Be Prepared

to STOP:

Tahoe Traffic and Squaw Valley Development

JANUARY 2018
# Be Prepared to STOP: Tahoe Traffic and Squaw Valley Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mega-Development: The Plan to Remake Squaw Valley</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tahoe Traffic Today</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuzzy Math: Downplaying Development Impacts</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Squaw Traffic and Tahoe Clarity</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning for Disaster</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driving Climate Change</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finding Solutions to Tahoe’s Traffic Woes</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusion</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endnotes</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Researched compiled and prepared by:

Elizabeth Stampe
Isaac Silverman
Tom Mooers
Introduction

The *Sacramento Bee* called it Northern California’s “biggest traffic jam.”¹ And it’s not the Bay Area. It’s not Sacramento or Silicon Valley.

**Northern California’s biggest traffic jam is Tahoe.**

And, if new development proposed for Squaw Valley is allowed to move forward, “biggest” would even get bigger; Tahoe traffic would get even worse.

Denver-based KSL Capital Partners proposes to remake the region with development of a size, scale, and scope Tahoe has never seen. It would include acres of high-rises with 1,493 new bedrooms—as many as three of South Lake Tahoe’s Stateline casinos combined. The project would be so big, it would take 30 years of construction to complete. The biggest building would be a massive 90,000-square-foot indoor waterpark, standing 96 feet high—the same floor area as a WalMart, but far taller—with indoor water slides, fake rivers, and video arcades.

**Tahoe traffic** is already notoriously bad. This development would make it far worse. The county’s transportation consultants estimate that it would add 3,300 car trips a day to the surrounding roads.³ And, as detailed in this report, their estimates tell only about half the story.

**Tahoe traffic** is more than a nuisance. Tahoe traffic diminishes the legacy of the Lake Tahoe experience, passed down from previous generations, by keeping families stuck in their cars instead of enjoying the great outdoors.

**Tahoe traffic** threatens public safety by restricting the ability of police and fire to respond to emergencies—and making it impossible to evacuate the public in the event of wildfire.

**Tahoe traffic** clogs local communities and undercuts small businesses that rely on a positive visitor experience.

And **Tahoe traffic** directly contributes the pollutants that are destroying the region’s most fundamental resource: the famous clarity of Lake Tahoe.

The purpose of this report is to quantify and demonstrate the extent to which new development in Squaw Valley would exacerbate Tahoe’s unacceptable traffic mess. We have researched and written this report in the firm belief that the first step in solving a problem is to stop making it worse—and with the shared hope that we can work together to plan a better future for the entire region. *Tahoe deserves no less.*
Mega-Development: The Plan to Remake Squaw Valley

KSL Capital Partners, a Colorado-based private equity firm, bought famed Tahoe ski mountain Squaw Valley in 2010 and, then, Alpine Meadows in 2011, citing the properties' “great growth potential.”

In 2015, the company released its final proposed development plan, asking Placer County for 30 years' worth of entitlements to transform Tahoe with a project of a size, scale, and scope the region has never seen.

New development would include:

- A 90,000-square-foot indoor water park that KSL calls a “Mountain Adventure Camp,” standing 96 feet tall with rides and attractions including indoor waterslides artificial rivers, indoor water-skiing, indoor sky-diving, video arcades, and a 30-lane bowling complex;

- Acres of high-rise condo hotels, many eight stories tall, containing 1,493 new rooms—as many bedrooms as three of South Lake Tahoe’s Stateline casinos combined—over an area greater than six city blocks;

- Commercial development totaling 300,000 square feet, three times the current commercial area and enough to build a mall covering more than five football fields; and

- 21 timeshare mansions on undeveloped land at the mouth of Shirley Canyon.

Throughout the planning process, local residents, small business owners, state agencies, and conservation non-profits sought to understand: what would all this development do to Tahoe traffic?
Tahoe Traffic Today

The first step to solving any problem is to establish an objective diagnosis of existing conditions. And current conditions are a mess.

Tahoe traffic even made the Weather Channel’s America’s Top 10 Most Congested Roads for Thanksgiving travel.¹⁵

The problem is a function of popularity, infrastructure, and geography. Squaw Valley (also known as Olympic Valley) is located in the Sierra Nevada northwest of Lake Tahoe. It’s a mountain canyon that is, in terms of traffic flow, a cul-de-sac. There’s only one way in and out of the valley: Squaw Valley Road.

