire Tahoe basin. Please do not let this happen.

Sincerely
Mary Silverman
mfsilverman2@gmail.com

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

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

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

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

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

Dear Paul –

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

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you for your consideration.

Gayle Pigatto

670 Sierra Vista Ave, Homewood

--

Gayle Pigatto

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

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

Hi Mr. Paul Neilson,

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

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

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

Thank you for your time and consideration.

-Monica

--

Monica Ryan, Esq.
Sr. Counsel, Visa

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

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

Thank you for your attention to this important matter.

Sincerely,

Sally Grassi

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

Hello,

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

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

Sincerely,
Greg Fibiger

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

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

Dear Mr Nielsen

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

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

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

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

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

Very truly yours

Dennis E. Kuzak
410 Sunnyview Dr, Tahoma
dekuzak@gmail.com

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

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

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

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

Sent from my iPhone

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

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

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

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

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

To Paul Nielsen, Special Projects Manager - TRPA,

Hello Mr Nielsen,

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

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

Thanks for ALL you do!

Brook Reed

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

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

Pete Uehlin
7091 Ninth Ave.
Tahoma

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

Dear Mr Chapman,

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

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

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

Sincerely

Richard and Jane Hokanson

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Best regards,

Art Chapman

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

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

A couple of questions:

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

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

- Tim

Tim Angst

415-244-8252

timangst@sbcglobal.net

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

Dear Mr. Angst,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Best regards,

Art Chapman

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

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

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

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

Dear Mr Chapman,

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

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

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

Sincerely

Richard and Jane Hokanson

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Best regards,

Art Chapman

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

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

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

Andrew Bowdle
GaviaLabs.com

Sent from Proton Mail for iOS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Best regards,

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

First of all how did you get my email address?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Dear Mr. Chapman,

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

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

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

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

Your below email contains many false assumptions and poor arguments.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Best Regards,
Allyson Schreiber

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

Dear Ms. Schreiber,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Best regards,

Art Chapman

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

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

A couple of questions:

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

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

- Tim

Tim Angst

415-244-8252

timangst@sbcglobal.net

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

Dear Mr. Angst,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Best regards,

Art Chapman

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,
Deanne Bostrom

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

Dear TRPA and PCBD Committee Members,

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,
Tim Albinson
Homewood Resident and Homeowner

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

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

Dear Mr. Chapman,

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

Let me elaborate:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Regards,

Jim Lyon
Chamberlands

cc. TRPA
cc. Placer County Planning Department

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

Dear Mr. Lyon,

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

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

During the last 10 years, we have seen the advent of the new Ikon and Epic super ski passes which involve the annual sale of hundreds of thousands of passes that are interchangeable at mountains throughout North America. Not only cannot small, commuter-oriented ski areas compete with these two industry giants, in the case of Homewood, it is difficult to even get to the ski area on a holiday or weekend as masses are drawn to resorts that participate in these pass products. From Truckee and the I-80 freeway exit, what normally is a 40-minute ride typically takes over 1 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: Kathleen Annice <katannice@gmail.com>
Sent: 1/27/2023 10:50:11 AM
To: Paul Nielsen <pnielsen@trpa.gov>; Jeff Cowen <jcowen@trpa.gov>; HomewoodPlan <homewoodplan@trpa.gov>
Subject: Homewood Mountain Resort - Noticing Lists of Interested Parties

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

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

To whom it may concern:

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

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

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

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

Thank you for your time,

Darren

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

Kevin M. McGuire
President CEO
License #: 0651143



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

*******NOTE*******

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

Kevin M. McGuire

1501 Warrington Road

Santa Rosa, CA 95404

707-321-2277

kevinm@QuieTrack.com

January 24, 2023

Dear TRPA,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely



Kevin M. McGuire

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,
Evonne Revitt
Homeowner
Chamberlands

Sent from my iPhone

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

Sent from my iPhone
Lou Parrague
510-551-9666

Begin forwarded message:

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

Good day,

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

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

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

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

Kindly stand up and do the same.

Lou Parrague

Sent from my iPhone
Lou Parrague
510-551-9666

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

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you

Kerri Gilbert
West Shore Homeowner

Sent from my iPhone

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

Dear Paul Nielsen,

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

Jo Ellen Green Kaiser
6220 Lark Drive
Homewood CA

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

Dear Sir or Madam,

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

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

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

--David Purves

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

Dear Paul,

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

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

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

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

Thank you for your consideration and time.
Sincerely,
Carolyn and Michael Selig
445 Snowbird Loop
Homewood, California

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

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

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

Andrew Bowdle

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

TRPA -

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

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

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

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

Kevin Foster

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

Hi,

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

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

I urge you to reject the new proposal.

Thanks.

John Strain
John.f.strain@gmail.com

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

To TRPA and Placer County

For over 50 years I have enjoyed Tahoe Ski Bowl and Homewood Mountain Resort. I have many concerns with the proposed JMA JMA along with Discovery Land and Mohari have contracted to propose a remodeling of Homewood Mountain Resort which directly contradicts the 2011 plan provided to the public by the TRPA with the stated purpose of
“Improving the access and experience for locals and tourists”
They have done this “bait and switch” without public input with the goal of actually excluding locals and tourists.
Aside from the stress on an already crowded West Shore Blvd, the increased traffic not withstanding new shuttles, electric cars or water taxis would be detrimental to West Shore longtime residents and tourists. As well, locals and tourists meant to benefit from the approved 2011 plan would now be universally excluded from Homewood Mountain Resort usage.
Respectfully I ask that the same public impact opinions considered in 2011 be allowed to factor into the 2022 plan. Much planning and activity have been obscured from public access and knowledge. I ask the TRPA to reject any application by Homewood Mountain Resort (HMR) to take the ski area private. Losing HMR to an elitist exclusive entity akin to the Yellowstone Club in Montana would be a tragedy and an affront to the history and culture of Lake Tahoe’s West Shore community.
Respectfully,
Sheila Newton

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

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

Dear TRPA,

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

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

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

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

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

Thanks for your consideration,

Rich Singer

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

Hello,

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

A few significant issues:

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

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

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

Thank you for your time and attention,

Rachel Bowdle

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

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

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

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

Penelope & William Brown

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

To the TRPA,

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

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

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

Appreciate your consideration of this request.

Very Truly Yours,
Todd Mercer
Homewood, CA

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

To the TRPA -

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

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

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

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

Appreciate your consideration of this request.

Best,
Heidi Mercer Melin
3220 Ann Rd
Homewood, CA

Sent from my iPhone

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

TRPA and Placer County,

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

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

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

Lover of Homewood,
Eileen Wee
6285 Lark Dr.

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

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

Thank you for being guardians of the Tahoe basin.

Steve & Donna Becker
6170 Chamberland Dr
Homewood

March 31, 2022

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

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

Dear Placer County and TRPA:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

Steve and Donna Becker
6170 Chamberland Dr/Homewood

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

To Whom it May Concern:

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

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

Paula Mix

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

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

Please reconsider supporting this revolting revision and exclusionary vision.

Frank P. Kelly
frankpkelly3@gmail.com

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

To whom it may concern,

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

Sincerely,
Julie Thomas (granddaughter of Ed Ransom)

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

Ladies and gentlemen;

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

Cecilia Siino
Homewood owner

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

To whom it may concern,

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

Please Do Not Approve the changes that have been requested.

Kevin and Nancy Cooper
395 Elizabeth Drive
Homewood, CA 96141

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

Dear Placer County officials:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you for your time,

Patrice Murphy
460 Chukar Circle
Homewood, CA

Sent from my iPad

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

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

Andrea Mccausland
Chamberlains homeowner

Sent from my iPhone

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

Hello,

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

Kevin Kelker
555 Grouse Drive
Homewood

Sent from my Verizon, Samsung Galaxy smartphone