Squaw Valley Road begins at a signaled intersection with Highway 89, which runs north-south between Truckee and Tahoe City. Just as Squaw Valley Road is the only way to get into Squaw Valley, Highway 89 is the only way to get to Squaw Valley Road.

With just one way in and one way out, there are no shortcuts or alternative routes to circumvent traffic; everyone is stuck.

It’s important to note that there are no viable options to widen the highway and increase capacity on that lone route. Simply put, we can’t pave our way out of Squaw traffic. The highway is hemmed in by the Truckee River and steep terrain, and, even if construction were possible, added capacity in a limited stretch would only shift the gridlock further down the road, creating new traffic problems for the Tahoe Basin and adding more pollution to the lake.

The winter of 2016-17 brought record snowfall—and, according to the Sacramento Bee, the worst traffic in Northern California.¹⁶ Would-be skiers found themselves stuck in gridlock—backed up all the way onto Interstate 80.

The fifteen mile trip on Highway 89—usually a 20-minute drive from Truckee to Tahoe City—often took hours. Tourists could not reach their destinations. Parents were stuck and unable to pick up their kids. Employees couldn’t make it to work.
The response from County officials, unfortunately, was denial. As part of the review of KSL’s proposed development, they claimed that the trip from Truckee to Squaw Valley Road on the busiest winter mornings takes only 10½ minutes.

Summer, as any local resident or Tahoe visitor knows, is no better. Traffic during the summer season is so bad that, according to Captain Ryan Stonebraker, the local California Highway Patrol is better off patrolling North Tahoe on bikes.

“A bicycle,” says Stonebraker, “is the only thing that can get around.”

**Fuzzy Math: Downplaying Development Impacts**

As part of the public planning process, state law requires Placer County to both establish a baseline of existing conditions and project future conditions if KSL’s development were to be approved and constructed. Unfortunately, the County failed on both counts and, instead, offered the public a dangerous combination of denial and dismissiveness.

For example, at the heart of the public planning process for any proposed project is the Environmental Impact Report (EIR), designed to let the public and decision-makers understand the development’s potential impacts. The EIR for KSL’s proposal does include some scary numbers, projecting that:

- In winter, KSL’s development would add 2,437 cars to the existing gridlock on average winter Saturdays.
- Summer would be worse—KSL’s new development would add 3,300 new daily car trips on a typical summer Friday.

But those totals are the result of misleading methodologies and fuzzy math; they deeply underestimate the staggering amount of traffic KSL’s project would generate.

The projection of 3,300 new daily car trips on average busy summer days was derived by measuring trips generated by a hotel in South Lake Tahoe on Friday, August 14. Traffic on August 14 in Tahoe can be bad. But it’s not likely to be one of the busiest summer days. Most schools in California are back in session by then; summer vacation is over. In the case of South Lake Tahoe, for example, the public schools in El Dorado, Washoe, and Douglas Counties returned to class on August 10.
Interestingly, an earlier version of the EIR may have been more realistic, estimating that the project would add 8,410 vehicles a day on peak summer season days. But that estimate was removed from subsequent documents.

The County’s analysis of summer visits to the indoor waterpark is especially puzzling; it somehow projects few daily drivers to the waterpark—1,067 guests per day in July, and a scant 138 car trips. The project’s EIR claims, incredibly, that the massive indoor water park, designed to draw 300,000 visitors annually, would generate only 19 trips during its busiest hour of operation. The math begs a question: why build it, if no one will come?

Beyond local Tahoe traffic, the artery from the Bay Area and Sacramento to Tahoe, I-80, is also already clogged. On busy weekends now, I-80 piles up with traffic waiting to turn onto Highway 89 to reach Squaw and other destinations.

The development’s Final Environmental Impact Report claims that the massive indoor water park, designed to draw over 300,000 visitors per year, would generate only 19 trips during the busiest hour of operation.

But the EIR dismisses the idea that the project would have an impact on I-80, a throughway of national importance, even though an early draft projected the development would add up to 5,130 new cars per day to I-80 and its ramps.

The final version of the EIR did add an estimate of the project’s traffic impacts on I-80, but the numbers are perplexingly low. For example, on peak winter Sundays in afternoon/evening traffic, as skiers head home from the mountains to the Bay Area, the final EIR claims that the project would add only 62 cars going west. Given that the draft EIR initially said that project would add more than 5,000 cars a day on I-80 alone, a peak-afternoon number of just 62 more cars seems to bear no relation to the project’s other traffic estimates—or to reality.
In spite of all the obfuscation, there are some moments of clarity in the EIR. For example, the County admits the proposed development would result in severe, unavoidable traffic congestion on the roads and intersections leading to Squaw Valley and that the new traffic mess would violate Placer County General Plan standards.

The County’s General Plan requires that roads function—barely—at “Level of Service” (LOS) D—a notch above failure. The Squaw EIR, however, predicts that new development would actually push local roads and intersections down to the lowest possible rating, LOS F: Failure.

The response from KSL and the County? They did not act to limit the development and lessen its impacts. Instead, the County lowered its standards. They simply moved the bar lower—all the way down to the ground—and created a new policy: LOS F is acceptable, and fail is the new pass.

This approach has far-reaching implications. Not only would KSL’s project be allowed to fail, all future projects in Squaw Valley would as well. Neither the County nor developers would ever be required to plan around or mitigate traffic in this area again, as these roads would already be failing—gridlocked—and that would be acceptable.
Squaw Traffic and Tahoe Clarity

In spite of persistent efforts to downplay the impacts, it’s clear that KSL’s Squaw Valley development would make Tahoe traffic much worse. And in Tahoe, all those new daily car trips are more than a nuisance; they are a direct threat to the most fundamental value of the entire region: the clarity of the lake itself.26

Much of that new traffic—1,353 cars per day—would head, slowly but surely, to the lake.26 Once in the Basin, those cars would contribute the pollutants that are clouding Tahoe.

Lake Tahoe is special. State and federal planning laws are designed to protect the lake’s unique values—especially its remarkable clarity. In the words of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, “In addition to being a scenic and ecological treasure, the Lake Tahoe watershed is one of the outstanding recreational resources of the United States. It is recognized nationally and globally as a natural resource of special significance, and the lake is designated an ‘Outstanding National Resource Water’ under the Clean Water Act.”27

The multi-generational battle to “Keep Tahoe Blue” is far from won.

Each year, scientists measure the lake’s clarity by lowering a “Secchi disk” into the water and noting the depth at which it can no longer be seen. In 1968, the waters of Tahoe were so clear that they could still see the disk more than 100 feet below the surface. Over time, however, much of the lake’s clarity has been lost. In recent years, the average visible depth has been 69 feet, and in 2016, it was only 56 feet.28

The lake’s clarity isn’t just cosmetic. It’s “a critically important indicator of Lake Tahoe’s ecological health,” according to a new report on efforts to reduce the lake’s pollution.29 For Tahoe’s tourist economy, it’s the region’s greatest attraction.

What’s causing Lake Tahoe’s loss of clarity? In large part: cars30

Lake Tahoe is ringed by roads. The more cars that drive on these roads, the more pollution they make. Pieces of asphalt and the sand used to increase road traction—and even pieces of tires—are ground by traffic into tiny particles, carried to the lake by rain and melting snow.31,32 These particles are so small that rather than sinking, they remain suspended, clouding the water. The more cars drive the
roads, the more particles are created, the finer they become—and the more the lake is polluted. This is how the lake’s famed clarity is steadily lost.

While road runoff is a primary driver in reducing the lake’s clarity, the lake is also being clouded with algae, literally fed by pollution from traffic. Tailpipe emissions are the primary source of nitrogen pollution, which settles in the lake, and road runoff pours phosphorus into the water, providing the nutrients that fuel the overgrowth of floating algae. Compounding this, climate change is making the lake warmer and more vulnerable to these algae blooms.

Protecting Lake Tahoe—and reversing the loss of clarity—is the task of the Tahoe Regional Planning Association (TRPA), a bi-state agency that governs the Tahoe Basin (the lake and its watershed). The agency was created in the late 1960s as a direct result of public outcry over a plan to urbanize Tahoe and circle the lake with freeways. The agency’s mission is to “preserve, restore, and enhance” the environment around the lake, and to do this, it adopts goals for environmental measures such as water and air quality.

One critical measure TRPA uses for air quality—which also relates closely to water quality, as described below—is Vehicle Miles Travelled (VMT). It’s a simple total of car travel on Tahoe’s roads. VMT is also used to set climate goals to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

TRPA has a long-standing goal, or “threshold,” that calls for reducing VMT to 10% below 1981 levels, or 2,067,600. This is the cumulative VMT threshold for the entire region—all the driving that results from all the existing and planned projects in the entire Tahoe Basin. The current VMT, set in 2010, is 1,984,600. That means that only 83,000 VMT remain before the threshold is reached for the entire basin.

Proposed development in Squaw Valley would push traffic a lot closer to the limit. The KSL project’s EIR calculates that it would generate 23,842 VMT in the Tahoe Basin in summer peak conditions, and it concludes that adding this to the current 1,984,600 level would still keep the total below the threshold.

However, with only 83,000 VMT remaining before the cumulative threshold is reached for all of the Tahoe Basin’s development—23,842 is no small number. It is another outsized impact. This one project by KSL is proposing to use up 29%—almost one third—of the entire Tahoe Basin’s remaining driving allowance.
The project’s Final Environmental Impact Report also claims that because Squaw Valley is located outside the TRPA Tahoe Basin’s jurisdictional boundary, the thresholds and required mitigation set by the TRPA do not apply.

But the development would clearly generate many vehicle trips into the Basin: the FEIR says, for example, that it will generate 1,353 daily trips to Tahoe City. TRPA has set a per-project threshold of 200 daily trips. This means that TRPA considers any project that generates more than 200 car trips per day a problem. KSL’s development would generate seven times the threshold level.

There’s a reason why the Tahoe Basin has some of the strictest land use regulations in the country and has received hundreds of millions of dollars of public funding: this is meant to reverse the loss of lake clarity. KSL’s massive development is just outside TRPA’s boundary but would have big impacts inside it. This development should not be allowed to wipe out years of work and millions in investment to Keep Tahoe Blue.
Planning for Disaster

Traffic is more than a mere inconvenience, not only when it comes to pollution, but in the case of emergency—when failed roadways and crowded conditions put lives at risk.

KSL’s proposed development is in the middle of an area that the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE) has designated as a “very high fire hazard severity zone.”

According to the EIR, it would take more than ten hours to evacuate Squaw Valley—just to get to Highway 89. That’s not planning for disaster; it’s planning a disaster.

Northern California suffers frequent reminders of the dangers of wildfire. In the middle of a September night in 2014, a large and fast-growing fire called the King Fire burned rapidly and unexpectedly towards Tahoe, through ten miles of forest, to a point just six miles from Squaw Peak. Though the King Fire was halted before reaching Squaw Valley, smaller fires occur here regularly, on average every year or two.

When fires happen here, it is critical to be able to get emergency vehicles in—and potentially get everyone out.

In 2016, Peter Bansen, Chief of the Squaw Valley Fire Department, voiced his concerns about current conditions and the project’s impacts on safety.

“Emergency vehicle access is regularly impeded”, Chief Bansen wrote to Placer County, because “Squaw Valley Resort is unwilling to accept responsibility for towing vehicles that block roadways and fire lanes on their private property.”

There is no reason, he added, to believe that the current situation would get better if the project was approved—“and many reasons to believe that the project will adversely affect emergency access to the project area and surrounding properties.”

The developers seem to suggest that helicopter evacuation means we don’t have to worry about road traffic. But Bansen points out that helicopter evacuation is no panacea: “The decision to use a helicopter to transport an injured person to a hospital is determined solely by the nature of the person’s injuries and distance to the destination facility most capable of rendering an appropriate level of care—it is unrelated to the presence or absence of traffic. The statement would seem to imply that because helicopters are sometimes used to transport patients to the
hospital, the urgency of providing unimpeded emergency vehicle access at all times is reduced. This is certainly not the case.”

Bansen also points out that KSL’s assertion that emergency responders would help direct traffic is “highly unrealistic”.

He writes, “This scenario was proposed by the consultant, but they were advised by Squaw Valley Fire Department that during a wildland fire it would be highly unrealistic to expect there to be sufficient public safety personnel in the region to perform traffic control as described. Any available public safety personnel would be tasked with much higher priority tasks and even then, the numbers of public safety personnel would likely be inadequate.”

Perhaps most alarming, the Final Environmental Impact Report does admit that, in an emergency, getting everyone out of the valley would be a matter of not minutes, but many hours. If the project were built, it would (normally) take about five hours for all vehicles to leave the valley. With the development at full capacity, evacuating the valley would take more than ten hours.

With a wildfire approaching, the prospect of having to wait over ten hours to escape is nightmarish.
Driving Climate Change

The traffic from KSL’s development would have still another impact: adding greenhouse gases to worsen climate change.

California is leading the nation in setting ambitious goals to fight climate change by reducing greenhouse gas emissions. The largest contributor to greenhouse gas emissions is transportation—tailpipes. And this massive development puts KSL squarely on the wrong side of climate history.

Development projects in the state are required to evaluate their impacts on the climate in their environmental impact reports (EIRs). This project’s Final EIR says that the project would generate 38,975 tons of carbon dioxide per year.\(^\text{48}\)

According to the developers, this project will generate nearly 40 times the amount of climate pollution that air quality agencies consider “significant.”

Planes are the least efficient, most climate-polluting mode of transportation. Already, 15–18% of overnight visitors travel to Squaw Valley by plane each year—which often means renting a car and driving an hour each way as well.\(^\text{49}\)

The project’s developers are making a concerted effort to grow the numbers of visitors who come by air, and not without reason. Squaw’s Andy Wirth explains why: A visitor who flies in from New York is likely to spend about $700–$900 per night with all expenses included. “The comparative for the Marin County customer is more like $200 to $225 a day,” Wirth said.\(^\text{50}\)

Per-customer profits, in short, could quadruple. But if this effort succeeds, it would send the project’s greenhouse gas emissions skyrocketing—a painful irony for a ski resort that relies on the existence of cold and snowy winters.
Finding Solutions to Tahoe’s Traffic Woes

In spite of its obvious and outsized impacts on Tahoe traffic, KSL attempts to portray itself as the cure rather than the cause. In a 2016 press release, KSL claimed, “Congestion on peak days is a regional issue, and Squaw Valley Alpine Meadows has and will continue to serve as a leader for solutions and progress.”

A 2017 email went further. In it, Andy Wirth, COO of KSL’s subsidiary, Squaw Valley Ski Holdings, said, “My company and I are hell bent on developing and implementing a variety of solutions related to resolving road congestion and regional transportation.

This rhetoric sounds impressive. But KSL’s mega-development would put thousands more cars on the roads. It would worsen traffic all along Squaw Valley Road, Highway 89, Interstate 80, and well into Tahoe City and the Tahoe Basin. The project’s own environmental impact reports make this clear—and, as this report demonstrates, the impacts are likely to be much more severe.

Still, KSL somehow continues to assert that proposed development would actually be a net benefit for Tahoe traffic. The main reason cited is that KSL would make some contributions to funding regional transit.

Placer County is complicit in the charade. In its “Statement of Overriding Considerations,” required whenever the County approves a project with significant and unmitigated impacts to the environment, officials claim that these funds will result in “significant regional benefit because these additional funds will further expand transit services in the region.”

Specifically, Placer County says that these funds will “help to achieve numerous complimentary transportation planning goals including increasing transit service and ridership, reducing highway congestion and reliance on the private automobile, improving air quality and providing increased regional transportation options for residents and guests in the region.”
Sounds nice. But if you do the math, the promises ring hollow. As of June 2016, the North Lake Tahoe Regional Transit Vision had an annual budget deficit of $3 million.\textsuperscript{55} Simply summing the monetary contributions contained in the development agreement reveals that KSL’s proposed contribution would add up to just 3\% of what is needed to close that gap.\textsuperscript{56} Countywide, public transit and other transportation projects are facing a $1.75 billion funding gap.\textsuperscript{57} KSL’s contribution would close 0.17\% of that gap.\textsuperscript{58}

These are the current gaps—not including KSL’s development and all the traffic it would add, and these contributions amount to only a tiny fraction of the established need. In spite of what KSL and the County claim, the proposed project would contribute almost nothing to the solution—just a whole lot to the problem.
The First Step Toward a Solution

Traffic in Tahoe is infamously terrible. Few comprehensive solutions have yet been proposed. For now, the best the region can do is the first step to solving any problem: stop making it worse.

The proposed mega-development at Squaw Valley is out of scale with the area and is far beyond what the infrastructure can support.

KSL’s marketing claims that it will somehow actually solve the region’s traffic problems. The truth is clearly the opposite.

The gravest threat posed by this development is to the beloved lake at the region’s heart. The cars and the pollution it would add to the roads could reverse efforts by generations of residents and visitors to “Keep Tahoe Blue.”

KSL says it will provide real solutions to Tahoe traffic. The obvious first step to do that is to scale back this proposal. For the sake of the lake, its environment, and the whole Tahoe experience for thousands of residents and visitors, the project cannot be built as currently proposed.

KSL can update Squaw Valley and it could even expand; but it must do so without adding thousands more cars to the roads. Squaw Valley needs a new, sustainable blueprint.

At stake is the future of Tahoe.
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